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ABSTRACT

A Corpus-based Discourse Analysis of Grammatical Cohesive Devices Used in Expository Essays Written by Emirati EFL Learners at Al Ghazali School, Abu Dhabi

This descriptive study aimed at investigating eighth-grade Emirati EFL learners’ familiarity with employing grammatical cohesive devices (GCDs) in generating expository texts. A learner corpus sample comprising 30 written expositions was analyzed according to Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) grammatical cohesion framework, by using the web-based software concordance tool Wmatrix3. The mixed-methods research design was conducted to identify the most frequently utilized GCDs in terms of numbers and percentages, and to disclose the difficulties encountered by the learners in using these linking ties.

The results obtained showed that the learners employed all four types of grammatical cohesion: reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction, despite of the considerable differences regarding their frequencies in the texts. They relied heavily on conjunctive devices (57%), followed by referential ones (35%), whereas elliptical and substitutional devices represented only 6.5% and 1.5% respectively of the total usage of GCDs. Furthermore, the learners employed all sub-types of grammatical cohesion, often with a focus on specific devices within each sub-type. However, 19% of the devices used in the text showed inappropriateness. The qualitative analysis indicated that the problems encountered by the learners were mainly misusing, excessively using, and inadequately using some GCDs in many paragraphs.

Some pedagogical implications were provided to help EFL teachers enhance learners’ skills in generating more cohesive written discourse. These included: blending reading with writing activities, teaching GCDs explicitly, helping learners to think in English while writing, exploiting writing as a thinking tool, and using corpora in learning and teaching practices.

IV
تحليل خطي لأدوات الربط النيولي المستخدمة في مجموعة النصوص التفسيرية كتبت

بواسطة طلاب إماراتيين يدرسون اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية

بمدرسة الغزالي في أبوظبي

تهدف هذه الدراسة الوصفية إلى استكشاف مدى معرفة طلاب الصف الثامن الإماراتيين الذين يدرسون اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، فتالف من النصوص التفسيرية الطلابية تمثلت من 30 مقالة وفقاً لإطار الربط النحوي الذي قدمه الباحثان هوليداي وحسن (1976)، وذلك باستخدام برنامج المطابقة الحاسوبية عبر الإنترنت الذي يدعى (ديليوماتريكس3). كما أنه تم استخدام نموذج أسلوب البحث المختلط لاستكشاف أكثر أدوات الربط هذ استخداماً في تلك النصوص من طريق

تعريفها بالأرقام و النسب المئوية، وكذلك للوقوف على المشاكل التي واجهها الطلاب في استخدامها.

هذ، وأظهرت النتائج أن الطلاب استخدموا أنواع الربط النحوي الأربعة، وهي: الإشارة، الحذف، البدل، الروابط، على الرغم من الخلافات الكبيرة المتعلقة بتكرار استخدامها في النصوص، وقادم الطلاب بشكل هائل على أدوات الروابط (57%)، ثم الإشارة (35%)، بينما استخدام الآدوات الخاصة بالحذف والبدل بنسبة (6.5%) و (1.5%) على التوالي. كما أن الطلاب قاموا جميع أنواع الربط النحوي الفرعي، مع اعتمادهم البازر على أدوات المعينة في كل نوع. وبالرغم من ذلك، فإن نسبة 19% من أدوات الربط النحوي المستخدمة في النصوص غير مناسبة، حيث أظهر التحليل القيمي أن الصعوبات التواجها الطلابي استخدم هذه الأدوات في بعض الفقرات.

هذ، وتم تقديم بعض الاقتراحات التعليمية لمعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، التي اشتملت على أن يتم المرجح بين أنشطة القراءة و الكتابة، و تدريس أدوات الربط النحوي بشكل علمي، ومساعدة الطلاب على التفكير باللغة الإنجليزية أثناء الكتابة، واستغلال الكتابة كأداة للفكر، واستخدام المجموعات النصية في الممارسات التعليمية و التعليمية.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

The writing skill is regarded as “…the vehicle for communication and a skill mandated in all aspects of life” (Caswell & Mahler 2004, p. 3). However, it is considered a difficult process in L1 and even more complicated in L2. Richards and Renandya (2002) assert that what makes writing the hardest skill for L2 learners to master is that the learners are not only required to employ lower level skills, such as: spelling, using correct punctuation, and selecting appropriate words, but they are also expected to make use of the higher level skills of planning and organizing texts to make them readable. Besides, writing becomes more challenging when L2 learners are engaged in writing extended texts, which turns out to be more demanding for them, particularly when this is compared with generating unrelated simple sentences.

In addition, writing extended texts requires learners’ awareness of another significant element; i.e. cohesion, which shows how semantic relationships are set up by overt lexical and syntactic features. Referred to as cohesive devices, these features are often used by language users to stretch any spoken or written piece of discourse in order to make it understandable (Halliday & Hasan 1976). Be they lexical or grammatical, these devices have a very strong effect on discourse, since they help listeners or readers to perceive the textual meaning of individual sentences.

In order to get a deeper insight into how learners make good use of cohesive devices in composing extended written texts, researchers employ discourse analyses (Meisuo 2000; Azzouz 2009; Ahmed 2010; Abadiano1995). Discourse analysis, as elucidated by Tracy (2001), explores how people present themselves, organise relationships, and assign responsibility and blame. Also, she explicates that it relates to many fields, including psychology, education and linguistics. Highlighting the significance of context, McCarthy (1991) believes that discourse analysis focuses on investigating the relationship between language and the contexts within which people use it. In addition, he makes clear that discourse analysts explore people’s natural spoken and written
communication, which is expected to be meaningful and coherent, in an attempt to gain deeper insights into how discourse looks and sounds.

Hence, the aim of this descriptive study is to investigate the extent to which Emirati EFL eighth graders at Al Ghazali School in Abu Dhabi make use of grammatical cohesive devices (GCDs) in writing a particular type of extended texts; i.e. exposition. The data for the study were obtained from a corpus; a purposeful collection of authentic spoken or written language (Hunston 2002). In accordance with Flowerdew’s (2012) description of corpus, it should comprise naturally occurring data, represent a particular genre, and focus on a specific linguistic or socio-pragmatic purpose. So, the samples were asked to write an exposition text about a grade-eight level theme-related topic. Next, a descriptive written discourse analysis was conducted to explore the predominant types of GCDs employed by the learners, and the problems they had in composing cohesive extended texts. Based on the findings, some pedagogical implications were suggested to help Emirati EFL learners make better use of GCDs in writing extended texts.

It is expected that this study will be of major benefits to EFL teachers and learners at Al Ghazali School, and other cycle-two schools in Abu Dhabi as well. Not only does it reveal the extent to which learners are familiar with using various types of grammatical cohesive features to create cohesive extended texts, the most and least frequent types used, and the problems that the learners encounter in using them, but it also offers some suggestions that might help teachers guide learners on how to avoid problems in producing cohesive extended texts.

1.2. Background of the Study

Located in the Emirate of Abu Dhabi, Al Ghazali is a cycle-two state school managed by Abu Dhabi Education Council (ADEC), which has been running all schools in Abu Dhabi since 2006. The school is attended by 580 local Emirati male students, aged between 11 and 15 years. With Arabic being their L1, in which they are taught all subjects, learners begin studying English as a foreign language (EFL) in grade one. Prior to 2006, EFL teachers practiced teaching to the test through using course books for each grade level. But since September that year, the teachers have been implementing the newly ADEC-
created EFL Curriculum which reflects the Dogme Approach and teaching to standards. Concerning cycle-two schools, the grades 6-9 EFL Curriculum (Appendix I) is being implemented.

The aims included in the grades 6-9 EFL Curriculum indicate that learners are taught to communicate effectively in English. As for the writing skill, they learn to express their ideas and feelings through composing substantial and sustained texts in a range of modes. Besides, in accordance with this curriculum, learners are expected to study the English language structures at the word, phrase, sentence, paragraph, and the whole text levels. The grade-eight standards introduced in that curriculum illustrate that learners will be able to compose logical arguments, express points of view convincingly, and revise their writing to improve its fluency, accuracy and readability.

Therefore, EFL teachers at Al Ghazali School have been collating and creating teaching materials and using them to help students compose coherent and cohesive written extended texts. In terms of text cohesion, they teach learners, basically implicitly, how to make use of some GCDs, especially those related to reference and conjunction. The rubric which is currently used to teach and assess extended written texts at Al Ghazali School (Appendix II) points out that the learners should structure content cohesively, logically, and clearly. In line with the criteria for text cohesion in that rubric, the learners who get the highest score should use a range of cohesive devices correctly to enhance reading and support underlying relationships. In the present study, it has been felt that analyzing samples of learners’ written extended texts would help the teachers explore the types of grammatical cohesive ties that the learners employ when writing, and the problems they face while making use of them. Consequently, appropriate teaching implications could be suggested to help learners make their writing more cohesive.

1.3. Statement of the Problem

With regard to the writing skill, second language acquisition key researchers, such as Halliday and Hasan (1976), emphasize the act of creating a coherent as well as cohesive discourse so as to ensure texture or cohesion in writing lengthy texts. They assert that discourse devices have very strong effect on writing, since they provide writers with
lexical and grammatical ties which can be used to stretch any piece of discourse to make it cohesive and understandable. It is noteworthy that writers cannot construct a cohesive piece of discourse without having a good command of these linguistic ties. Therefore, the problems addressed in this study are: to what extent are Emirati EFL learners familiar with using GCDs while writing extended texts; what problems do they have in using them; and what suggestions could be made to help the learners construct more cohesive written discourse? Across the UAE, there is a great deal of research conducted on analyzing learners’ grammatical errors committed in writing (Hamada 2008; Hourani 2008), whereas there is a lack of information regarding the degree to which learners make use of GCDs in writing extended texts. The current study aims at exploring this area.

1.4. Research Questions

The prime objective of this descriptive study is to examine the grammatical cohesive ties which Emirati EFL learners at Al Ghazali School in Abu Dhabi employ so as to generate a cohesive written discourse, and the problems that the learners have while using them. In order to achieve this objective, the following research questions have been developed:

1. What are the types of GCDs used by Emirati EFL learners in writing expository essays?
2. How frequently are the types of GCDs used by Emirati EFL learners in writing expository essays?
3. What problems do Emirati EFL learners have in using GCDs in writing?

The above-indicated research questions are based on the following hypotheses, which will be tested throughout the implementation of the study:

a) Emirati EFL learners at Al Ghazali School employ a range of GCDs in writing expository essays.
b) Emirati EFL learners at Al Ghazali School use some types and sub-types of GCDs much more frequently than others.
c- Emirati EFL learners at Al Ghazali School have many problems in using GCDs in writing.
1.5. Scope of the Study

Since its main focus is on examining learners’ use of GCDs in constructing extended texts, the scope of the current study includes a discourse analysis of a representative set of expositions written by Emirati eighth graders at Al Ghazali School in Abu Dhabi. Regarding the tool of analysis, Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) cohesion framework has been selected and adopted. The study covers an examination of the occurrence of the different types of GCDs used in the texts by means of employing specially-designed computer software for corpus analysis. Within the scope of the study, another analysis of the problems that the learners face in using these linking ties has been conducted. To keep the study more focused, an examination of lexical cohesive devices was not undertaken.

1.6. Rationale for the Study

From a theoretical perspective, the reason beyond selecting the topic of GCDs for investigation in the current study is that these significant devices refer to the range of possibilities that writers can use for linking an element of language with what has been mentioned before or what goes after in a text (Bae 2001). Although cohesion in a text is mainly expressed “… partly through the grammar and partly through the vocabulary” (Halliday & Hasan 1976, p. 5), for deeper and more focused perception of the topic, the grammatical devices only which occurred in the texts have been examined.

From a practical angle, cohesion is a basic criterion included in the writing rubrics which are commonly used to teach and assess the writing skill at Al Ghazali School, and in other educational institutions worldwide (Cooper et al. 2011). Because learners’ grades concerning text cohesion in these rubrics often reflect significant weakness in this area, EFL teachers at Al Ghazali School, including the researcher, have shown great interest in obtaining deeper insights into the extent to which Emirati learners employ GCDs in their writing, and the difficulties they have in using them as well. Consequently, some pedagogical procedures could be taken to enhance the learners’ skills in creating more cohesive written texts.
1.7. Significance of the Study

The current study demonstrates its significance in several aspects. While many researchers in the United Arab Emirates examined EFL learners’ various written texts by conducting error analyses (Hamada 2008; Hourani 2008), this study is thought to be the first to focus on investigating grammatical cohesion within written expository essays created by Emirati learners. It is expected that it would generate information on the degree of learners’ familiarity with adopting grammatical linking ties to create cohesive lengthy texts, the frequency of such ties in the texts, and the problems that the learners have in using them. By offering some suggestions for teachers to assist learners increase their performance in producing cohesive extended texts, the study would be of significant benefit for both EFL teachers and learners at Al Ghazali School, and other cycle-two schools across the UAE as well.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the theoretical background on which the current study is based. While incorporating explanations of discourse, discourse analysis, genre analysis, exposition text, coherence, and cohesion, it is elaborately structured to examine the related literature to written discourse analysis, and how the GCDs introduced by Halliday and Hasan (1976); reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction, are used to organize clauses and sentences into one whole text.

2.2. Discourse

*Discourse* refers to the language used by people in communication. While *language* is characterized as a means of human communication that comprises speaking, writing, and nonverbal expressions (Simpson 2001), *communication* itself refers to the process via which individuals and institutions exchange information among them (Tracy 2001). Therefore, researchers’ definitions of discourse mostly refer to people’s language in use. Gee (2011, p. 30), for example, defines discourse as “... a characteristic way of saying, doing, and being”, and it contains different features that distinguish individuals and contexts. Moreover, Scollon and Scollon (2001) add a social dimension to discourse by explicating that it is also concerned with habits and social conventions, because people in any community are shaped and recognized through discourse and social interaction.

2.3. Written Discourse

Although spoken and written texts share the same purpose of characteristics in order to achieve specific goals; inform, and entertain (Nunan 1993), researchers have drawn a clear distinction between spoken and written discourse. According to Brown and Yule (1983), the spoken language is intended to be transitory and it has an interactional function; to establish relationship with people. On the other hand, the written language is planned to be permanent, and it reflects a transactional purpose; to transfer information. Therefore, the difference between spoken and written language, as summarized by Stubbs (1996), is that the former is the type of communication which is mostly performed...
informally, spontaneously, privately, and directly, whilst the latter is carried out formally, deliberately, publicly, and indirectly. Also, written discourse almost involves using standard language and editing procedures, but it holds no interaction with the audience (Stubbs 1996).

2.4. Discourse Analysis

The term discourse analysis was first introduced by Harris (1952), who believed that it deals with analyzing connected speech and writing. Later, many researchers have similarly, and sometimes typically, explained it. McCarthy (1991), for example, elucidates that discourse analysts explore people’s natural spoken and written communication, which is expected to be coherent and meaningful, in an attempt to gain deeper insight into how their discourse looks and sounds. Meanwhile, he emphasizes the significance of context, as he considers that discourse analysis focuses on investigating the relationship between language and the contexts within which it is used. A more elaborate explanation of discourse analysis is introduced by Tracy (2001), who believes that it examines how people present themselves, arrange relationships, and consign responsibility and blame. Also, she explicates that it relates to a range of fields, such as psychology, education, and linguistics. Concerning the current study, and from an EFL teacher and researcher perspective at Al Ghazali School, written discourse analysis is identified as the reflective linguistic investigation of learners’ written extended texts in order to gain more thoughtful insights into how cohesive their writing is, and consequently suggest procedures to guide teachers in enhancing learners’ generation of more cohesive written discourse.

2.5. Genre Analysis and Exposition Text Type

The terms genre and text type are very often used interchangeably, though the first is more comprehensive and refers to the classification of texts, whereas the second denotes the form of texts (Helder 2011). Within a novel, as an example of genre, a range of text types such as description and discussion might be used. Even within the same text type, instances of other text types might be found. For example, in an argumentative text, instances of narration and description are frequently found (Helder 2011).
Given that the study of genre involves examination of text types, Koester and Handford (2013) define genre analysis as a specific type of discourse analysis which aims at identifying the particular nature of genres. Bhatia (1993) explains that there are different approaches to genre analysis, including linguistic, sociological, and psychological ones. Regarding the linguistic approach, which is adopted in the current study, it focuses on investigating specific words and syntactic structures which recurrently or rarely occur in texts. As for the significance of genre and text type analysis, many researchers confirm that analysing genres and text types is considerably productive in various ways. Learners studying the genuine features of particular genres, as assumed by Swales (1990, p.18), “…can get a better handle on communicative affairs”. In other words, so as to develop their overall communicative competence, learners should enhance their discourse competence, which refers to learners’ mastery of how to integrate and conceive meanings and forms to create unified text in different modes through using both cohesion devices; to link forms, and coherence rules; to organize meanings (Canale 1983). Furthermore, Huhta et al. (2013) verify that genre studies have made enormous contributions to the conception of the discourse of academic, technical, and business texts.

As mentioned above, the current study adopts a linguistic approach to genre analysis so as to examine grammatical cohesion within learners’ written expository essays. It is noteworthy that exposition is one of the five basic text types; narration, argumentation, description, instruction, and exposition (Helder 2011). In its written form, a writer creating an exposition sends a message to readers to inform them through describing and explaining a situation. Basically, the writer exposes information regarding this situation by answering topic-related questions of how and why, assuming that the readers have little knowledge about it. Some common patterns of exposition are: cause and effect; in which the writer mentions why something occurs, and problem and solution; where the writer states a problem and provides solutions for it. In sum, learners composing expositions need to introduce a topic, state a position, support it with evidence and examples, and link ideas through using a range of logical connectors (Schleppegrell 2004).
Although *genre* and *text type* analysis has made considerable contributions to language teaching and learning, it has some remarkable limitations. According to Widdowson (1983), one of these limitations is that it might direct researchers and teachers to presume that form-function correlations within genres are rigid and can be taught to learners as formulae. This might reduce the importance of the procedures of learning and using language. A further limitation, introduced by (Paltridge 2001), is the question about learners’ creativity; to what extent should learners be encouraged to generate creative writing that reflects their independent voice, while they are taught to stick rigidly to the conventional features of genre? In other words, learners who are taught to stick strictly to the features of genre are basically expected to produce written texts that reflect convention rather than invention.

### 2.6. Coherence and Cohesion

Generally, the concepts of *coherence* and *cohesion* are more technical and less familiar to many people compared to other language-related elements, such as text length, content, and grammar (Bae 2001). As for *coherence*, researchers have not reached a consensus on a comprehensive definition of it (Grabe & Kaplan 1996), as the term has been defined from different perspectives. However, most researchers in their definitions of *coherence* agree that it refers to the connectivity of ideas in a text. For Castro (2004), it refers to the connection which links ideas in a text and causes the flow of thoughts to be clear and meaningful for the reader. Similarly, Kuo (1995) believes that it is the meaningful relationship among elements of a text, originating from thematic development, organization of information, or the communicative function of a specific discourse. Blanpain (2008) elucidates that *coherence* denotes the fundamental logical relations that make the text unified, rather than being a sequence of independent sentences. He affirms that if a text is not fully coherent, it is hard for the reader to make sense of it because there is no sufficient explicit relationship between its sentences and paragraphs. One of the most influential interpretations of *coherence* has been introduced by Halliday and Hasan (1976, p. 23) who explicate that a text is coherent in “…two regards: it 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”. That is to say, *cohesion* is a basic
characteristic of *coherence* with regard to the linguistic features of the language which give a sequence of sentences a coherent; logical, texture.

Concerning the concept of *cohesion*, a review of theoretical resources reveals that it has significantly been one of the most productive areas in the examination of texts (Thompson 2006). Stemming from Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) cohesion theory, *cohesion* is regarded as a semantic relation; it refers to the relations of meaning which exist in a text. It “…occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another” (Halliday & Hasan 1976, p. 4). For readers to be able to understand the semantic relations within and across sentences in a text, and decode some elements, such as nouns, pronouns, and demonstrative adjectives, they have to examine all the other surrounding elements included in that text. Furthermore, the theory explains that cohesion denotes the continuity which is created between parts of the text through employing some specific elements which can be lexical or grammatical. In this respect, Mahlberg (2009) in her explanation of *cohesion* has presented the notion of the property of connectedness. Indicating the flow of information within a text, such connectedness is reflected by the choice of vocabulary items and grammatical linking words that contribute to textual relations.

Most researchers assert that *cohesion* has a significant impact on the comprehensibility of texts, and highlight the role which should be played by readers to use text features in order to recognize the information presented in these texts. For example, Hoey (1991) asserts that readers are required to look to the surrounding sentences to interpret the cohesive devices included in a text. Correspondingly, Stoddard (1991), by defining cohesion as a mental construct, believes that readers are expected to exert mental effort to interpret cohesive devices used within texts. These text-forming devices, according to Nunan (1993), allow writers and speakers to construct relationships across utterance or sentence boundaries. Because they come in different sets, cohesive resources; devices, establish different kinds of boundaries, and may point out different kinds of links within the chunks of a text (Thompson & Thompson 2001).
2.7. Types of Cohesion

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), cohesion is classified into two broad types: grammatical, and lexical. While the grammatical type is realized by various grammatical devices used to make relations among sentences more explicit, the lexical one is established through the structure of vocabulary; by relating words in terms of their meaning. Both types of cohesion and their divisions are presented in Table 1, based on (Halliday & Hasan 1976). Since the main focus of the current study is on examining GCDs within learners’ expository writing, an elaborate explanation of grammatical cohesion only will be presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohesion</th>
<th>Grammatical</th>
<th>Lexical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Exophoric [situational]</td>
<td>Reiteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endophoric [textual]</td>
<td>Repitition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anaphoric [to preceeding text]</td>
<td>Synonyms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cataphoric [to following text]</td>
<td>Superordinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td></td>
<td>General word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellipsis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Types of Cohesion based on Halliday and Hasan (1976)
(Tsareva 2010, p. 10)

2.7.1. Grammatical Cohesion

Assuming that any sentence in a text is grammatically structured, researchers presuppose that all individual sentences in a text are linked together in a way which contributes to the construction of the whole text. Thus, denoting the linguistic structure established in a text as a whole, grammatical cohesion can be achieved by using GCDs to fix pieces of text together in a particular way, so that the reader can perceive the items referred to, replaced, or omitted (Harmer 2006). Found within and between sentences, these cohesive devices help a text function as a text through constructing cohesive relations among all of its pieces (Halliday & Hasan 1976). Table 2 illustrates these GCDs according to Halliday and Hasan (1976), who classify them into four categories: reference, substitution, ellipsis,
and conjunction. These categories have a theoretical basis which provides researchers with practical means to describe and analyse texts in terms of grammatical cohesion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Cohesion</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Substitution</th>
<th>Ellipsis</th>
<th>Conjunction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Additive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>Possessive</td>
<td>one, ones,</td>
<td>and, and also, nor, or, or else, furthermore, by the way, in other words, likewise, for example on the other hand, thus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/me, you, we/us, he/ him, she/ her, it, they/ them, one</td>
<td>my/mine, your/yours, our/ours, his, her/hers, its, their/their, one's</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>yet, though, only, but, however, at last, in fact, rather, on the contrary, I mean, in any case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstratives</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Adversative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td></td>
<td>so, not</td>
<td>so, then, therefore, because, otherwise, apart from this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>Clausal</td>
<td>Clausal</td>
<td>Causal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>so, not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparatives</td>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>same, identical, similar(ly), such, different, other, else</td>
<td></td>
<td>then, next, before that, first...then, first, formerly...finally, at once, soon, to sum up, in conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more, so many, better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Types of Grammatical Cohesion based on Halliday and Hasan (1976)
(Adapted from Tsareva 2010, p. 13)

2.7.1.1. Reference

Reference is one of the options used to create surface links between sentences. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), the features of reference cannot be semantically interpreted without checking some other features in the text. Similarly, Nunan (1993) confirms that referential cohesion plays a significant role in constructing cohesive ties between the elements which can be difficult, or even impossible, to interpret if a single sentence is isolated from context. While pronominalisation is the most common referring
device, there are other linguistic elements used to fulfill the same function, such as demonstratives and comparatives.

As illustrated in Table 1, reference can serve exophoric and endophoric functions. Regarding the first one, the reader is required to look out of the text so as to interpret the referent. In other words, through exophoric reference, the reader is directed out of the text towards an assumed world shared between him and the writer (McCarthy 1991) in order to retrieve the meaning of the sentences (Halliday & Hasan 1976). An example of exophoric reference presented by Flowerdew (2013, p. 34), is “…[t]hat picture is beautiful” in which that may refer to a picture hanging on the wall. The picture in this example is part of the context of situation, even if it does not appear in the text anywhere else. Although it interacts with the cohesion system and contributes to text coherence (Flowerdew 2013), exphoric reference is not incorporated as a component of cohesion since it does not connect two elements together in a text (Halliday & Hasan 1976).

Pertaining to endophoric reference, it exists when readers refer to elements within the text itself to recognize it (Brown & Yule 1983). It is categorized by Halliday and Hasan (1976) into two types: anaphoric, and cataphoric. In the first type, readers review previous sentences to discover the referent, such as in the example: “[l]ook at the sun. It’s going down quickly” (Brown & Yule 1983, p. 193), where it indicates the previously-mentioned noun; the sun. In contrast, readers in the second type examine the following sentences to realize the referent, as in the example: “[i]t’s going down quickly, the sun” (Brown & Yule 1983, p. 193), where it refers to the subsequently-mentioned noun; the sun.

As illustrated in Table 2, referential cohesion is classified by Halliday and Hasan (1976) into three sub-categories: personal, demonstrative, and comparative. They enable writers to make several references to people and things within a text. Employed to identify people, objects or other things that are mentioned somewhere in the text, personal reference items include: personal pronouns, possessive determiners, and possessive pronouns. In the example: “[w]ash and core six cooking apples. Put them into a fireproof dish” (Halliday & Hasan 1976, p. 2), them expresses an anaphoric reference which
creates grammatical cohesion between the two sentences, and can be interpreted only when readers refer back to the previous text.

Classified as the second type of reference, *demonstrative* is regarded as “… a form of verbal pointing” (Halliday & Hasan 1976, p. 57). Expressed through determiners and adverbs, it is realized by means of location, “…on a scale of proximity” (Halliday & Hasan 1976, p. 57); i.e. nearness in time, place, occurrence, or relation. In the text: “I like the lions, and I like the polar bears. These are my favourites” (Halliday & Hasan 1976, p. 57), *these* is a demonstrative reference element, acting as a grammatical cohesive device, i.e. linking the two sentences and expressing proximity to the speaker by referring to the animals mentioned in the first sentence. As for the definite article *the*, which is included in the class of demonstrative reference, it cannot specify anything on its own because it has no content. Though it does not contain information in itself; as it depends on something else in the text, *the* signals definiteness by creating a cohesive link between the sentence it occurs in and the link it refers to (Halliday & Hasan 1976).

Regarding *comparative*, the third type of referential cohesion, Nunan (1993) elucidates, that it is expressed by using adverbs and adjectives in order to compare and contrast items within a text. Including examples, Table 3 shows that comparative reference is categorised by Halliday and Hasan (1976) into two sub-categories: general, and particular. While the general sub-category expresses resemblance between things with regard to identity, similarity, or difference, the particular one demonstrates comparability between things in terms of quantity or quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Particular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td><em>We have received exactly the same report as was submitted two months ago.</em></td>
<td><em>quantity/numerative</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>There were twice as many people there as last time.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td><em>The candidates gave three similar answers.</em></td>
<td><em>quality/epithet</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Difference**

| A: Would you like these seats? | B: No, I’d like the other seats. | dreamt of in your philosophy. |

**Table 3: Types of Comparative Reference based on Halliday and Hasan (1976)**

(Adapted from Tsareva 2010, p. 15)

**2.7.1.2. Substitution**

Substitution occurs anaphorically in a text when a feature replaces a previous word, phrase or clause, such as in the example: “[m]y axe is too blunt. Do you have a sharper one?” (Halliday & Hasan 1976, p. 89), where one replaces axe. Halliday and Hasan (1976) expound that substitution holds a text together through avoiding repetition and creating cohesive grammatical relations, not in the meaning but in the wording, between words, clauses and phrases. Table 4 demonstrates with examples that there are three types of substitution, as distinguished by Halliday and Hasan (1976).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal substitution</th>
<th>Verbal substitution</th>
<th>Clausal substitution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which kind of engines do you want? Ones with whistles, or ones without?</td>
<td>He never really succeeded in his ambitions. He might have done, one felt, had it not been for the restlessness of his nature.</td>
<td>Is there going to be an earthquake? - It says so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Types of Substitution based on Halliday and Hasan (1976)**

As demonstrated in Table 4, the example provided for the first type, *nominal substitution*, shows that the two questions in the text are grammatically linked by the first and second words *ones*. The words act as substitutes for the noun *engines*, which functions as head of a nominal group. In the example that appears below the second type *verbal substitution*, *done* is an anaphoric substitute for the verb *succeeded*, whereas *so* in the example...
provided for the last type, *clausal substitution*, substitutes the clause *there is going to be an earthquake*.

### 2.7.1.3. Ellipsis

*Ellipsis* is defined as “… the omission of elements required by grammatical rules” (ed. Cummings 2009, p. 124). It is the deliberate omission of words in a sentence whereas the meaning is still obvious (Harmer 2006). A rationale for ellipsis, as introduced by Carter, Hughes and MacCarthy (2000), is that it occurs in texts to avoid redundancy which is caused by repetition of words. Halliday and Hasan (1976) point out that *ellipsis* and *substitution* are very closely similar because *ellipsis* is the replacement of elements within a text by nothing, though readers can recover omitted elements by referring to their antecedents in the text. Like *substitution*, *ellipsis* is categorized by Halliday and Hasan (1976) into three categories, as illustrated in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal ellipsis</th>
<th>Verbal ellipsis</th>
<th>Clausal ellipsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The men got back at midnight. All were tired out.</td>
<td>Have you been swimming?</td>
<td>Who was going to plant a row of poplars in the park?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, I have.</td>
<td>– The Duke was.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5: Types of Ellipsis based on Halliday and Hasan (1976)**

The first category, *nominal ellipsis,* “…often involves omission of a noun headword” (McCarthy 1991, p. 43). In Table 5, the example provided under this category shows that the two sentences are cohesive because *all* functions elliptically and refers anaphorically to the nominal group *the men*. The second category, *verbal ellipsis*, occurs in the verbal group when a verb is omitted from a sentence, but the meaning can be recovered from a previous one. The example cited for this category shows that the answer *yes I have* is an instance of verbal ellipsis, as it presupposes *have been swimming* from the verbal group within the previous question. *Clausal ellipsis*, the third category, refers to the partial or entire omission of a clause, such as in the example included for this category, where *going to plant a row of poplars in the park* is omitted from the answer.
2.7.1.4. Conjunction

Most researchers concur that *conjunctions* are words that bind a variety of language units together, though they define them a little differently. Crismore, Markkanen and Steffensen (1993) consider them as *textual markers* which facilitate organising discourse, whereas Hyland (2005), identifies them as *frame markers*, such as *first, second, and next*, which are used to sequence information within a discourse. Likewise, Kopple (1985) believes that *conjunctions* are called *text connectives*, which are used to link units of a text. Showing relationships between sentences in a text, conjunctive ties are significant devices that “...make text comprehension proceed more efficiently” (Donnelly 1994, p. 96). *Conjunction*, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976), is the fourth grammatical cohesion type which differs from reference, substitution, and ellipsis in that it does not express anaphoric relations within a text. Still, denoting indirect cohesive relations through certain meanings, conjunctions presuppose the presence of other elements in the discourse. Table 6 represents Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) classification of conjunctions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of conjunction</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>To add more information to what is already in the sentence</td>
<td><em>and, also, furthermore, in addition, besides, that is, in other words, moreover</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To indicate comparison: <em>likewise, similarly, in the same way</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To indicate dissimilarity: <em>on the other hand, in contrast, alternatively</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversative</td>
<td>To indicate contrast between information in each clause</td>
<td><em>but, however, although, yet, though, only, nevertheless, despite this, on the other hand, instead, on the contrary, anyhow, at any rate</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal</td>
<td>To indicate causality</td>
<td><em>so, then, hence, therefore, consequently, because, for this reason, it follows, on this basis, to this end</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>To indicate time</td>
<td><em>then, next, before, after, during, when, at the same time, previously, finally, at last, soon, next day, an hour later, meanwhile, at this moment, first, second, third, in conclusion, up to now</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Types of Conjunction based on Halliday and Hasan (1976)
(Adapted from Almasi & Fullerton 2012, p. 132)

As illustrated in Table 6, conjunctions are classified into four types. *And, in addition, moreover, in other words,* and *on the other hand* are examples of the first type *additive,* which is used to present further information to what has been mentioned. The second type *adversative* includes conjunctions which indicate contrast between different positions or situations. Examples of this type include *but, though, however,* and *nevertheless.* *Causal conjunctions,* the third type, incorporate words and phrases which are used to introduce causes and results, such as *so, because, then,* and *therefore.* *First, next, then, in conclusion,* and *finally* are examples of the fourth type, *temporal,* which is used to express relations in time.

2.8. Criticism to the Cohesion Theory

Challenging the cohesive theory proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976), many researchers believe that connectedness in text is not exclusively attributed to the choice of lexical or grammatical linking devices. According to Johns (1986), readers’ background knowledge also plays a significant role in interpreting texts. Similarly, Carrell (1982), basing his argument on schema theory, asserts that text processing is an interactive process between the text itself and the audience’s prior background knowledge or memory schemata. In other words, in addition to textual structure and content, readers’ operation on the text helps them understand its components. After conducting discourse analyses on three empirical studies, Carrell (1982) proves that there is no relationship between the number of cohesive devices and textual coherence. In addition, (Mahlberg 2009) believes that genre conventions impact the cohesive devices which are used to link parts of a text.

2.9. Using Corpora in Language Studies

A *corpus* can be simply defined as “…any collection of more than one text” (McEnery & Wilson 2001, p. 29), or elaborately described as a huge compilation of language, which is
usually stored electronically in order to be analysed linguistically (Flowerdew 2013). Collated in different forms; spoken, written, or mix, these texts are usually stored on a computer, and analysed by researchers with the usage of specially designed software in order to disclose language patterns which occur in them. The rationale beyond this analysis, according to Flowerdew (2013), is that computational tools can deal faster and more precisely than humans with huge amounts of texts. Also, they can reveal textual linguistic features which might be hidden to the naked eye. Corpus-based approaches have been extensively used to explore spoken and written texts, though they are lately criticized for some potential drawbacks. As discussed by Flowerdew (2009), researchers adopting these approaches might find difficulty in selecting the most appropriate corpora to serve their research purposes, and also in using the inductive approach which is usually associated with analyzing corpora. Added to that, because of being decontextualised, corpus data may not be transferable to researchers’ own contexts.

2.10. Previous Studies

Many researchers examined GCDs within expository essays written by EFL learners and native speakers. They investigated the extent to which learners were familiar with the use of these devices in creating cohesive written extended texts. Besides, they explored the most and least frequent cohesive ties employed by learners, and the problems they encountered in using them. The researchers provided suggestions for helping the learners generate more cohesive written discourse. This section reviews some of these studies and presents summaries of their findings.

In a study conducted by Meisuo (2000), the use of cohesive features in expository compositions written by Chinese EFL undergraduates was investigated. Adopting Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) taxonomy of cohesive devices and their framework for analysis, the researcher examined one hundred and seven essays. In these texts, the learners successfully employed a variety of GCDs, with some categories of links used more frequently than others. Conjunction was the most used, followed by reference. However, the study yielded that learners misused some conjunctions, and there was ambiguity in some referential devices in the texts.
In a similar descriptive study conducted in an Algerian university, Azzouz (2009) examined second-year EFL undergraduates’ familiarity with using GCDs in writing essays. Attributed by the researcher to the learners’ awareness of it, conjunction was the most predominant category employed in the forty analysed essays. Also, there was a predominant device within each sub-type. *And, but, because* and *in conclusion* were the most frequent within the *additive, adversative, causal,* and *temporal* types respectively. Nevertheless, many conjunctions were used inappropriately. According to the researcher, learners’ avoidance of using some cohesive features, such as *ellipsis,* was traceable to their unfamiliarity with them, as they did not know when, how, or where to use such devices. The researcher concluded that the more GCDs were employed by the learners, the more inappropriate occurrences were detected.

Researching Egyptian EFL learners’ cohesion problems in essay writing, Ahmed (2010) concluded that many factors caused their texts to be non-cohesive. These factors include learners’ low proficiency in English, writing anxiety, and lack of both motivation and self-confidence. Added to that, because of the considerable differences between Arabic and English, especially in lexico-grammatical and structural aspects, the researcher argued that L1 interference in learners’ written texts contributed negatively to the non-cohesiveness of their written discourse. The researcher offers some pedagogical implications to help learners generate more cohesive extended texts. He suggests that the teaching material should cover cohesion and coherence skills, and learners should receive both oral and written feedback regarding their written production. A further suggestion made by the researcher is that writing teachers should be engaged in conducting research, so as to explore learners’ weakness areas and find out how to overcome them.

In her study conducted to examine cohesive devices within written expositions created by USA learners of English, Abadiano (1995) concluded that reference and conjunction were the most frequently used devices within the grammatical type, while ellipsis and substitution were hardly ever employed. The six-grade native learners of English relied frequently on the conjunctive additives *and* and *or,* followed by temporal conjunctions, then the causal ones. She attributed the high frequency of the conjunctive causal *because* to the nature of the expository writing which required the learners to reason or explain. In
general, the learners employed a wide range of GCDs in their expositions, though some of them limited their choice to very few types. According to the researcher, some learners demonstrated little knowledge of the use of appropriate cohesive ties because they were still not aware of the expository text type, and they lacked the necessary information to use in their texts.

2.11. Summary

In the current chapter, it has been shown that cohesion in a text can be established by using specific grammatical and lexical devices. Through adopting a linguistic approach to discourse analysis, researchers explore such devices so as to examine to what extent writers employ them in generating cohesive discourse. Researchers select to investigate the genres and text types which fulfill their research purposes. These text types include the five basic ones: narration, argumentation, instruction, description, and exposition (Helder 2011). By using special computer software, researchers can conduct corpus-based written discourse analyses of small or large corpora, in order to reveal the linguistic features of texts. Thus, they can gain new insights into how to develop learners’ writing skills, and enhance their discourse competence as well. In the last section of this chapter, reviews of some similar previous studies conducted worldwide were discussed. These studies examined GCDs within learners’ written expositions. Generally speaking, they showed that learners relied more on some specific cohesive devices than others in composing expository essays, and they misused some types.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter elaborates on the methods and strategies used in the implementation of the current study. It starts with a Gantt chart representing the chronological development of the research, followed by shedding light on the research purpose. Next, it provides details about the sampling and data collection procedures, how the study corpus has been built, and which strategy and tools have been adopted to analyse it. After explaining the rationale beyond selecting the mixed-methods approach, it demonstrates the data analysis model which was adopted. The chapter also highlights some ethical issues which were taken into consideration while conducting the research, and finally it illustrates how validity, reliability, and credibility were established in the study. The core activities and phases of the study are illustrated in the following Gantt chart, Figure 1, which is a common figure of illustrating the progress of a research (Denicolo& Becker 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Research Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Ethical approvals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Defining research areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Collecting Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Corpus building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Analysing Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Writing Final Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Chronological Stages of the Study

3.2. Research Purpose

The current study is purely descriptive purposed as determined by the research questions. A descriptive research basically aims at understanding social problems and issues, and finds out how prevalent they are, through describing people, phenomena, or events (ed.
While the overall purpose is to identify the types and frequency of GCDs employed by Emirati EFL learners in writing expositions, the study also aims at disclosing the problems that the learners have in using such devices. Based on the findings, the study seeks to suggest some pedagogical implications to help Emirati EFL learners make best use of GCDs in generating cohesive written discourse.

3.3. Population and Sample

The study population comprises 110 eighth graders at Al Ghazali School for Boys in Abu Dhabi. Being from the United Arab Emirates, the learners’ L1 is Arabic, and they are homogeneous in terms of their linguistic and socioeconomic background. Aged 13-14 years, they study all subjects in Arabic, with EFL taught to them six lessons of 45 minutes per week since grade one. As part of their continuous assessment for the first trimester, and within 50 minutes, they were asked to write a grade-eight theme-related expository essay of approximately 200 words about the challenges facing the environment. As stated by (Kothari 2004, p. 58) a random sample has “… the same composition and characteristics of a universe.” Therefore, after collecting the essays, the randomization technique of simple random sampling was adopted in selecting the study sample, 30 essays, to ensure that each member of the population had an equal and independent chance of being represented (Pathak 2008).

3.4. Data Collection and Corpus Building

The 30-essay sample was typed on the computer by a professional typist, using Word files. After comparing the handwritten with the electronic versions to ensure typicality, the Word files were converted into one plain text file, which was fed into Wmatrix3. This is a web-based corpus processing software tool which allows the macroscopic analysis of a text to inform the microscopic one (Rayson 2002). In other words, by analyzing the characteristics of a whole corpus; through the integration of part-of-speech tagging and lexical semantic tagging in such a profiling tool, this software enables researchers to examine the use of specific linguistic features, including key grammatical categories and key concepts. Paquot (2010, p. 36) explains that Wmatrix“… gives researchers access to several corpus annotation and retrieval tools.” However, within the current learner corpus
of Al Ghazali School eighth graders, the purpose beyond adopting this computational analysis was to specifically find out the occurrence and frequency of the GCDs identified by Halliday and Hassan (1976) in their comprehensive and well-developed taxonomy (Geluykens 2013). An example page of Wmatrix3Concordance can be seen at the end of this study (Appendix IV).

Although the current study corpus comprises only 30 expository essays, many researchers such as Ghadessy, Henry and Roseberry (eds.2001) confirm that analysing small corpora has yielded as remarkable discoveries about the language as large corpora. They also assert that further knowledge about language could not have been explored through analyzing large corpora, or conducting any other known method of linguistic analysis.

### 3.5. Research Strategy

The three research questions can be classified into two types. Firstly, two questions seek qualitative results: the types of GCDs used by learners in writing expositions, and the problems that the learners encounter in using such devices. In order to answer these, the qualitative research method was adopted to interpret the data retrieved from the corpus. Merriam (2009) explicated that the characteristics marking qualitative research include that its main focus is on process, understanding, and meaning. She also elucidates that when conducting qualitative research, the principal tool of data collection and analysis is the researcher himself, the process which is adopted is inductive, and its product is richly descriptive. Secondly, one question seeks quantitative results; the frequency of GCDs used in the written expository texts. For this to be answered, the quantitative research method was adopted to quantify these devices, after categorizing them, in terms of numbers and percentages. As stated by Walliman (2005, p. 302) the quantitative analysis “… uses the syntax of mathematical operations to investigate the properties of data”. According to Johnson and Christensen (2012), the quantitative method gains some advantages in a piece of research, such as yielding accurate numerical data, and the statistical generalisations which can be made about the study’s population.
Thus, through “… collecting and analysing both qualitative and quantitative data in a single study” (Creswell 2003, p. 210), and presenting answers to the research questions through both narrative and numerical forms (Teddli & Tashakkori 2009), the mixed-method approach was adopted as the strategy of the current research. Although it might be time-consuming and difficult for a single researcher to carry out; because of dealing sometimes simultaneously with both quantitative and qualitative data, the mixed-method approach creates “…more complete knowledge necessary to inform theory and practice”, because it “… can add insights and understanding” Onwuegbuzie and Johnson (2004, p. 21), which might be missed in case a researcher adopts a mono-method approach.

As shown in Figure 2, the sequential exploratory design, which is a qualitative approach to mixed methods research designs, was adopted in the current study. According to Hesse-Biber (2010), qualitative approaches to mixed methods research may employ both qualitative and quantitative studies for many reasons. These reasons include collecting more data about the target sample, answering different questions, gaining more robust understanding of qualitative results by combining quantitative findings, and validating the qualitative analysis and interpretation. As for the sequential exploratory design itself, Creswell (2003) explains that the primary purpose of this strategy is to explore a phenomenon through using quantitative data and results to assist in interpreting qualitative data. Within this strategy, priority is generally given to the first phase of the study which includes qualitative data collection and analysis, and it is followed by the second phase; i.e. collecting and analyzing quantitative data. Re the current study, the cohesive devices used in learners’ expositions were identified, and then quantified in terms of numbers and percentages. This helped in: exploring to what extent the learners were aware of employing such devices, revealing some problems they faced in using them, and providing suggestions for enhancing their skills in generating more cohesive discourse.
3.6. Data Analysis Model

To achieve effectiveness and viability of study results, the data collected should undergo rigorous analysis which is both transparent and visible (Chisnall 1997). Besides, as stated by Hesse-Biber (2010, p. 76), the findings of both quantitative and qualitative techniques should be comprehensively addressed and combined, and be “…in conversation with one another”. This study adopted Onwuegbuzie and Teddlie’s (2010) phase-based model for analyzing mixed methods data, as shown in Figure 3 below. Introduced in 2003, this model has seven phases, with the first two only following logical steps in data analysis, whereas the other ones are alternative options for analysis (Creswell & Clark 2011).
Figure 3: Mixed Methods Data Analysis Model based on Onwuegbuzie and Teddlie (2010)

3.7. Ethical Considerations

As explained by Creswell (2003), ethical issues should be addressed throughout the different phases of qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods research. Therefore, right from the introduction of the current study, its significance and rationale were highlighted. It was necessary to inform the school principal, the academic deputy, and grade eight EFL learners and teachers about the significance of the research problem, purpose, and questions. They were shown how the study would benefit the learners being studied and the EFL teachers as well. Official permissions from the school were obtained to use continuous assessment samples; learners’ written expositions, in building the study corpus. Besides, prior consent was taken from the learners, after guaranteeing full anonymity of their written expository articles, by replacing their names on the papers with numerical codes (Appendix III).

3.8. Validity and Reliability

Hunter and Brewer (2003) believe that the two qualities of validity and reliability indicate the assessment of effectiveness of a measurement. They state that validity refers to whether one’s measurement of a phenomenon is true or not; i.e. does it measure what it intends to do? Nevertheless, validity is viewed differently according to different research designs. In quantitative research, it denotes careful sampling, using appropriate tools, and statistical treatments of the data (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2013), whereas in qualitative research, it is established through collecting and interpreting data so that the conclusions accurately represent the real world that has been studied (Yin 2011). In mixed methods research, validity often concentrates on the methods themselves; how far quantitative and qualitative methods are blended, what for, and how evidently the steps of mixing methods are described and followed (Hesse-Biber 2010). On the other hand, the second term, reliability, refers to the replicability degree of the measurement, in other words, does the study yield consistent results if it is repeated many times?
In the current study, both validity and reliability were addressed through many strategies and techniques. Member checks, which “… help improve the accuracy, credibility, validity and transferability” of a study (Collins 2010, p. 168), were conducted through asking some learners to review their essays and answer explanatory questions raised by the researcher during analyzing and interpreting data. Additionally, triangular procedures, which add strength to a study by integrating methods (Patton 2002), were adopted. Such procedures try more deeply to understand and interpret the richness and complexity of human behaviour by studying it from more than one angle. Denzin’s classification of triangulation strategies in 1978 (cited in Patton 2002) shows that there are four types of triangulation. Data triangulation is the first type in which more than one data source is used in a study. The second one is investigator triangulation, in which multiple researchers or evaluators analyse and interpret data. Adopting more than one method to investigate a problem refers to the third type, methodological triangulation, whereas the fourth one is theory triangulation, in which two or more perspectives are used to investigate a problem. The current study adopted both the second and third types of triangulation. Two other researchers were asked to individually analyse and interpret the data to find out and categorize the GCDs employed in the expository essays, and to examine the problems that faced the learners in using them. Then, interpretations were compared and discussed. In addition, both the quantitative and qualitative approaches were blended to investigate learners’ use of such devices. Furthermore, to enhance the credibility of the study, many learners were asked to read through and reflect upon the study findings (Koch 2006, cited in Ryan, Coughlan & Cronin 2007).

3.9. Summary

This chapter described in details the methods and strategies used in implementing the current study. First of all, the chronological development of the research was illustrated in a Gantt chart, followed by an explanation of the descriptive nature of the research purpose. Then, it was shown how the study sample, 30 written expositions, was selected through adopting the randomization technique of simple random sampling. Next, in order to demonstrate the procedures followed in collecting data and building the study corpus, the chapter included a description of how the expositions were fed onto a web-based
corpus processing software tool, Wmatrix3, to be analysed. This was followed by elucidating the rationale beyond selecting the mixed-methods approach as the research strategy, and explicating why Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) framework was adopted in analysing the data. After elaborating on Onwuegbuzie and Teddlie’s (2010) mixed methods data analysis model, which was adopted in analyzing the data, a presentation of some ethical issues was made. Finally, the last section of the chapter illustrated how validity, reliability, and credibility were established throughout the study.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Introduction

An elaborate examination of the GCDs used in the learners’ expository essays constitutes the main body of this chapter. It illustrates how these elements operate as links for several independent clauses and sentences, and in what way they establish connectedness and organize these clauses and sentences into one whole text. Initially, a chart will show the occurrence and frequency of each cohesive device type used. After that, each type and sub-type of these cohesive elements will be presented and described separately, following Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) concept of grammatical cohesion. Then, a discussion of the problems that the learners face in using these devices will follow.

4.2. The Occurrence and Frequency of GCDs

In this section, the first and second research questions will be addressed: what are the types of GCDs used by Emirati EFL learners in writing expository essays? , and how frequently are the types of GCDs used by Emirati EFL learners in expository essays? As discussed above, the focus will be primarily on the grammatical devices which operate internally to link independent clauses and sentences, and so act cohesively in the texts, whereas those which express inter-sentential or exophoric relations will not be counted as cohesive devices. Some examples from the learners’ essays representing both cohesive and non-cohesive devices will be provided within the tables which are used for presenting each type.

Chart 1 below demonstrates the number and percentage of each grammatical cohesive type which occurred in the learners’30 essays. With the total number of devices602, the learners adopted all four types, despite of the considerable differences among them. They depended most heavily on conjunction, as it represents 57% of the total cohesive relations generated. In the second place appears reference (35%), while ellipsis and substitution come third and fourth, with 6.5%and 1.5%. respectively These results correspond to Meisuo’s (2000) and Azzouz’s (2009) studies in relation to using the conjunction type the most in expository essays, but they are unlike Abadiano’s (1995) findings which show
that reference was the most predominant category utilized in the same text type. However, the results in all four studies indicate that ellipsis and substitution were scarcely exploited, which corresponds to Halliday and Hasan (1976) who assert that they occur more frequently in spoken language.

(Mahlberg 2009), as was indentified in 2.8, considers that genre conventions have an impact on the cohesive devices used in linking parts of a text. This might justify, in the current study, the learners’ primary reliance on conjunction in creating cohesive links in their expositions, which basically include introducing a topic, stating a position, providing examples, and linking ideas by a range of logical connectors(Schleppegrell 2004).

**Chart 1: Numbers and Percentages of GCDs**

In relation to each type and sub-type, the following results have been found.

**4.2.1. Reference**

As shown above, the number of reference devices adopted is 211, which represents 35% of the 602 occurrences of all GCDs. Chart 2 illustrates the number and percentage of all three reference sub-types; personal, demonstrative, and comparative.
The chart above indicates that the learners employed 132 personal reference items, which represent 62% of the total devices used within this category. This might be attributed to the learners’ familiarity with this sub-type which is taught in early stages. The demonstrative sub-type items come second with 73 devices (35%), probably because they are considered very simple GCDs which are often excessively used by L2 learners (Hinkel 2013). Regarding comparative reference, it is clear that the learners adopted it the least, as it represents only 3%.

The adopted devices related to all three sub-types; personal, demonstrative, and comparative, are shown in the following tables.

### 4.2.1.1. Personal Reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>71.97</td>
<td>The second point is water pollution. It means garbage in the sea water, rivers, oceans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>CFL lights consume less energy. They live longer, consume less electricity, lower electricity bills and also help you to reduce …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>It is the seas, mountains, desert where people can have fun and ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
enjoy. But people everywhere are harming them.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>us</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theirs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7: Personal Reference Items**

The table above shows that the learners used *it* (approximately 71%) much more extensively than any other device within the personal reference sub-category, whereas *they*, *them*, and *their* represent only about 10%, 7%, and 6% respectively. As for *us*, *our*, and *theirs*, the results obtained show that they are the least used among this sub-type. The learners’ extensive reliance on the non-person singular *it* might be justified by their reference to the challenges facing the environment, the topic of the exposition, which they kept introducing and explaining one by one in their essays.

All the devices were used cohesively to link sentences in the texts where they occurred. In the examples excerpted from the essays (Appendix III), and provided opposite each device in Table 7, it is clear that all the devices refer anaphorically to items previously mentioned in the texts. For example, *it*, *they*, and *them* refer to *water pollution*, *CFL lights*, and *seas, mountains, desert* respectively. As for *our*, it refers anaphorically to *we*, although *we* basically refers exophorically to the human race in general or to the writer and reader. However, *our* gains its cohesive force from the existence of *we* in the previous sentences. Interestingly, *theirs* in the example provided is doubly anaphoric: it expresses anaphoric reference to *people*, which exists in the previous sentence, and it also indicates ellipsis of *rivers*, as it will be explained in detail in 4.2.3.

Many personal reference items are widely present in the texts, but they are excluded because they establish no cohesive relations. For instance, since it is commonly used in expository writing, *I* has no cohesive force in the example: *Hence, I think that we*
should look after the environment carefully, where I refers externally to the writer. Likewise, in the example: In Russia, they have an island where they throw their nuclear waste, they is non-cohesive because it refers exophorically to Russian people or scientists. Moreover, the learners did not use other items of personal reference such as: he, him, his, she, her, and hers, probably because these pronouns are more used in other text types, such as narrative, to avoid repetition of proper nouns (Hinkel2013).

4.2.1.2. Demonstrative Reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>this</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57.53</td>
<td>… some ships dump their waste … , some cities dump sewage….If we keep this way we will lose the water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>…and there are other things that damage the water life like oil spills. That also has the same result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td>… cars that release CO2 … factory chimneys … Burning of fossil fuels …These are many causes of this problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>…climate change… many cars release … chimneys. …. People all over the world should take fast action against those problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>We can enjoy visiting the beaches and deserts. There we can go camping and diving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Demonstrative Reference Items

The results illustrated in Table 8 indicate that the highest frequency is in using this(approximately 57%) which exceeds the use of these(about 17%) and there(about 16%). This shows the learners’ preference for using the singular form of demonstrative to refer to what has been mentioned in the texts. It is noteworthy that there are77 occurrences of there in the texts, not only 12 as presented in Table 8, but they are not cohesive because they were mostly used as pronouns, such as in the example: But, there are many challenges which face the environment. So, only the anaphoric and locative demonstrative adverb there was regarded cohesive. As for that and those, they were rarely used by the learners, as they represented approximately7% and 1% respectively of the total demonstrative devices. The examples provided in the table prove that the
learners succeeded in using demonstrative devices cohesively, as they contributed to the unity of text. For instance, showing extended reference and not referring to a person or an animal, *this* was used to point anaphorically to the set of activities of polluting water resources which was mentioned all through the previous sentences. Interestingly, it is sometimes difficult to state whether the referent of a demonstrative is a particular nominal item in the text, or it should be taken to include other things. This may be applicable to *those* in the example provided in the same table, where it may refer to cars, and chimneys, and also to all the other problems which were previously mentioned in the text.

Another interesting point is that *the*, which is the most extensively used item in the texts with 585 occurrences, has no cohesive force at all. In some instances, it expresses exophoric relations, while in other cases it indicates inter-sentential cataphoric ones, or sometimes both. In this example excerpted from the text: The second serious challenge that faces the environment is land pollution that damages the land and seriously the environment that we live in, all the occurrences of *the* refer exophorically, with the last *the* referring both exophorically and cataphorically to the environment in which the writer, reader, and the entire human race live. Therefore, they do not establish cohesive connections with any other sentence in the text.

### 4.2.1.3. Comparative Reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Thirdly, water pollution means the water is dirty …it's killing the fish. …, and there are other things that damage the water life like oil spills. That also has the same result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Natural actions events that pollute the air include forest fires, volcanic eruption, wind erosion and natural radioactivity Fourthly, … automobiles. Apart from that, the other causes are combustion of coal, acid rain …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Comparative Reference Items
According to Table 9, the learners used the comparative reference devices *same* and *other* equally; three occurrences each. As shown in the example included in the table, the sameness expressed by *same* has an anaphoric referential property, as it refers non-structurally, i.e. cohesively, to the consequences of water pollution which were mentioned in the previous sentences. Likewise, *other* in the other example in the table is anaphoric to the sources of pollution included in the preceding text. The learners’ little use of comparative reference could be traceable to their little experience in creating comparisons, which could also be more frequent in other text types, such as comparative argumentation.

### 4.2.2. Substitution

As previously shown in Chart 1, the number of substitution devices employed in the essays is 9, which represents the least percentage (1.5%) of the 602 occurrences of all GCDs used by the learners. Chart 3 illustrates the frequencies and percentages of all three substitution sub-types; nominal, verbal, and clausal.

![Chart 3: Numbers and Percentages of Substitution Sub-types](chart-image-url)

The chart indicates that the learners generated 5 nominal substitution relations, which represent 56% of the total relations established within this category, whereas the clausal
sub-type comes second with 3 occurrences (33%). Concerning the verbal sub-category, it is evident that the learners employed it the least, as it was used only once (3%). It is thought that only the high achieving learners could make such cohesive relations as they are much more interested than others in examining authentic English material available from various resources, such as TV, computer programs, and the Internet. Also, some have been joining summer EFL learning courses organized in English speaking countries. The following tables provide details and examples of each sub-category.

4.2.2.1. Nominal Substitution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Also, burning trees causes land pollution. There are many effects resulting from this one, like people catch diseases and become sick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>But some people kill and damage the environment. We should not do the same to the environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Nominal Substitution Items

The nominal substitution ties one and same, as illustrated in Table 10, have three and two occurrences respectively. As for the substitution counter one, the example in the table shows that it creates an anaphoric relation in the wording. It is used to subordinate information and establish text cohesion by forcing the reader back to preceding sentence. The presupposed item that it substitutes; the activity or problem of burning trees, is easily recoverable from there. Similarly, the same in the other example expresses a cohesive force at the lexico-grammatical level by substituting the activity of killing and damaging the environment.

It is noteworthy that one has many other occurrences in the learners’ essays, but with no cohesive force. For example, one in the sentence: If each of us plants one little tree, it can fight…., does not substitute a noun from preceding text. This is clearly because it
functions as a numerative modifier in the nominal group *one little tree*, whereas the substitute *one* functions only as a head noun.

### 4.2.2.2. Verbal Substitution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Can we use public transport? I think we can do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11: Verbal Substitution Items**

The results obtained show that verbal substitution was adopted once in all the essays. The example in Table 11 shows that *do* links the rejoinder to the question by anaphora, as it presupposes *use public transport* in the question.

Although there are 31 other occurrences of *do* in the learners’ essays, they were not regarded as verbal substitutes because in each instance *do* acted as something different. For instance, *do* in the example: *Therefore, we must* do *something before we lose the environment*, acts as a general verb, while in: *Do you know the effects which result from this problem?*, it acts as an operator. Also, *do in* do *the same* was considered as a general verb, and the type of substitution generated in such a phrase is regarded nominal, not verbal.

### 4.2.2.3. Clausal Substitution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>say so</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>The question is: will we lose our environment? Will we lose forests and animals? Scientists and reports say so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do so</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>First solution is fix filters to factory chimneys, …use public transport …, make movies about challenges that face the environment, …take serious steps … . If we do so, our life will</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be happier.

| Total | 3 | 100% |

| Table 12: Clausal Substitution Items |

As illustrated in the two examples included in Table 12, *so* provides anaphoric cohesion in each text. In the first example, it replaces *lose the environment* and *lose the forest and animals*, whereas in the second one, it is possible to restore the presupposed items from many previous sentences; the variety of environmental solutions listed by the writer.

4.2.3. Ellipsis

The learners, as previously shown in Chart 1, created 39 grammatical cohesive relations between sentences through ellipsis. This represents 6.5% of the 602 occurrences of all the GCDs employed within the texts. The frequencies and percentages of the three ellipsis sub-categories; nominal, verbal, and clausal, are displayed in Chart 4.

| Nominal  | 5% |
| Verbal   | 5% |
| Clausal  | 5% |
| Total    | 90% |

| Chart 4: Numbers and Percentages of Ellipsis Sub-types |

Based on the results illustrated in Chart 4, the learners established 35 verbal elliptical relations, which stand for 90% of the total cohesive features generated within this
category. This could be partially attributable to the effect of the reading texts which the learners studied on their writing (Irwin & Doyle 1992), as they contained lots of rhetorical question with answers expressing verbal ellipsis. Concerning the nominal and clausal sub-types, there are two occurrences of each, which stand for 5% of the total adoption of ellipsis. Examples of each sub-category are provided in the following table, with X’s marking the elliptical elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ellipsis Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Also, some animals will be sick. Some X will disappear and become extinct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>But, can we do that? Yes, I think we can X.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clausal</td>
<td>But what cause pollution in all oceans and seas? The ships X of course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Ellipsis Sub-type Examples

In the table above, there is a sense of incompleteness associated with the structure of each example. The left structural slots presuppose the existence of preceding items which act as the source of the missing information. In the nominal ellipsis example, the non-specific deictic some was upgraded in the second sentence to the status of a head, and the left slot presupposes the head noun animals from the preceding sentence. Likewise, the elliptical elements can be easily retrieved from the previous text in the examples related to the verbal and clausal sub-types.

4.2.4. Conjunction

With 343 items representing 57%, conjunction comes first in terms of the most widely-generated grammatical cohesive relations in the essays, as previously shown in Chart 1. This has previously been justified by the impact which the expository text type features have on the texts. In addition, learners might be familiar with using many of these cohesive devices, such as first, second, and finally, which are employed in other text types like procedure, explanation, and recount. The frequencies and percentages of the
four conjunction sub-categories; additive, adversative, causal, and temporal, are shown in Chart 5 below.

![Chart 5: Numbers and Percentages of Conjunction Sub-types](image)

The chart above indicates that the learners established 172 additive cohesive relations in the 30 essays, which represent 50% of the total devices used within the category of conjunction. They created 84 temporal cohesive connections, which come second (24%), while they adopted 61 devices related to the causal sub-category, which stand for 18%. With 26 devices representing only 8%, the adversative one comes last among the four conjunction sub-types. The devices and examples that belong to each sub-type; additive, adversative, causal, and temporal, are provided in the following tables.

### 4.2.4.1. Additive Conjunction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>88.37</td>
<td>Endangered animals are caused by us because we hunt. <strong>And</strong> hunting makes the animals decrease like polar bears, whales ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>Finally, we should face the problems which face the environment <strong>or</strong> we will lose everything.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 indicates that *and* was the most largely used device (approximately 88%) within the additive sub-type. This might be attributed to three reasons. The first is that the additive function of *and* is known to the learners from early stages in studying EFL. The second is intra-lingual interference; direct translation from L1, as the equivalent of *and* in Arabic, *wa*, *is* is extensively used in written Arabic expository texts (Al-Batal 1990). The third possible reason is that the learners might find *and* more common than other additives such as *furthermore* and *additionally*, as it appears the fifth in the list of the 100 Commonest English Words (Oxford Dictionaries, n. d.).

It is worth mentioning that there are 295 occurrences of *and* in the texts, not only 152 as included in the table. This is because many of them establish structural, not semantic, relations. To elaborate on this, in the example provided in the table above, the first *and* operates conjunctively between the two adjacent sentences, and so the additive relation it creates in the text is cohesive. With this internal meaning, *and* indicates that there is another point; hunting, to be taken in conjunction with the previous one. Because there is a shift in participants in the second sentence, this is a typical context of the conjunctive *and*. On the contrary, the coordination relation expressed by the second *and* in the same example is structural, and thus non-cohesive.

Regarding *for example*, it came second (approximately 11%), and as shown in the example in Table 14, it generates a relation between the two sentences on the internal plane. Structurally, this exemplificatory relation corresponds to apposition, not coordination, because *for example* was employed to provide clarification to the previous point; air pollution. This relation is widely employed in expository writing in which writers provide various examples to support their ideas (Schleppegrell 2004).
However, many other common additive devices were not used by the learners, such as: *besides, furthermore, in other words, on the other hand,* and *likewise.* It is thought that the learners are not familiar with employing them yet.

### 4.2.4.2. Adversative Conjunction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adversative Conjunction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>however</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 15: Adversative Conjunction Items**

According to the results presented in Table 15, the learners relied heavily on *but* (approximately 88%) to establish adversative cohesive relations between sentences. The internal aspect that *but* holds in the example provided suggests an underlying meaning, i.e.: what follows *but* is contrary to what is expected. So, in the same example, after the readers take an idea about the beautiful elements of the environment and reach the conjunctive adjunct *but,* they are prepared to recognize the presence of this adversative relation, such as the one mentioned; the activities that destroy the environment. The same applies to *however,* which occurred only three times, because it is not as commonly used in English as *but,* which is the twenty second commonest word in the English language (Oxford Dictionaries, n. d.).

### 4.2.4.3. Causal Conjunction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Conjunction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 indicates that the learners relied mostly on so (approximately 52%) in establishing causal relations in their texts, whereas because and therefore came second and third, with about 29% and 13% respectively. It might seem clear that the frequency of these words in the texts correspond to their positions in the list of the 100 Commonest English Words (Oxford Dictionaries, n. d.), where so comes the forty first, because the ninety fourth, while therefore is not included in that list. As the examples in the table show, all of these devices were used cohesively in the texts because what follows each of them is semantically related to what has gone before. So and therefore in the examples were used to combine the adjacent sentences semantically by providing the meaning of for this reason, which is often utilized in expository writing (Schleppegrell 2004). As for then, which is not temporal in any of its two occurrences, as it does not express time relations, it was used to anaphorically link the cause; i.e. killing the animals, and the result, their distinction.

4.2.4.4. Temporal Conjunction

According to the results shown in Table 17, the learners used the two temporal devices first and finally the most (approximately 23% each) within the temporal conjunction subcategory, while second and third came in the third and fourth place, representing about
15% and 11% respectively. The occurrences of the other devices show that they were infrequently used in the essays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Conjunction</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>First think for a good solution. Second work in teams. Third start with the plan…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firstly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>Firstly, in cities, air maybe severely polluted … Secondly, we believe human-caused pollution is … Thirdly, when we speak about air pollution… Fourthly, one of the most dominant players … Finally, what we can to before we lose our world?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thirdly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fourthly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finally</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fourth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>The fourth point is emphasis on clean energy resources … The last point is use energy efficient devices…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>last</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to sum up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>To sum up there are many challenges which are facing the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in conclusion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>In conclusion, I think all people must take serious steps before we lose our environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to cut a long story short</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>To cut a long story short, people all over the world are harming the earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 17: Temporal Conjunction Items**

This could be traceable to the learners’ awareness of how to begin and end their expositions, whereas gradually some might forget to use other linking words to introduce and organize further ideas in the texts. The examples provided in the table above illustrate that the learners succeeded in creating temporal cohesive relations with such
devices. For example, *first*; the typical cataphoric temporal, was used to establish internal relations with subsequent text, where the readers prepare themselves to see other points or ideas added to the discussion. The cohesive relation created between the sentences in the texts is not in successivity, but in the communication process. In other words, readers anticipate a sequence of points as the text unfolds until the culmination of the discussion, expressed by the discourse adjunct *finally*, is reached.

4.3. The Problems Encountered by the Learners in Using GCDs

In this section, the third research question will be addressed: what problems do Emirati EFL learners have in using GCDs in writing? The following chart displays the frequencies and percentages of both appropriately and inappropriately used devices.

![Chart 6: Appropriate Vs Inappropriate Use of GCDs](chart6.png)

Like Meisuo’s (2000) and Azzouz’s (2009) studies, the results illustrated in Chart 6 indicate that the learners are rather capable of using GCDs appropriately (81%), although, unlike Abadiano’s (1995) study of native speaker learners, they have considerable difficulties in using them as there are 19% of inappropriate occurrences. The following table displays the numbers and percentages of problems encountered by the learners in using each type.
Table 18: Problems Faced by Learners in Using Grammatical Cohesive Devices

The above table shows that there is no significant difference between the percentages of inappropriate use in conjunction and reference types, (22.75%) and (16.5%) respectively. It is noteworthy that all ellipsis and substitution relations were generated appropriately because they have little occurrences in the texts, and they were probably used by high achievers only as was mentioned previously. So, the following tables illustrate the most common inappropriate uses which occurred in the reference and conjunction types only, with examples excerpted from the texts.

4.3. 1. The Problems Encountered in Using Reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misuse</td>
<td>There are flowers and trees. She beautify the environment with the beautiful colors of the leaves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive use</td>
<td>Everyone in the world can see how beautiful the environment is. But there are many challenges which are facing it. Therefore we must protect it before we lose it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited use</td>
<td>Air pollution is caused by many things such as millions of cars release CO2 in the air which cause air pollution and factory chimneys also cause air pollution. Air pollution has serious effects like people will …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun shift</td>
<td>All governments must help our environment. People must stop throwing waste on the streets and anywhere. They must fix filters for factories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19: The Problems Faced by Learners in Using Reference

Based on the qualitative analysis, the learners faced many problems in adopting reference devices. Table 19 shows that they misused some items, such as she in the example provided, where it should be replaced by they. This lack of agreement between the noun and pronoun is attributable to intra-lingual interference; direct translation from L1 (Ahmed 2010; Hussein 2013). The qualitative analysis also revealed that the second problem, excessive use, is evident in some paragraphs, like it in the example provided which was redundantly employed, making the text dull. Likewise, the third problem, limited use, is clear in the reiteration of air pollution, where it could be replaced by appropriate pronouns. Re the fourth problem, pronoun shift, the writer adopted they to refer cataphorically to people, then shifted to we. This might cause confusion as the reader might think that the writer is speaking about two different groups, which is not true because he refers exophrichally to all the people in the world. The same confusion might be caused by this in the example related to the fifth problem, ambiguity, as it does not refer to a specific problem because there are several problems mentioned previously in the text. In the example pertinent to run on sentences, the last problem, the two sentences were improperly connected by the comma.

4.3.2. The Problems Encountered in Using Conjunction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjunction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20: The Problems Faced by Learners in Using Conjunction

As illustrated in Table 20, the qualitative analysis showed learners’ incompetence in adopting conjunction in some paragraphs. *But*, in the example provided for the problem of misuse, was inappropriately employed because a sentence in English cannot be simultaneously hypotactic and paratactic (Halliday & Hasan 1976). This device should be eliminated, or preceded by a clause to complete the first sentence. Regarding the problem of excessive use in some paragraphs, the example provided indicates that the readers might be confused by the existence of *so, but* and *so* in three successive sentences, and as for the problem of ambiguity, they might also be confused by the writer’s wrong choice or adoption of *but*. Likewise, in the example concerning the problem of limited use, the paratactic style in the paragraph reflects that the writer’s use of GCDs is limited.

4.4. Summary

The results obtained indicate that the learners adopted all four types of GCDs, despite of the considerable difference regarding their frequencies in the text. Conjunctive, referential, and elliptical relations came first, second, and third respectively, whereas substitutional ones were hardly ever adopted. Regarding the GCDs which belong to each sub-type, the learners relied heavily on the commonest ones in English, and those ones that are often used in generating written expository texts. Moreover, the results point out that the learners were almost capable of using GCDs appropriately (81%), but they had some difficulties in adopting them, as indicated by 19% of inappropriate occurrences. These were attributed to many factors, including intra-lingual interference and learners’ little experience in using some devices.

| Limited use | We should not use cfc’s. We should not throw garbage in water. We should not kill animals. We must do something quickly. |
| Ambiguity | Second, I’ll explain deforestation, what does it mean? It means people cut trees in forests or jungles. **But** there are many results for deforestation. The first result is… |

| environment. *So*, we must do something before … |
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

5.1. Introduction

The aim of the study was to identify the occurrence and frequency of GCDs within expository writing generated by Emirati eighth graders at Al Ghazali School in Abu Dhabi. Also, it aimed at disclosing the problems encountered by the learners in using these devices to establish texture in these extended texts. The results have indicated that the learners could create cohesion in the texts by employing all the four types of GCDs, though some were used much more frequently than others. Besides, the qualitative analysis indicated that the learners misused, excessively used, and inadequately used GCDs in some paragraphs.

5.2. Summary of Findings

The conclusion drawn from this study indicates that the learners succeeded in establishing 602 grammatical cohesive relations in the expository texts. Among the four grammatical cohesion types employed by the learners in their essays, conjunction covered more than half the frequencies (57%), reference came second with more than one third (35%), while ellipsis represented approximately one eighth (6.5%), and substitution stood for not more than 1.5%. These findings are in line with Mahlberg’s (2009) assertion that genre conventions have an impact on the types of cohesive ties used to connect elements within a text. In other words, since the features of expository writing include adopting a range of logical connectors (Schleppegrell 2004), conjunctive relations were found to be the most frequent ones created by the learners. Besides, substitution and ellipsis were not widely utilized due to their low frequency of occurrence in formal writing (liu & Braine 2005).

Regarding conjunction sub-types, the results show the extended use of the additive(50%), followed by the temporal (24%), causal (18%), and adversative (8%). And, within the additive sub-category, represented 88% of the total devices employed, which could be attributed to learners’ familiarity in using it in English, and in using its Arabic equivalent wa in writing expository texts (Al-Batal 1990). In terms of the most frequently used items
within the temporal sub-type, *first* and *finally* represented approximately 24% each, followed by *second* (nearly 16%) and *third* (nearly 12%). This might reflect the learners’ awareness of how to begin and end an essay, while they do not realise the importance of adopting other conjunctions to introduce further ideas. Regarding the causal sub-type, the learners’ heavy reliance on *so* (approximately 52%) was not surprising due to the word’s frequency of occurrence, as it is the forty second in the list of the 100 Commonest English Words (Oxford Dictionaries, n.d.), whereas *because*, which was adopted about 29%, appears the ninety fourth in the same list. Among the adversative sub-type devices, the highest frequency appeared in using *but* (nearly 88%), followed by *however* (about 12%), because the first is more commonly used in English than the second (Oxford Dictionaries, n.d.).

Concerning the reference sub-categories, the frequencies obtained reveal that personal reference was the most employed (62%), followed by the demonstrative (35%), while the comparative displayed no more than 3%. This may refer to the learners’ mastery of using the first sub-type, their knowledge about the second, and their unfamiliarity with the third. The adoption of personal reference is characterized by the high frequency of the non-person singular *it* (approximately 71%), which may be attributed to the learners’ reference to the challenges facing the environment which they introduced and explained one by one in their essays. Within the demonstrative sub-type, there is little occurrence of *these* (approximately 17%), compared to this (57%), which may indicate that the learners might not have mastered the use of the plural demonstratives. One of the most interesting findings is that *the* showed no cohesive force in the text because it either expressed exophoric relations or inter-sentential cataphoric ones.

Learners’ use of ellipsis sub-types largely appear in adopting verbal ellipsis (90%), which could be due to the effect of the reading texts which the learners studied on their written texts (Irwin & Doyle 1992), as they contained many rhetorical question with answers expressing verbal ellipsis. Regarding substitution, it is thought that only the high achieving learners could employ it because they are more interested in examining English authentic material, and travelling to English speaking countries during summer holidays.
Another conclusion obtained from the current research is that, in accordance with previous studies (Azzouz 2009; Meisuo 2000; Tsareva 2010), the EFL learners encountered some difficulties while utilizing GCDs. In some paragraphs and within the reference category, there are instances of misuse, excessive use, limited ruse, pronoun shift, ambiguity, and run on sentences. Some of these problems, such as the lack of agreement between noun and pronoun pertaining to the misuse problem, could be attributed to intra-lingual interference; direct translation from L1, while others can be traceable to the learners themselves being novice writers of extended texts. Likewise, in the conjunction type, the learners misused, excessively used, and inadequately used devices in some paragraphs, which may be similarly justified by their little experience in adopting GCDs.

5.3. Recommendations for EFL Teachers

Based on the findings and conclusions illustrated above, the current study provides some recommendations for EFL teachers to enhance learners’ production of cohesive extended texts, and overcome the problems encountered by them in using GCDs to generate different text types.

First, teachers should incorporate reading activities into writing classes, which could enhance learners’ awareness of the features of good writing (Heller 1995). The adoption of extended reading programs could help learners improve their writing skills because “…we learn to write through reading” (Day & Bamford 1998, p. 37). Findings from different studies conducted worldwide (Elley & Mangubhai 1981; Janopoulos 1986; Hafiz & Tudor 1989, cited in Day & Bamford 1998) assert that extended reading has impressive outcomes which include increasing learners’ proficiency in written English. Surprisingly, these findings confirm that extensive reading programs helped learners improve some writing skills, sometimes without being given instruction in writing.

Second, learners should be explicitly instructed on how to use GCDs through integrating grammatical cohesion into the material used in teaching them. Researchers (Majdeddin 2010; Rassouli & Abbasvandi 2013; Tangkiengsirisin 2010;) assert the effectiveness of explicit teaching of grammatical cohesion on increasing the use of cohesive ties in
learners’ writing. So, learners should be explicitly taught how to employ a wide range of GCDs while being taught other writing skills, without excessively using them.

Third, regarding the problems that the learners face in using GCDs, especially those related to intra-lingual interference, the learners are in urgent need to be taught how to think in English, not in Arabic, while writing in English. They should avoid preparing ideas in L1 and then translate them to L2 so as to avoid any possible negative transfer caused by linguistic, strategic, and rhetorical differences between L1 and L2 (Silva 1993). This can also help learners avoid overemphasizing particular types of GCDs while ignoring others.

Fourth, teachers should consider teaching writing as a thinking tool. According to Bjork and Raisanen (2003), writing should be regarded as a thinking tool for language development, critical thinking, and learning in all areas. When learners are required to write an extended text about a topic in a writing lesson, they should not be just given the title and asked to write a specific number of words. Teachers should rather guide learners employ different thinking skills in many areas, such as brainstorming ideas, discussing different issues, organizing information, and using appropriate text type features. Thus, they can produce more cohesive and coherent texts.

Last, EFL teachers and learners should be encouraged to use corpora for learning and teaching purposes and to make use of their findings, in order to bridge the large gap between the significant findings of applied corpus linguistic research and the teaching practice in schools (ed. Sinclair 2004). There is a need for fostering communication between researchers and practitioners to help more people see that corpora are enormously valuable and profitable tools in the context of language learning and teaching (Römer 2006).

**5.4. Evaluation against Hypotheses**

The three hypotheses which this research set out to investigate were:

a) Emirati EFL learners at Al Ghazali School employ a range of GCDs in writing expository essays.
b) Emirati EFL learners at Al Ghazali School use some types and sub-types of GCDs much more frequently than others.

c) Emirati EFL learners at Al Ghazali School have many problems in using GCDs in writing.

The first hypothesis can be confirmed given that the learners were successfully able to establish 602 cohesive relations using all types and sub-types of GCDs; reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. The second hypothesis can also be confirmed, as conjunction and reference types were employed the most, representing 57% and 35% respectively, whereas ellipsis (6.5%) and substitution (1.5%) were utilized the least. Among each type, the learners preferred relying greatly on specific sub-types. For example, out of the 211 referential cohesive relations generated in the texts, they created 132 personal reference ones, which stand for 62%, and similarly they created 172 additive relations (50%) out of 343 within the conjunctive type. Moreover, within the same sub-types, some devices were remarkably utilized more than others, and some were not used at all. For example, within the above-mentioned personal referential sub-type, the use of it represented approximately 71%, and similarly within additive sub-type of conjunction, the use of and stood for more than 88%. Regarding the last hypothesis, it was confirmed because the study yielded that Emirati EFL learners had many difficulties in using GCDs, such as misuse, excessive use and limited use.

5.5. Limitations of the Study

Some limitations impacted the application and interpretation of the current study. First of all, the analysis software tool selected, Wmatrix3, could not provide a clear-cut analysis of GCDs; whether they had internal cohesive force or not, neither could it detect ellipses or many instances of substitution. Therefore, the cohesive occurrence and frequency of all GCDs had to be reviewed manually. A second limitation is that the main focus of the study was on examining GCDs only; whilst a full picture about textual cohesion cannot be obtained unless lexical cohesion is included too. A further limitation is that one text type only, i.e. exposition, was selected for analysis. As it was previously mentioned, this limited learners’ use of GCDs, which means that the results regarding the adoption of
GCDs and the problems that the learners faced in using them might not be generalizable to other text types. Finally, one of the constraints on generalizability and utility of findings is that the study was conducted in one school only where the learners were all male Emiratis. So, the results cannot be generalized to all cycle-two schools in Abu Dhabi.

5.6. Future Research Pathways

Recommendations for future action include the use of a more up-to-date analysis software tool that can detect devices which act cohesively within texts, and spot the occurrence of all types of grammatical cohesion, including ellipsis. Also, there is a need for further research on the occurrence and frequency of both lexical and grammatical cohesive devices in learners’ written expositions, and other text types as well, to gain deeper insights into how learners establish cohesive relations among the elements of varied text types by using all possible categories of ties. Comparisons could be held among these text types in terms of their frequency and effectiveness. Besides, further research could be conducted in many cycle-two schools, including girls’, to allow for more generalizability of the results, and comparisons can be held to illustrate if there are differences between male and female learners in using cohesive devices.

5.7. Conclusion

The aim of the current study was to reveal the extent to which grade-eight EFL learners at Al Ghazali School in Abu Dhabi could employ GCDs in writing expositions, the frequency of these devices in the texts, and the problems they encountered in using them. The overall conclusion that can be drawn is that the learners succeeded in adopting the four types of grammatical cohesion introduced by Halliday and Hasan (1976), despite their significantly different frequencies in the texts. Out of the 602 cohesive relations that were established in the texts, the learners relied heavily on conjunctive devices (57%), followed by referential ones (35%), whereas ellipsis and substitution relations appeared third and fourth, with 6.5% and 1.5% respectively. The findings are in line with Meisuo’s (2000) and Azzouz’s (2009) studies with regard to using the conjunction type the most in expository essays, but they are different from Abadiano’s (1995) which show
that reference was the most predominant. Nonetheless, corresponding to Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) views, the results in all four studies illustrate that ellipsis and substitution were hardly utilized. The learners’ principal reliance on conjunction in creating cohesive links in their expositions might be impacted by genre conventions (Mahlberg 2009), since expository writing includes specific features, such as introducing a topic, providing examples, and combining ideas by a variety of logical connectors (Schleppegrell 2004). Also, it is noteworthy that the learners used some sub-categories of cohesion much more frequently than others, and within each sub-category they employed particular devices while ignoring others. This was traceable to many factors, including the fact that they used the commonest words in English more frequently, they are still inexperienced writers, and the skill of writing is developmental.

Regarding the problems that the learners faced in using GCDs, the percentage of inappropriately used devices was 19, with the commonest were in misusing, excessively using, and in adequately using GCDs in some paragraphs. These problems were attributed to some factors, such as intra-lingual interference, and the learners’ incompetence in adopting some devices. The study provides some recommendations to EFL teachers, including integrating reading activities with writing ones, teaching GCDs explicitly, helping learners to think in English, considering writing as a thinking tool, and using corpora in learning and teaching contexts.
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Appendix I: 6-9 EFL Curriculum

(It has been emailed separately with the dissertation).
## Appendix II: Grade 8 Writing Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>A text with developing structure and detail</th>
<th>A text which indicates some structure</th>
<th>A limited text with some elaboration</th>
<th>A simple text that includes some related ideas</th>
<th>A simple text</th>
<th>Attempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>Attempts to select content to create interest. Increased awareness of expression.</td>
<td>Demonstrates clear main ideas. All writing is related to the main idea. Elaboration of some of the ideas. Links and includes ideas with an emerging sense of style.</td>
<td>Content is generally relevant to the central idea. Some attempt at elaborating ideas but ideas are sufficient to the task.</td>
<td>Some ideas evident Some details related to the central idea.</td>
<td>Response is just a list of words or ideas</td>
<td>Not related to main idea. May have copied question. No ideas evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates structure. Provides supporting details Uses paragraphing throughout Includes a variety of sentence structures – developing control of tenses.</td>
<td>Shows a sense of organization of ideas. Attempts to paragraph in places Demonstrates control of extended sentences – may show some variable control of tenses and subject verb and noun pronoun agreement.</td>
<td>Attempts some organization of ideas. Attempts to use extended sentences.</td>
<td>Demonstrates some control over sentence structure</td>
<td>Text is difficult or impossible to understand.</td>
<td>Writes from left to right using some recognisable English letters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attempt</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion &amp; Coherence</td>
<td>A range of cohesive devices is used correctly to enhance reading and support underlying relationships -- an extended, highly cohesive piece of writing showing tightly linked sections of text.</td>
<td>Controlled use of cohesive devices support reader understanding Meaning is clear on first reading and text flows well in a sustained piece of writing.</td>
<td>Many correct links between sentences Many referring words are accurate.</td>
<td>Some correct links between sentences Some referring words are accurate.</td>
<td>Links are mostly missing or incorrect short script Mostly confusing for the reader.</td>
<td>Links are missing or incorrect Very short script All confusing for the reader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocab</td>
<td>Begins to use vocabulary with an awareness of purpose and audience.</td>
<td>Demonstrates appropriate word choice.</td>
<td>Experiments with word choice Words link to central idea.</td>
<td>Uses key words and phrases that are generally linked to the central idea.</td>
<td>Begins to form words</td>
<td>Uses English alphabet letters to represent words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Spells a range of complex words correctly. Attempts to use more difficult words. Spells common words correctly all of the time.</td>
<td>Spells complex words correctly. Spells common words correctly most of the time.</td>
<td>Spells some complex words correctly. Spells common words correctly using a range of strategies -- how words sound/or look or common letter sequences. Uses initial letters and some known letter patterns.</td>
<td>Spells some common words correctly using a range of strategies -- how words sound/or look or common letter sequences. Uses initial letters and some known letter patterns.</td>
<td>Uses initial letters and some known letter patterns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>Uses a wider range of punctuation (direct speech marks, question marks, exclamation marks, apostrophes). Expands use of sentence level punctuation (commas).</td>
<td>Uses a wider range of punctuation (direct speech marks, question marks, exclamation marks, apostrophes). Expands use of sentence level punctuation (commas).</td>
<td>Expands use of sentence level punctuation (commas). Some attempt to use sentence level punctuation (capital letters and full stops).</td>
<td>Expands use of sentence level punctuation (capital letters and full stops)</td>
<td>Some attempt to use sentence level punctuation (capital letters and full stops)</td>
<td>Some attempt to use sentence level punctuation (capital letters and full stops).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III: Examples of Learners’ Expositions

Abu Dhabi education Council
Al Ghazali School for Boys-Cycle 2
English Language

Writing Task (Argumentative Text: Exposition)
Write an exposition of approximately 300 words about:
Challenges that face the environment

Our environment is the beautiful world which we live in.
It’s the sea where people can have fun with swimming,
and the mountains where people can climb and live in
the nice weather, but people all over the world are damaging the environment, so we should protect our beautiful environment and take steps that will help us in our daily life without harming the environment. They think the world is not important.

The first challenge which the environment is facing is air pollution. What is meant about it? It’s a kind of pollution that belongs to the air that we breathe from it. But the people are not feeling about what they are doing and the cause is not from the people only but it’s in what they invented like the cars that burn fuel and also factory smoke that harms the ozone layer.

The second serious challenge that faces the environment is land pollution that damages the
Land and seriously, the environment that we live on, but we are not caring about it because we are damaging it with our hands, such as things in the water and rubbish that we throw in the land; that's why it's damaged by land pollution. It's not hard to go to the garbage and see what is the very little things like plastic and paper.

Thirdly, "WATER pollution" means the water is dirty and it has a lot of garbage that gets a negative point because it's killing the life. And the fish is our resource of food, and there are other things that damage the water like oil spills. That also have the same result.

Let's start with the solutions for the three kinds that talk about it. First of all, people should be required public transport so as to reduce smog, and we could use less fuel in order that we might decrease the green-house effects.

Finally, the environment is very important for us, so we should be careful with caring for it because sometimes we damage it without knowing.
Everybody in the world can see how beautiful the environment is. It is full of very beautiful beaches and deserts where people can go there to relax and enjoy. However, there are many challenges which are facing the environment. Therefore, we must do something before we lose the environment.

First of all, endangered animals. It means animals become in danger of extinction such as Zanzibar Cigar and Javaan Cigar and more. There are many things which cause this problem like some people kill animals for sport, and cutting down trees destroyed natural habitats of animals and more. Endangered animal has serious effects like animals will get disappeared and animals eat wastes and will die. We should protect these animals.

The second point is water pollution. It means garbage in the sea, water, rivers, oceans.
Water pollution is caused by many things. Some ships dump their waste into the water, some cities dump sewage into seas and rivers. Do you know the effects which result from this problem? Seas will get polluted. The water animals will die. If we keep this way, we will lose the water. We should save the water.

The third challenge which faces the environment is climate change means change of average weather conditions. The causes of this problem are: too many cars, too much CO2 into the air which causes climate change. Factories' chimneys. Climate change has many effects such as people will become sick. We want to enjoy the weather and we must protect the weather.

So many solutions can be done. People all over the world should take fast action against these problems. We should not use cars. We should not throw garbage in water. We should not kill animals. We must do something quickly. Finally, this is why all people must save the beautiful environment.
Our environment is the beautiful world which we live in. It is the seas, mountains, deserts where people can have fun and enjoy. But people everywhere are harming the earth so we should do something before we lose it.

One challenge affecting the environment is air pollution. It means when there is dirt in the air and smoke and it is not clean. For example, when you go to the bus stop, you see smoke coming from bus exhaust or smoke coming from chimneys.

The second challenge affecting the environment is depletion of ozone layer. It means decrease of ozone layer volume in the earth's stratosphere saves the people from the harmful rays of the Sun.

The third challenge affecting the environment is endangered animals. It means some animals are in danger of extinction, some animals will disappear in the coming few years such as the panda and the white tiger.
The fourth challenge affecting the environment is climate change. It means change of average weather conditions or significant change in weather in many places in the world. Some many people get sick and get dangerous diseases.

All countries throughout the world must do something to tackle this fatal problem. We should fix factories' factory chimneys. We should stop using CFCs. People must stop smoking. What about cleaning the environment? We should help our environment; otherwise, it will be lost. To cut along story short, people all over the world are harming the earth, so we should save our environment and make it clean.
We are on a very beautiful planet where all human beings can visit beaches and enjoy fishing. Unfortunately, many things destroy the beauty of this planet. This is why all people must do something before we lose this planet.

Water pollution affects plants and organisms living in these bodies of water. In almost all cases, the effect is damaging not only to individual species and populations, but also to the natural biological communities.

To reduce this problem, we should clean the beaches, build factories far from the seas, and make ships friendly environments and not spill oil in seas.

The main pollutants from the largest sources of water pollution prevalent and influential. Despite its modernity, ships cause oil pollution when leaking petroleum products into water bodies.
why not resolve by planting some trees every year? If each of us plants one little tree, it can add to a great amount of afforestation, making the environment healthier. Increasing the use of bicycles or making a habit to walk down short distances can contribute to reduction in our pollution. Try to minimize the use of vehicles. Use CFC-free products for some destination, the use of vehicles has no better options. But at least maintain your vehicles, clean their exhaust pipes, keep the pollution they cause under strict control. But can we do all that? I think we can.

The wonder is life and no life without wonder. To live a happy life, we should keep the seas, oceans, rivers and beaches clean.
Our environment is one of the great gifts that people have from God. It is the seas, where people can go swimming, the mountains, where they can live and play, and the deserts, where every body can go camping. Many people in the world are harming it, so we should do something before we lose the environment.

The first challenge which faces environment is air pollution. Air pollution what is it? It means that there is dirt in the air. For example, when the air is dirty, there is smoke and dust. These things which cause cause huge pollution air conditioners.

There are many effects resulting from this problem, these effects of this problem are dangerous. Air pollution has serious effects, for example: air will get polluted, the sea will rise. A lot of trees will die, and people all over the world should take rapid action against this problem. People all over the world must do something to solve this dangerous problem. For example, we should not use coal. Stop smoking in filters to factory chimneys.

Finally, many people in the world destroy the environment, so we should save it.
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