THE COHESIVE DEVICES USED IN THE CAUSE EFFECT ESSAY WRITTEN BY THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT STUDENTS OF STKIP ST. PAULUS RUTENG

Stanislaus Guna [1]
Agustinus Ngadiman [2]

Abstract

The purpose of this research study is to analyze the types of cohesive devices, the frequency of each cohesive device used and to identify cohesive errors that the students committed in their cause - effect essay. There were 29 students' essays analyzed.. The study revealed that there were four types of cohesive devices used by the students in their essay: Reference, Substitution, Conjunction and Lexical cohesion. In accordance with the frequency of cohesive device, reference had the highest frequency which is 45,38%, followed by Lexical Cohesion 39,33%, Conjunction 14,90%, and Substitution 0,37%. The types of reference: personal, demonstrative and comparative rerference; types of substitution is nominal substitution; types of conjunction: additive, adversative, causal and temporal conjunction, and lexical cohesion: reiteration (repetition, synonym, general word and antonym) and collocation (adjectives + nouns, noun + noun, and verb + preposition) . Dealing with the errors in cohesive devices, the most frequency of errors was reference with the percentage 55,85%, conjunction 16,48%, lexical cohesion 2,76%. The research study revealed that most of the students committed errors in accordance with the source of interlanguage errors and intralingual errors. Most of the students committed errors on pronoun shift refers to grammatical errors, misuse of plural and singular form of demonstrative pronoun, overuse of cohesive devices, run-on sentence, misuse of cohesive devices and overgeneralization in their cause effect essay. The results of this study can contribute some pedagogical implications for writing teachers and students. It is necessary for English teacher to teach cohesion and cohesive devices explicitly and provide them with ample examples in English classes.

Key words: cohesion, coherence and cohesive devices, errors, and cause effect essay.

Introduction

The essential features of a well-written text are the coherence or unity and connectedness, making the individual sentences in the text

---

[1] Stanislaus Guna *adalah* Dosen Bahasa Inggris di STKIP St. Paulus Ruteng.

[2] Agustinus Ngadiman *adalah* Dosen Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris di FKIP Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya.

'hang' together and relate to one another. To write the unity or the connectedness of sentences in a text, writers must employ cohesion to join ideas between sentences to create texture.

The concept of coherence is introduced by Halliday and Hasan (1976: 2) who identify how sentences are linked in a text. For them, the various parts of a paragraph are connected together by cohesive ties where a text has texture, and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text. It derives this texture from the fact that it functions as a unity with respect to its environment. They add that if a passage of English containing more than one sentence is perceived as a text, there will be certain linguistic features present in that passage which can be identified as contributing to its total unity and giving it texture. Here is the example to make the cohesive ties clear; "*Wash and core six cooking apples. Put them into a fireproof dish.*" Based on the example given, it is clear that the underlined word 'them' in the second sentence refers back to (is anaphoric to) the *six cooking apples* in the first sentence. This anaphoric function of *them* gives cohesion to the two sentences, so we interpret *them* as a whole; the two sentences together constitute a text.

Furthermore, cohesion refers to the linguistic features which help make a sequence of sentences in a text. It occurs in a text through the use of cohesive devices that link across sentences. It is a relationship between lexical and grammatical devices that are put together to construct a unified text (Alarcon & Morales, 2011:115). Cohesion deals with how words and expression of a text are bound together through grammatical devices such as reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. In other words, cohesion deals with the accurateness of utilizing grammatical devices from one sentence to another sentence in a written text. It helps the readers to convey the meaning and usage. While cohesion focuses on the correctness of using grammatical devices, coherence concerns with the unity of ideas within sentences in a written text. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 4) state that providing linguistic ties makes the text more cohesive and understandable. They also asserted that the effect of cohesive devices on writing is very crucial since they afford the readers with various kinds of grammatical devices which are used to reach a cohesive text.

There are some empirical studies that investigated the use of cohesive devices in the students' essay, they are as follows:

Meisuo's study (2000) in Alarcon and Morales (2011) investigated qualitatively the relationship of cohesive ties in the Chinese students' essays with the quality of their writing. The results of the study revealed that lexical category had the highest percentage of ties, followed by conjunctions, and references which suggest a general pattern of cohesive features. Meisuo included quantitative finding which revealed cohesive features such as errors, ambiguity, overuse and misuse of cohesive devices. Furthermore, Meisuo's study found that there was no significant relationship between the number of cohesive ties used and the quality of

writing. These findings are supported by Tierney and Mosenthal (1983), Connor (1984), Allard and Ulatowska (1991), Johnson (1992), and Karasi (1994). More features occurred in the area of conjunctions. The qualities analysis showed that Chinese students tended to overuse additive and temporal devices and to misuse adversatives. Similar findings can be found in Hu et al, (1982), Johnson (1984), Crewe (1990) and Field and Yip (1992). The overuse of temporal (for examples, firstly, secondly, etc.) is another characteristic feature of the composition written by Chinese students, who adopted this enumerative style extensively in order to list points and ideas. There was some difference, however, between the better writers and weaker ones in the use of temporal devices. The former tended to use temporal devices in a clear and affect manner (a strong point in fact) whereas the latter tended to use them only to list random and sometimes confusing ideas. Apart from the feature of overuse of addictive and temporal, misuse of adversatives is also prominent in the essays studied. Students used such adversative as 'but, 'however' and 'on the other hand' without any explicit or implied contrast, instead they were often given an additive function as conducted by Johns (1984), Field and Yip (1992) cited in Alarcon and Morales 2011: 116).

Alarcon and Morales (2001: 126) conducted a research on grammatical cohesion in students' argumentative essays. The study revealed that reference is the most frequently used cohesive devices, followed by conjunctions and substitution. No instances of ellipsis were found since according to Halliday and Hasan (1976) they appear more in oral discourse than in written discourse. Referring to the qualitative analysis, it was found out that certain cohesive types assisted the students in the argumentation process. For instance, the use of adversative conjunctions helped them establish counterclaims. However, 'but' is the most frequently used adversative conjunction by the students which may signify that their knowledge on the use of this kind of cohesive device is limited. There were instances where they can use concessive like "yet or however' to establish stronger claims. Hence, qualitative analysis supports the concept of form and function. In the students' argumentative essays, certain forms were chosen over the others for a specific purpose that supports the overall objective of an argumentative text.

In terms of cohesive errors, Na (2011) in Kwan and Yunus (2014) attempted to compare the cohesive devices and cohesive errors of native and non-native speakers. In comparing the Korean and American university students, the non-native speakers or Korean students, were found to have used more cohesive devices than the natives, or American students. The results of the study indicated a significant overuse of cohesive devices, which are not necessarily applied accurately or appropriately in Writing. With Chinese EFL learners in Singapore, Ong (2011) examined the students' expository writing and found that reference cohesion, conjunction, and lexical cohesion posed greatest difficulty for the students. However, results also showed redundant an inaccurate use of

cohesive devices. Meanwhile, Huang's (2005) study found that cohesive errors was one of the top three most frequent errors besides grammar and lexical errors by Chinese learners.

Chen (2008) in his study: An investigation of EFL Students' use of cohesive devices revealed that in general, the students were capable of employing different cohesive devices in their writing. However, several problems with cohesion were found in the essays; such as pronoun shift, run –on- sentence, misuse of lexical items, and overuse of cohesive devices. The results of this study were also supported by the previous study; such as Castro, 2004; Crew, 1990; Liu & Brain, 2005; Zhang, 2000; Fan, Hsu, & Yang, 2006 had reported similar difficulties.

Of the previous studies presented above, the writer can infer that the results of the empirical studies had controversial results. The results showed that there were some empirical studies that revealed that there was positive correlation between the number of cohesive devices and good writing. Other studies revealed that there was a crucial correlation between the number of cohesive devices and the quality of good writing. The students also committed errors on cohesive devices used in their writing.

This study is conducted to answer the following questions: 1) what types of cohesive devices are used by college students in their writing effect essays? 2) How frequent are the cohesive devices used? 3) What errors do they have when they use cohesive devices in their cause effect essays?

The Research Method

The subjects of the present study were the third graders of the English Study Program at STKIP St. Paulus Ruteng who received instructional in writing skill for two years at this college. There were 89 students that involved three classes and each class had a different number of students; class A consisted of 30 students, class B comprised 29 students, class C consisted of 30 students. In this research, the researcher chose purposively random sampling that is class B as the subject of the research since they studied the same course on writing class, in the same semester in this college.

The sources of data of this research were the linguistic markers that linked a text cohesive. These linguistic markers could be found in the students' cause effect essay including the sources of errors based on Halliday and Hasan's (1976) Taxonomy of Cohesive Device.

The model of the test was writing essay test in which the researcher asked the students to write paragraph(s) of cause effect essay with the two prepared topics. The students were asked to choose freely one of the two topics as follows: (a). The effect of watching too much TV and (b). The effect of the internet on everyday lives. Before collecting the data to 29 students in the classroom as the subjects of the research, the researcher asked permission to the head of STKIP St. Paulus Ruteng and

the head of English Study Program. The data were collected on Monday, 6th October 2014, at STKIP St. Paulus Ruteng. It started at 7.30 and ended at 10.a.m.

The Results

The tables below are the results of the calculation of data analysis found as a whole of the research study to show the types of Cohesive devices used by the students in their cause effect essay. The researcher calculated all the data analysis found in every cohesive device in the students' essay.

Table
Types of Cohesive Devices Used

Total	Type of Cohesive Devices Used	Total Number	%
2.133	Reference	968	45,38%
	Substitution	8	0,37%
	Ellipsis	0	0,%
	Conjunction	318	14,90%
	Lexical Cohesion	839	39,33%

Th Frequency of Reference Cohesive Devices Used

In the following table the researcher demonstrates the frequency of reference cohesive devices used; such as pronominals, demonstrative and comparative Reference. The results of the obtained data analysis were as follows:

Table
The Frequency of Reference Cohesive Devices Used

Total	Sub-types of Reference as Cohesive Devices Used	Total Number of frequency Used	(%)
968	**Pronominals** *(I, you, we, they, it, our, ourselves, themselves, them, us, yourself, your, my, he, she)*	498	51,44%
	Demonstrative Reference *(this, there, that, those, here)*	451	46,59%
	Comparative Reference *(more, better, so many)*	19	1,96%

The Frequency of Substitution cohesive Devices Used

The frequency of substitution cohesive devices used was analyzed in accordance with the total number of cohesive devices and the number

of substitutions used by the students in their cause effect essay. The result is calculated and demonstrated in the following table below:

Table
The Frequency of Substitution Cohesive Devices Used

Total	Substitution Cohesive Devices Used		
2.133	Total		**%**
	Nominal	8	**0.37%**

The Frequency of Conjunction Cohesive Devices Used

The following table presents the frequency of conjunction cohesvie devices used in the students' cause-effect essay. The types of conjunction cohesive devices used are additive, adversative, causal and temporal conjunction. The results are demonstrated in the table below.

Table
The Frequency of types of Conjunction Used

Total	Type of Conjunction of Cohesive Devices Used	Total Number of Frequency Used	%
318	**Additive Conjunction** (*and, or, besides (that), for example, for instance, in addition, furthermore, that is*)	**183**	**57,54%**
	Adversative Conjunction (*but, on the other hand, even though, although, in fact, however*)	**40**	**12,57%**
	Causal Conjunction (*so, because, therefore, because of, cause*)	**44**	**13,83%**
	Temporal Conjunction. (*first, firstly, second, secondly, third, fourth, in conclusion, finally, the last*).	**47**	**14,77%**

The Frequency of Lexical Cohesion Used

The table below are the results of data analysis of the frequency of lexical cohesion used in the students' cause-effect essay. The types of lexical cohesion are same word/repetition, synonym, general words, antonym, and collocation. The reults of data analysis are presented as follows:

Table
The Frequency of Types of Lexical Cohesion Used

Total	Type of Lexical Cohesion Used	Total Number of Frequency Used	%
839	Reiteration	560	66,74%
	Same words/Repetition		
	Synonym	5	0,59%
	General Word	116	13,82%
	Antonym	29	3,45%
	Collocation		
	a. Adjective + Noun	10	1,19%
	b. Noun + Noun	4	0,47%
	c. Verb + Preposition	15	1,78%

The Students' errors of Cohesive Devices in their Cause -Effect Essay

The following table presents general finding of students' errors on Cohesive Devices in their cause- effect essay. The results of the obtained data analysis were as follows:

Table
The Students' Error of Cohesive Devices in Cause- Effect Essay

Total	Type of Cohesive Devices Used	Total Number	%
187	Reference	104	55,61%
	Substitution	0	0,%
	Ellipsis	0	0,%
	Conjunction	31	16,57%
	Lexical Cohesion	52	27,80%

Errors on Types of Cohesive Devices in the Students' Cause -Effect Essay

In the following table the researcher presents the students' errors on types of Cohesive Devices used in their cause - effect essay. The results of the obtained data analysis were as follows:

Table 9
Errors on Types of Cohesive Devices
in the Students' Cause Effect Essay

Total	Cohesive Devices		Number Of Errors	Percentage (%)
104	Reference	Personal	23	22.11%
		Demonstrative	77	74,03%
		Comparative	4	3,84%
0	Substitution	Nominal	0	0,00%
		Verbal	0	0,00%
		Clausal	0	0,00%
0	Ellipsis	Nominal	0	0,00%
		Verbal	0	0,00%
		Clausal	0	0,00%
31	Conjunction	Additive	6	19,35%
		Adversative	10	32,25%
		Causal	3	9,67%
		Temporal	12	38,70%
52	Lexical Cohesion	Reiteration	39	75%
		Collocation	13	25,%

Discussion

As stated in the previous research questions that this study was conducted to answer the following questions: 1. What types of cohesive devices are used by the college students in their writing essay? 2. How frequent are the cohesive devices used? 3. What errors do they have when they use cohesive devices in their cause effect essay?

In response to the first and second research questions, the results of the research study revealed that the students of Language Study program at STKIP St. Paulus Ruteng used four types of cohesive devices in their cause effect essay; such as **reference**, **substitution**, **conjunction** and **lexical cohesion** (See Table 1). In response to the second question, the results of the research study revealed that the most frequency of the sub-types of reference was pronominal with the total number was: 498 (51,44%); followed by demonstrative referenc with the total number was 451 (46,59%); and comparative reference: 19 (1,96%) respectively**.** In sub-types of substitution the results revealed that the students rarely used substitution in their cause effect essay. Of three sub-types of substitution as cohesive devices (nominal, verbal and clausal substitution, only one sub-type of substitution used, namely, nominal substitution with total number was 8 (0,38%). In Sub-types of Conjunction as cohesive devices; the resuts of the research study revealed that the highest frequency of the sub-types of conjunction as cohesive devices were as follows: additive

conjunction with the total number was 183 (57,54%); followed by temporal conjunction: 47 (14,77%); causal conjunction: 44 (13,83%); and adversative conjunctionL 40 (12,57%). In the sub-types of Lexical Cohesion; the results of the research study revelaed that in reiteration the total number of the students who frequently employed same word/repetition was 560 (66,74%), it means that the students predominatly employed same word/repetition; followed by general world: 116 (13,82%); antonym: 29 (3,45%); and synonym: 5 (0,59%). In accordance with collocation: adjective & noun: 110 (13,11%); Noun and noun: 4 (0,47%); and verb with preposition: 15 (1,78%).

Finally, to respond to the third research question, the results of the study revealed that most of the students committed errors in reference, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. The results of table 8 above showed that the students who committed errors in writing their cause effect essay were as follows: Reference: 105 (55, 85%), Conjunction: 31 (16, 48%), and Lexical Cohesion: 52 (2,76%). It is noticed that the predominat errors committed by the students in their cause effect essay was lexical cohesion followed by reference, and conjunction. The students did not commit erros in substitution since substitution as cohesive devices was rarely employed in their essay, meanwhile, for ellipsis, there is no instances found in the students' essay.

Dealing with the sub-types of cohesive devices used; the sub-types of reference; the total number of errors in personal reference was 23 (22,11%); demonstrative reference: 77 (74,03%); and comparative reference: 4 (3,84%). In terms of the sub-types of conjunction, the results of the research study revealed that most of the students committed errros in temporal conjunction with the total number of errors: 12 (38,70%); followed by adversative conjunction: 10 (32,25%); additive conjunction: 6 (19,35%); and causal conjunction 3 (9,67%). Finally, the sub-types of lexical cohesion, Reiteration was 39 (75%); and Collocation was 13 (25%).

The Grammatical Cohesive devices Used.

Reference Cohesive Devices Used. As mentioned earlier, of the five types of cohesive devices as proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976), reference cohesive devices were the most frequently employed in the students' cause effect essay. It is supported by Alarcon and Morales (2011) in their research study on Grammatical cohesion in students' argumentative essay revealed that reference was significantly more frequently used than the other types of cohesive devices. Simillarly, Dueraman (2007) in his research study on Cohesion and Coherence in English essays written by Malaysian and Thai Medical students revealed that the students used more reference than conjunction, reiteration and collocation in argumentative essays. These findings are not in line with previous studies: (Neuner 1987; Liu & Brain, 2005; in their study on Cohesive features in argumentative writing produced by Chinese

Undergraduates, found out that the Chinese students employed lexical cohesive devices more frequently than, reference, and conjunction. No intances of substitution and ellipsis found in the students' essay. Zhang (2000) in the study on cohesive features in the expository writing of undergraduates in two Chinese Universities stated that the conjunction devices were higher than the reference devices. It means that there were still contradictory on the use of cohesive devices as the most important or dominat one as found in the students' essay

The results of data analysis on the frequency of demonstrative reference as cohesive devices revealed that definite article **the** was predominatly engaged in the students' cause effect essay. This is attributed to the high frequency of the non-selective demonstrative **the.** Alarcon and Morales (2011) stated that the number of reference dealing with definite article **the** in the students' essay was predominatly higher than the other two types of references. The current research study apparently revealed that the high frequency of reference in the students' essay was personal reference, followed by demonstrative reference, and comparative reference.

The following is the discussion in terms of the demonstrative reference; how **this, those, that, there, here**, and **the** were used in the students' cause effect essay. Dealing with anaphoric and cataphoric reference, Thompson (2004:181) stated that most cohesive, endophoric, reference is anaphoric means pointing backwards. Less often reference may be cataphoric means pointing forwards: this signals that the meaning of the reference item will not be specified until further on in the text. He added that in the expohora reference the identity of the reference item was recovered from outside the text in the environment, but in the endophoric reference it was recovered from inside the text. Similarly, the current study revealed that the most cohesive, endophoric, reference is anaphoric and less often reference was cataphoric reference.

Dealing with anaphiric and cataphoric reference. This current research study revealed that the students did not use cataphoric reference in their cause essay. It is apparent that the most cohesive, endophoric, reference is anaphoric and no cataphoric reference used. Most of the students employed anaphoric nominal references that comprise subject pronoun, object pronoun and possessive pronouns. However, the students were unfamiliar with cataphoric reference in their essay.

In terms of personals reference devices, as stated in results of data analysis previously, the results of the research study revealed that most of the students in their cause effect essay employed personal reference devices. Typically the pronominals dealing with the speaker or writer only; such as: pronoun **I,** functions as head and possessive pronoun **my** functions as modifier; and the listener: pronoun **you** functions as head, possessive determiners / adjectives **your, yourself** as possessive determiners function as modifiers; speaker /writer and other persons: pronoun **we, us** are as heads and possessive determiner **our, ourselves**

and functions as modifiers. Other people male: pronoun **he** functions as head, female: pronoun **she** functions as head; other persons; objects: pronoun **they, them**, and possessive determiner **their** and **themselves** functioning as modifiers; object; passage of text: pronoun **it** functioning as head.

Halliday and Hasan (1976:45) stated that each of personal forms entered into the structure in one of two guises: either as participant in some process, or as possessor of some entity. If the former, it falls into the class noun, subclass pronoun, and functions as head and sole element in the nominal group; it than has one form when that nominal group is the subject (I, we, he, she, it, they, one) and in most cases a different form when it is anything other than subject (me, you, us, him, her, it, them, one). It is clear that all the examples employed in the students' cause effect essay; such as **we, I, you, they, he, she,** and **it** were subject pronouns as participants and function as heads.

Dealing with comparative reference, the students used **particular comparison**; such as more, more and more, so many and many people in their essay.

Substitution Cohesive Devices Used. Table 3 above showed that the students rarely used Substitution. In their essay the researcher found out that they just employed nominal substitution **one.** No instances found in accordance with verbal and clausal substitution. Nominal substitution is used where the noun or a nominal group can be replaced by a noun.

Conjunction Cohesive Devices Used. In terms of the results of conjunction, research study, the writer can say that the students employed the conjunction in their essya; such as additive (and, or, besides, for example, for instance, in addition, furthermore, that is); adversative (but, on the other hand, even though, although, in fact, however); causal (so, because, therefore, because of, cause) and temporal conjunction (firts, firstly, second, secondly, third, fourth, in conclusion, finally, the last) in their essay. The predominat use of conjunction was additive conjunction devices, followed by temporal, causal, and adversative conjunction devices.

The Lexical Cohesive deviced Used

Reiteration used. In the current research study, the researcher found out that most of the students frequently employed repetition and general word in their essay. However, they rarely employed synonym, antonym.

The collocation used. In accordance with ollocation; the students rarely employed the collocation; such as noun + noun, noun + verb, and verb with preposition (McCarthy and O'Dell (2000:6). Other linguistic markers of lexical devices; such as superordinate, noun & verb did not appear in the students' essay. The misuse of lexical devices might be due to the lack of students' proficiency or lack of vocabulary they had.

To answer the research question number 3 as stated earlier, in this part, the researcher discusses errors committed by the students in their essay in terms of cohesive devices. As mentioned before that most of the students committed errors on their essay. The results of the table 8 above showed that the students who committed errors in their essay were as follows: **Reference: 105 (55, 85%), Conjunction: 31 (16, 48%**), and **Lexical Cohesion: 52 (2,76%).** It is noticed that the predominat errors committed by the students in their cause effect essay was lexical cohesion followed by reference, and conjunction. The students did not commit erros on substitution since substitution as cohesive devices rarely employed in their cause effect essay, meanwhile, for ellipsis, there is no instances found in the students' essay.

Dealing with the sub-types of devices used; the sub-types of reference are as follows; the total number of errors on **personal reference** was **23 (22,11%); demonstrative reference: 77 (74,03%);** and **comparative reference: 4 (3,84%).** In terms of the sub-types of **conjunction,** the results of the research study revealed that most of the students committed errros on **temporal conjunction** with the total number of errors: **12 (38,70%);** followed by **adversative conjunction**: **10** or **32,25%; additive conjunction: 6 (19,35%);** and **causal conjunction 3 or 9,67%.** Finally, the sub-types of lexical cohesion, **Reiteration was 39 (75%);** and **Collocation was 13 (25%). (See table)**

After analyzing the results of the students' essay, the researcher found out the errors in terms of the linguistic markers as cohesive devices they committed. Their errors found in the use of linguistic markers were as follows: pronoun shift, the misuse of singular and plural form of demonstrative pronouns, the misuse of lexical cohesion, overuse of cohesive devices, overgeneralization of using reflective pronoun in singular form and for plural form, omitting object pronoun, and addition. All these errors were caused by the **interlanguage errors** which results from the mother tongue interferrence, **intralingual errors** in which the results from faulty or partial learning of the target language and developmetal errors that occured when the students hypothesized about the target language based on their limited knowledge. Similarly, the earlier Studies: Crewe 1990; Zhang, 2000; Castro, 2004; Brain, 2005, Fan, Hsu, & Yang (2006) and Chen (2008) had revealed that the students committed errors in the use of cohesive devices in their writing; such as pronoun shift refers to a grammatical errors in which the students employed a specific kind of pronoun in a sentence or a paragraph and then suddenly shifts the pronoun to another; run-one sentence means that a sentence consists of two or more main clauses are joined without proper punctuation marks or conjunctions. Run-on sentences can be atrributed to a number of causes, including they did not know how to use conjunctions appropriately and did not understand the difference between dependent and independent clauses; the misuse of lexical items, such as limited choice of lexical items and misuse of lexicons or collocation; the overuse

of Cohesive devices that can cause the writing to be redundant or difficult to decipher in which the writing is difficult to read or understand.

The recent study also found out that among the four sub-types of conjunctions, errors in temporal conjunction was the most difficult use for the students in their essay, followed by adversative conjunction, additive conjunction and causal conjunction. Some students still committed errors, such as the overuse of conjunction and the misuse of conjunction in their cause effect essay. The students could not consturct the sentences in the appropriate grammatical relation between sentences and paragraph in a text. It is supported by the previous studies, such as Meisue, 2000, Chen, 2006, Abaldwahid, 2012, and Hamed 2014. They said that the students employed conjunction: adversative, additive, and causal and temporal conjunction inappropriately in their writing and it thus weakend the logical connectivity between sentences and paragraph.

Conclusion

The results of the research study revealed that the third grade students of Language Study Program at STKIP St. Paulus Ruteng employed four types of cohesive devices; they are Reference with the sub-types: personal reference, demonstrative reference, and comparative reference; Substitution with the sub-types: nominal substitution; Conjunction with the sub-categories: additive conjunction, adversative conjunction, causal conjunction and temporal conjunction; and lexical cohesion with the sub-types reiteration and colocation. The results of research study also revealed that the students employed a variety of cohesive devices in their cause –effect essay; and Reference is the most frequently used with the percentage (45,38%), followed by Lexical cohesion (39, 33%), Conjunction (14, 90%) and Substitution (0,37%). No instances of Ellipsis were found in the students' essay since according to Halliday and Hasan (1976) ellipsis is mostly used in oral discourse than in written discourse

Based on the students' errors in the use of cohesive devices in their essay, the students commited errors as in: interlingual and intralingual errors in which the results from faulty or partial learning of the target language. The results indicated that most of the students committed errors as in: pronoun shift, the misuse of singular and plural form of demonstrative pronoun, the misuse of lexical cohesion, overuse of cohesive devices, overgeneralization of using reflective pronoun in singular form and for plural form, omitting object pronoun, and addition.

Suggestions

Referring to the results and discussions presented above, the researcher provides some suggestions for both writing teachers and EFL students as the pedagogical implications of this research study. First, since almost of the students committed errors in their essay that

influenced the quality of their writing, that is why the writing teachers are expected to instruct the students employ the proper cohesive devices to make their essay better in constructing simple sentence, compound sentence complex sentence and compound –complex sentence. Second, it is essential for the teacher to inform and remind the students not to employ **interlingual** transfer caused by their native language that makes the quality of writing becomes worse since the results of the research study indicated that one of the errors committed by the students is influenced by their mother tongue. Third, the writing teachers help the students enrich and enlarge the choice of vocabulary since the findings indicated that the students rarely used collocation in their essay. Fourth, the writing teachers are also expected to help the students choose proper word choice that they employ in collocation in their writing, especially for word order. Last but not least, the students are expected to bear in mind that the usage of proper cohesive devices can make the quality of writing better, so, it is suggested that the students should learn more and more how to engage each type of cohesive devices accurately in their essay in writing class

References

Alarcon B. Josephine & Morales S. Ninfa Katrina (2011). *Grammatical Cohesion in Students' Argumentative essay.* Languages Department, Faculty of Enginering, University of St. Tomas, Manila, Philipines.Journal of English and Literature vol. 2(5), pp.114-127, June 2011.

Castro C (2004). *Cohesion and the Social Construction of Meaning in the Essays of Filipino College Students Writing in L2 English.* Asia Pasific Educ. Rev., 5(2): 215-225

Chen, J. L. (2008). *An Investigation of EFL Student's Use of Cohesive Devices.* National Tsing Hua University, 93-107.

Connor, U. (1984). *A study on cohesion and coherence in English as a second language student's writing.* Paper in linguistics, 17, 301-316.

Crewe, W.J. (1990). *The illogical of logical connectives.* ELT. Journal, 44(4), 316-325

Field, Y., & Oi, Y. (1992). *A comparison of internal cohesive conjunction in the English writing of Cantonese speakers of English.* RELC Journal, 23, 15-28.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, Ruqaiya (1976). *Cohesion in English.* New York: Longman group Ltd.

Hamed, Muftah. 2014. Conjunctions in Argumentative Writing of Libyan Tertiary Students. English Language Teaching; Vol.7.No.3;2014.

School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffth University, Queensland, Australia.

Hu, Zhuang-Lin.et al (1982). Some linguistic differences in the written English of Chinese and Australian students, *Language learning and Communication*

Johnson, P. (1992). *Cohesion and Coherence in compositions in Malay and English.* RELC Journal, 33(2), 1-17.

Karasi, M. (1994). Cohesive features in the expository essays of secondary four (Express) and secondary five (Normal) students in Singapore. M.A. Dissertation, Nanyang Technological University.

Kwan. L,. S. Lisa & Yunus Md Melor (2014). *Cohesive Errors in Writing among ESL Pre-Service Teahcers.* English Language Teaching Vol. 7, No. 11; 2014.

Liu M, Braine (2005). Cohesive *features in Argumentative Writing produced by Chinese Undergraduates.* Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science

Meisuo, Z. (2000). *Cohesive Features in the expository writing of undergraduates in two Chinese Universities.* RELC J., 52439 (61)

McCarty. M. O'Dell F. (2000). Collocations In Use. Cambridge

Neuner, J. L. (1987). *Cohesive ties and chains in good and poor freshman essays.* Research in the teaching of English, 21(1) 92-105.

Ong, J. (2011). Investigating the use of cohesive devices by Chinese EFL learners. *The Assian EFL Journal Quarterly, 13(3), 42-65.*

Tierney, R.J., and Mosenthae, J. H (1983). *Cohesion and Textual Coherence. Research in the teaching of English,* 17, 215-229

Thompson, G. (2004). *Introducing Functional Grammar (2nd ed.)* London. Arnold.

Zhang, M. (2000). *Cohesive features in the expository writing of undergraduates in two Chinese Universities.* RELC Journal, 30(1), 61-95