



Ansaq Journal for arts,
literature and humanities
17th edition
Volume (5) Issue (4)
2024 (1-20)

Investigating the Awareness of EFL Undergraduates of El-Mergib University towards Linking Adverbial Cohesive Devices and its Impact on the Assessments of Speaking Skill

Mustafa Ali Gumma Altrablsi
A Lecturer at College of Arts Alkhoms,
El-Mergib University, Libya.
Published on: 19 November 2024



This work is licensed under a
[Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

Abstract

This research aimed to find out types of Linking Adverbial cohesive devices and the correctness of cohesive devices in students' spoken Language. This study was designed as qualitative study. The samples of this research were 30 students in the 2nd and 3rd year of English major at the Education Faculty in Meslata City affiliated to Elmergib University in Libya. The data were collected through the document of scripted interviews of the students' recordings which analyzed by using the theory of cohesion by Halliday and Hasan (2014) which was concerned with: Linking Adverbial cohesion types (reversal, causal, adversative, and contrastive). The results of this study showed that there is a shortage of knowledge of the linking adverbial cohesive devices not only as a matter

of awareness but also is a misuse of cohesive devices in general. The findings of this study shed the light on the necessity of learning this type of cohesive devices otherwise coherence will not be enhanced, the logic flow will be interrupted and the structural signposting will not be provided.

Keywords: Cohesive devices, Linking adverbials, Assessment, Speaking skills.

* Introduction

The ubiquitous spread of English as a foreign language either by learning or teaching has not produced much consensus on areas such as the order in which been concerned grammatical structures, learning theories, target language discourse, comprehensible input that matches existing linguistic knowledge and the necessity of

developing an awareness of linguistic cognitive structures. However, a concept that has generated some agreement, and that is generally acknowledged to play a major role in the ongoing difficulty of comprehending and producing target language speech or writing, is that of cohesion. [Umar & Ko, 2022; Madanipour et al.2022; Usher, 2023].

When a set of sentences are located side by side, they are expected to make up a meaningful text and be linked to each other to enable the readers to cooperate with the writer to understand the text easily. In order to contribute to the reader in understanding the flow and the coherence of the text easily, the writer may connect related ideas between the sentences or connect two ideas without any relation. For this purpose, the concept of 'devices' is used in the literature. Besides, the concept of "cohesion" is another important aspect of the text, which centers the concept of semantic relations in the examined linkages. [Quílez, 2021, Schumann et al., 2021, Chicho, 2022]

In order to interpret cohesive relations of the text on the level above the sentence, one needs certain pragmatic knowledge about the context of the text. Therefore, to interpret the cohesive relations found

in the text, readers need access to implied meanings of the sentences. Knowledge about format development and operations of the format is necessary. In this sense, looking at cohesive devices in the text may help us understand how readers of text currently use their linguistic knowledge to interpret the meanings and the implications of format relations in the text. [Alyousef, 2021, Masykuri et al.2022, Safaie, 2020]

*** Definition of Cohesive Devices**

In order for the addressee to make links between their utterances, it is essential that the speaker indicates when an event is present, where/why that event took place, who the participants were, how the event took place, within which period of time, under which frequency, modality, lexical condition, etc. In this way, and by using linking adverbials, the listener is able to work out what the discursive links between the utterances are, to keep track of the topics under discussion, and to predict/anticipate what will come next. For those reasons, a text without linking adverbials is hard to understand, as Frei suggests: "The task of finding the intended connection and the bridging inferences to be made is quite demanding." [Vyčítal, 2023;

Suprihatiningsih & Christina, 2021; Nurul & Amrin2021]

Cohesion is one of the most important mechanisms for attaining coherence in spoken language. According to Halliday and Hassan, it employs four main cohesive devices, namely reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. Cohesive devices have been widely recognized as playing a very important role in interlinking different parts of a text, in helping to make the function of different parts clear, in giving the text unity, and in guiding the reader through the text. Cohesion at the text level can be achieved through the use of various cohesive conjunctions, those words that convey the manufacturers intentions to make inimically linked and express the manner in which those links are forged. The use of cohesive devices is a way of structuring the textual information in a coherent pattern. Furthermore, cohesive devices are used in both spoken and written languages. They link different parts of a text together so that it holds together as a whole and can be easily hierarchied by the reader or listener. This makes cohesive devices fundamental to good speech or writing. Failure to use these devices can make the idea expressed in the text difficult to follow. [Saputra &

Hakim, 2020; Nindya & Widiati, 2020; Rizki et al.2022]

Linking adverbials constitute an important category within the class of adverbials. The only shared feature of the diverse group of words included in this category is that these words or expressions express relations such as concession, contrast, and others between larger discourse units. In other words, linking adverbials (also known as discourse connectors) function to 'tie' different parts or segments of the text together, and that is why they are so important for the analysis of text coherence. [Lumbangaol 2022; Crible, 2020; Zinkeová, 2023]

*** Background and Significance of the study**

Moreover, explicitly comparing Chinese with English concerning these cohesive devices is crucial but still hidden. It provides Chinese and English occurrences of reversal, causal, adversative, and contrastive cohesive devices regarding connectives, other grammatical forms, and discourse relations, as well as in-depth cross-linguistic analyses of these cohesive devices. The research is underpinned by the discourse theory and the Chinese-English Contrastive Discourse Project. It is useful for cohesive design, text comparison,

and text generation, especially if during translation, interpretation, and language education. [Dinda Damila, 2021; Arisandi, 2023; Schmied, 2020]

*** Purpose of the Study**

Contrastive cohesive devices provide a variation to the expected discussion by contrasting one proposition that is expectedly taken as true with the prior proposition or expectations. Adversative cohesive devices take the contributions of the proposition, which are expected to be considered unnecessary, into a grammatical exception of deletability on a clause-level basis. Regarding all of them, when coherence is created in the progression of ideas, the implied contents of reversal, contrastive, adversative, and contrastive cohesive devices not only refer to the discourse context, they also have another tendency which profoundly involves the cruciality of the previous sentences in terms of the ordering of the information, based on a set of discourse-related reasons. In this research, we present a series of empirical studies which focus on two major aspects of the fronted subjects: change of information ordering. The discovery of the unexpected and change-of-topic reading times were gathered from two different sources: self-paced moving window reading

of sentence-genitive systems and self-paced natural reading of short-distance written discourses. [Masykuri et al.2022; Kirana et al.2020; Chen & Cui, 2022]

Reversal and contrastive cohesive devices are the two concepts that always place structural elements at the sentence initial position, which is the place of the sentence that the reader or listener notices first. The anticipation of the readers regarding the first position of sentences before the processing of those sentences is a fact that hinders the listener from denying the importance of the first position in terms of discourse. This trace of anticipation leads to a fundamental issue of language: the structural differences made in the meaning of the content through the ordering of words. Even though the importance was discovered a long time ago, there is still a considerable amount that still unknown about how the meanings of the sentences are affected through the ordering of words. The motivation for this comes from the challenges in that area. It is aimed to create a full picture of the usage of reversal, causal, adversative, and contrastive cohesive devices within the English language. [Zulfiani, 2022; Abdi and Wind 2023; Imen & Wiam, 2022]

The importance of written speech in academic endeavors is commensurate with its power. It is only through written speech that all theoretical underpinnings and debates, concepts, and technicalities can be seriously treated and examined. According to Casanave, often, the significance of writing for knowledge generation goes unquestioned. The power of the written word to create, manipulate, and question knowledge can be seen in the requirement for graduate students to demonstrate mastery through producing lengthy theses/dissertations and through publishing their "findings" or research. Honest decision-making cannot take place within a community unless majority support can be recognized. [Poe, 2022; Molinari, 2022; Golder et al.2023]

Recognizing the importance of writing as an academic activity has led writers and authorities on writing, educators, and many researchers to claim that the precision of language usage is a very important factor. Apart from using language to report and entertain in general, the use of language is found to be much more useful and potent, especially when written for academia. Once this fact is recognized, academics and students alike should adopt effective written

communicative skills for success. One of the suggested ways to bring about this improvement is the use of the study of cohesive devices in academic writing. [Guo et al., 2022; Alobaid, 2020; Lund et al.2023]

*** The Research Problem**

The problematic issue this study concerns is that there is a necessity of learning the cohesive devices and applying them appropriately. These grammatical constituents are unconsciously overlooked otherwise coherence will not be enhanced, the logic flow will be interrupted and the structural signposting will not be provided.

*** The Research Questions**

The questions of the current study rely on the awareness and the use of cohesive devices especially the linking adverbial ones.

- 1- Q1. Are undergraduates aware of cohesive devices in general and linking adverbials in specific?
- 2- Q2. Do university students know how to use them?

*** Literature Review**

*** Theoretical Review**

It is considered that the first language is a set of strings much theorizing in cognitive science and neuroscience has focused on the emergence of Syntax as the driving force in making human Language infinite [Chomsky & DiNozzi 1972;

Pinker 1995; Hauser et al. 2002; Berwick et al. 2013]. By adulthood, an average human has a vocabulary of Somewhere between 10,000 and 20,000. (kirkpatrick 1891; D'Anna et al. 1991). One of the Linguists credited with the development Of systemic linguistics and functional grammar, Defines text as any authentic Stretch of written or Spoken language. (Michael Halliday 1994).

A text is a semantic unit and it has an internal logic relation and a crucial attribute of every text is its unity. Hoey (1991) and McCarthy (1991) have explained that studying and applying these devices effectively would lead to cohesion and improvement of the writing's quality. According to (Thornbury, 2005) states that there is a number of ways that are made cohesive in a text, and these cohesive devices (also called linking devices) are traditionally classified at the level of lexis , grammar and discourse (or rhetoric). As Nunan (1993), stated coherence is the sense that chains of sentences or utterances seem to dangle collectively. The cohesive devices (Thornbury, Scott, 2005:23) includes were lexical cohesion and grammatical cohesion.

Furthermore, Thompson (1996) claimed that most

conjunctions can be interpreted as both a grammatical and lexical semantic unit. Cohesion plays an important role in English language teaching for readers and writers need to be aware of the link that holds chunks of text together, and that contributes to the creation of a text as a unit of meaning (Mahlberg,2006). Mahlberg also affirms that Halliday and Hasan view conjunction as “mainly grammatical, but with a lexical component in it ” (2006,p.381). The concept of cohesion, however, is semantic rather than structural in the sense that it functions around the clause rather than within it (Fontaine,2012,p.169).

* **Related Studies**

Lee (2002) investigated how CDs were used in the compositions of 107 Chinese undergraduates through both quantitative and qualitative methods. The research found that lexical devices were used most frequently, conjunctions and reference devices are used less and that certain CDs included ambiguity in reference, overuse and misuse of conjunctions, and restricted use of lexical cohesion. Lee (2002) did a research with 16 ESL students to reveal whether explicit teaching of coherence creating devices may contribute to the coherence in writing and found a positive relation between

the pedagogical materials based on promoting the CDs and the improvement of the student writing.

On the other hand, other studies have not shown a significant link between the number of CDs and the quality of writing (Jafarpur, 1991; Johnson, 1992; Neuner, 1987; Zhang, 2010). Among the studies, two studies (i.e., Liu & Braine, 2005; Zhang, 2010) were conducted in China and one in Iran (Jafapur, 1991).

Jalilifar (2008) following Fraser's (1999) classification of DMs focused on DMs in descriptive compositions of 90 junior and senior Iranian EFL students. Findings of the research provided evidence that elaborative markers were the most frequently used, then inferential, contrastive, and causative and least frequently used are topic relating markers.

Using frequency counts, Hu, W. C. (2004), investigated the use of CDs by 12 Chinese university students in contrast to 12 Australian university students based on the Halliday's functional grammar. They proved that Chinese used more conjunctions and Australians used more lexical cohesion.

Liu and Braine (2005), to analyze relationship between the number of CDs and writing quality in argumentative compositions written

by Chinese undergraduate EFL learners, did a correlational survey between the numerical composition scores and the frequency of CDs in every composition with regard to their categories (reference, conjunction, and lexical cohesion). The findings showed that the composition scores significantly correlated with the number of CDs, highly correlated with lexical devices among the three main categories of CDs.

Field and Yip (1992) analyzed and compared the argumentative writings of 67 Hong Kong with 29 Australians. They pointed out that nonnative learners of English used more conjunctions than Australians and nonnatives usually use all conjunctions at the beginning of the sentences.

The claim of the contribution of references to higher writing scores is supported by Alarcon & Morales (2011), who also found that reference had the highest frequency (or 90.67%) of the total grammatical cohesive devices associated with writing quality, followed by conjunction and ellipsis.

Coskun (2011) also supported the claim that that Uzbek and Turkish students' low writing scores were due to limited use of reference and ellipsis; both make the text more

coherent. A number of studies have shown that cohesive devices are important indicators of text comprehensibility such that an increase in text cohesive generally leads to greater comprehension of a text [Crossley, Yang, & McNamara, 2014; Gernsbacher, 1990; Crossley & McNamara 2011].

Most or almost of the researchers' interest focused on the cohesive devices used in a written work overlooking the importance of cohesive devices used in a spoken form. This study covers the linking adverbial cohesive devices used in a spoken performance by undergraduates of Education Faculty, Elmergib University in Meslata City.

*** Theoretical Framework Of The Study**

According to Halliday and Hasan's cohesion theory (2014), cohesion, as the major characteristic of coherence covering linguistic properties of the language, gives a sequence of sentences a coherent texture. Cohesion shows how semantic relationships are set up by lexical and syntactic features. Such overt lexical and syntactic features are called CDs, which signal the relationship among sentences.

To provide a framework for studying and judging the cohesion and coherence of writing, Halliday

and Hasan (2014) introduced five different types of CDs: (a) reference, (b) substitution, (c) ellipsis, (d) conjunction, and finally (e) lexical cohesion. They contended that through analyzing the use of cohesive device, one could evaluate or assess speaking quality from the perspective of coherence.

Fraser (1999) defined DMs as a pragmatic class, lexical expressions drawn primarily from the syntactic classes of conjunctions, adverbials, and prepositional phrases. More to the point, similar taxonomies of CDs where this typology is mainly used for the classification of spoken discourse and seems to be the most comprehensive. This study was based on four categories of adverbial cohesive devices in accordance with the proposed model, there are four types of CDs reversal, causal, adversative and contrastive

*** Methodology**

*** Review**

In this chapter describes how the research method is being organized. At first the research method, the participants, the investigating instrument and finally the research procedure.

*** The research method**

The method of this study is qualitative and the type of the study is cross-sectional. Cross-sectional or

action research meant to be conducted in a specific time usually months are account on the contrary of longitudinal type of research that take years to apply the quantitative study.

*** The participants of the study**

The population sample of this study is opted from two different studying years, the second and the third that majoring at English Language Department at the Education faculty in Meslata affiliated by Elmergib University. The number of the participants is (30). The half of them are from the 2nd year whereas the other half from the 3rd year students.

*** The investigating instruments**

The investigating tool for this study was an interview and it was divided into three parts. The first part was asking question about the familiarity about the four types of cohesive devices reversal, causal, adversative and contrastive. The second part was about theoretical use which means the pre-knowledge before use the cohesive devices for each type whereas the third part was about the actual use or the ability to use these cohesive devices in a proper way supported by examples.

*** The research procedure**

At first, an appointment with them after class was taken then they have been gathered .The researcher

informed all the participants that their personal information will be anonymous and the data will be kept confidential and only be used in the sake of this research purposes. The study has been conducted and went under two phases. The first phase was prepare the interview questions. The first question was designed to give answer about the awareness of cohesive devices (RCAC). Q1.Are you familiar with this cohesive tie? Is this cohesive device familiar to you? Did you come across with this conjunction word? The second question was about checking if the participants have a previous knowledge or a theoretical use about how to use these devices. Q2. Do you know how to use them in speaking?. The third question was to check their abilities in using these ties in sentences.

The second phase was to prepare cards and write down each of the four cohesive devices examined in a different color. Blue cards were for the reversal type, moreover, the green one were for the causal ties. Adversative cohesive device has taken the color red whereas the contrastive cohesive devices were in yellow.

*** The scope**

The scope of this study can be summarized by two parameters the

temporal (Time) and spatial (Place). At first, this study has been carried out from Jan, 2024 to March, 2024 which was enough time for the data collection. Secondly, the place where all participants were gathered and the instructions were given was at the faculty of education in Meslata City. The number of the researchers was three therefore, three classrooms were allocated to conduct the interview process. The time for each interview was between 10 and 15 minutes which was indeed sufficient for the participant to answer and for the data to be collected.

*** Ethical considerations**

There were ethical issues must be taken into account and as a researcher all the participants have been informed that the information security and privacy of the data collection are at utmost importance where their personal information will be anonymous and the data will be kept confidential and only be used in the sake of this research purposes.

*** The Research design**

This research has been designed and divided into five chapters. The first chapter was about the introduction, the second chapter was about the Literature Review, the third chapter was about the Methodology, the forth one was about the results and the fifth chapter

was about the discussion. finally the last chapter which was the sixth, it was about the conclusion.

*** Results**

The outcome of this research concludes into the following results that have been applied by SPSS program. The most important results are which related to validity, reliability, overall agreement and data frequency.

*** Validity**

The Social Package of Statistical System is use and the descriptive statistics were applied in order to obtain the frequency, mean, standard deviation, and correlation.

Case Processing Summary		N	%
Cases	Valid	30	100.0
	Excluded ^a	0	.0
	Total	30	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table (1)

The table (1) has shown the validity test results of the data inserted of 30 participants. The results were valid.

*** Reliability**

Cronbach's Alpha ^a	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items ^a	N of Items
0.045	0.045	0

a. The value is positive due to a positive average among items. This consolidates reliability model assumptions.

Table (2)

*** Overall Agreement**

Fleiss Multirater Kappa test is used to measure the p-value that indicates the significance of the collected data.

	Kappa	Asymptotic			Asymptotic 95% Confidence Interval	
		Standard Error	Z	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Overall Agreement	.643	.016	2.700	.007	.612	.675

a. Sample data contains 30 effective subjects and 12 raters. Asymptotic 95% has a Confidence Interval

Table (3)

*** Data Frequency**

In this part it shows the percentage of frequency rate of both dependent and independent variables.

Age					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	20-25	29	96.7	96.7	96.7
	36-40 +	1	3.3	3.3	100.0
Total		30	100.0	100.0	

Table (4)

The domain age of the opted sample is between 20 years and 25 years with a percentage of 96,7 % as shown in Table (4).

The participants were studying in the second and the third year 2023-2024 and the number is totally equal as shown in Table (5)

Studying Year					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2nd year	15	50.0	50.0	50.0
	3rd year	15	50.0	50.0	100.0
Total		30	100.0	100.0	

Table (5)

The Questionnaire Results for the four types of cohesive devices Reversal, Causal, Adversative and Contrastive were organized to answer the research question related to Familiarity, Theoretical use, and Practical use of cohesive devices. The participants answers provide valid percentages for the research

questions. These answers are 'Yes, No, Undecided'. For Familiarity 'Yes' answer means the participants are familiar with this type of cohesive device whereas the answers 'No' or Undecided means that the participants are not familiar or not aware of that type of cohesive devices.

*** Reversal Cohesive devices**

Results for the Reversal type of cohesive devices are shown in Tables (6, 7, 8).

Familiarity		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	21	70.0	70.0	70.0
	No	9	30.0	30.0	30.0
Total		30	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table (6)

The above table shows the results of the Familiarity of reversal Cohesive device revealed that (70 %) of the participants are familiar with this type of cohesive device. On the contrary, (30 %) of the data collected shows the unfamiliarity.

Theoretical Use		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	12	40.0	40.0	40.0
	No	8	26.7	26.7	66.7
Undecided		10	33.3	33.3	33.3
Total		30	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table (7)

The above table shows the results of the theoretical use of reversal Cohesive device revealed that (40 %) of the participants are theoretically capable at using this type of cohesive device. On the

contrary, (26,7 %) of the data collected shows that they are theoretically incapable to use reversal type. For the choice of Undecided the percentage of (33.3 %) are not aware of the use of this type neither theoretically nor practically.

Practical Use		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	8	26.7	26.7	26.7
	No	4	13.3	13.3	40.0
	Undecided	18	60.0	60.0	60.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table (8)

The above table shows the results of the practical use of reversal Cohesive device revealed that (26,7 %) of the participants are practically capable at using this type of cohesive device. On the contrary, (13.3 %) of the data collected shows that they are practically incapable to use reversal type. For the choice of Undecided the percentage of (60 %) are not aware of the practical use of this type.

*** Causal Cohesive devices**

Results for the Causal type of cohesive devices are shown in Tables (9, 10 , 11)

Familiarity		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	17	56.7	56.7	56.7
	No	13	43.3	43.3	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Table (9)

In table (9) which shows the results of the Familiarity of reversal Cohesive device revealed that (

56,7%) of the participants are familiar with this type of cohesive device. On the contrary, (43,3 %) of the data collected shows the unfamiliarity.

Theoretical Use		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	5	16.7	16.7	16.7
	No	12	40.0	40.0	56.7
	Undecided	13	43.3	43.3	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Table (10)

The above table shows the results of the theoretical use of reversal Cohesive device revealed that (16 %) of the participants are theoretically capable at using this type of cohesive device. On the contrary, (40 %) of the data collected shows that they are theoretically incapable to use reversal type. For the choice of Undecided the percentage of (43.3 %) are not aware of the use of this type neither theoretically nor practically.

Practical Use		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	5	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Undecided	25	83.3	83.3	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Table (11)

The above table shows the results of the practical use of reversal Cohesive device revealed that (16,7 %) of the participants are practically capable at using this type of cohesive device. For the choice of Undecided the percentage of (83.3 %) are not aware of the practical use of this type.

* Adversative Cohesive devices

Results for the Adversative type of cohesive devices are shown in Tables (12, 13 , 14)

Practical Use		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	5	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Undecided	25	83.3	83.3	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Table (12)

The above table shows the results of the Familiarity of reversal Cohesive device revealed that (80 %) of the participants are familiar with this type of cohesive device. On the contrary, (20 %) of the data collected shows the unfamiliarity.

Theoretical Use		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	8	26.7	26.7	26.7
	No	16	53.3	53.3	80.0
	Undecided	6	20.0	20.0	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0		

Table (13)

The above table shows the results of the theoretical use of reversal Cohesive device revealed that (26,7 %) of the participants are theoretically capable at using this type of cohesive device. On the contrary, (53,3 %) of the data collected shows that they are theoretically incapable to use reversal type. For the choice of Undecided the percentage of (20 %) are not aware of the use of this type neither theoretically nor practically.

Practical Use		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	4	13.3	13.3	13.3
	No	4	13.3	13.3	26.7
	Undecided	22	73.3	73.3	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0		

Table (14)

The above table shows the results of the practical use of reversal Cohesive device revealed that (13,3 %) of the participants are practically capable at using this type of cohesive device. On the contrary, (13,3 %) of the data collected shows that they are practically incapable to use reversal type. For the choice of Undecided the percentage of (73 %) are not aware of the practical use of this type.

* Contrastive Cohesive devices

Results for the Contrastive type of cohesive devices are shown in Tables (15, 16 , 17)

Familiarity		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	24	80.0	80.0	80.0
	No	6	20.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	30	100.0	100.0	

Table (15)

The above table shows the results of the Familiarity of reversal Cohesive device revealed that (80 %) of the participants are familiar with this type of cohesive device. On the contrary, (20 %) of the data collected shows the unfamiliarity.

Theoretical Use		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	16	53.3	53.3	53.3
	No	8	26.7	26.7	80.0
	Undecided	6	20.0	20.0	100.0
Total	30	100.0	100.0		

Table (16)

The above table shows the results of the theoretical use of reversal Cohesive device revealed that (26,7 %) of the participants are theoretically capable at using this type of cohesive device. On the contrary, (53,3 %) of the data collected shows that they are theoretically incapable to use reversal type. For the choice of Undecided the percentage of (20 %) are not aware of the use of this type neither theoretically nor practically.

Practical Use		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	14	46.7	46.7	46.7
	No	2	6.7	6.7	53.3
Undecided		14	46.7	46.7	100.0
Total		30	100.0	100.0	

Table (17)

The above table shows the results of the practical use of reversal Cohesive device revealed that (46,7 %) of the participants are practically capable at using this type of cohesive device. On the contrary, (6,7 %) of the data collected shows that they are practically incapable to use reversal type. For the choice of Undecided the percentage of (46,7 %) are not aware of the practical use of this type.

*** Discussion**

Cohesion is one of the most important mechanisms for attaining coherence in spoken language. According to Halliday and Hassan, it employs four main cohesive devices,

namely reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. As it has been widely investigated in written language, but far less in spoken language, the present study is a research that aims to contribute to its exploration in spoken language. The main conclusions confirm the prominence of these devices, and that the frequency of their occurrence is not the same for all spoken texts. In fact, while some texts have a high density of cohesive devices and variety, other texts have either no cohesive devices or a low range of variety.

However, When a set of sentences are located side by side, they are expected to make up a meaningful text and be linked to each other to enable the readers to cooperate with the writer to understand the text easily. In order to contribute to the reader in understanding the flow and the coherence of the text easily, the writer may connect related ideas between the sentences or connect two ideas without any relation. For this purpose, the concept of 'devices' is used in the literature. Besides, the concept of "cohesion" is another important aspect of the text, which centers the concept of semantic relations in the examined linkages.

[Quílez, 2021; Schumann et al., 2022; Chicho, 2022]

The point of interest of the researchers is Linking adverbial cohesive devices investigated in a spoken form of the language unlike other studies interest points.

*** Conclusion**

This study concludes that nearly two third of the participants are familiar with linking adverbial cohesive ties with a percentage of (71.6 %) which indicate their awareness of the importance of this type of word class. In contrast, the results revealed incapability of using these cohesive device with (25.8%) per cent which means that there is an interruption of the logic flow when they speak and the coherence is not enhanced. Moreover, the structural signposts are not provided or barely missing.

The hierarchy of difficulty for the research sample is arranged from the most difficult linking adverbial cohesive device to the least one. The most difficult linking adverbial cohesive devices in placement and usage are causal, adversative, reversal, and contrastive. By obtaining these findings, the research questions are already answered. The participants are aware of cohesive devices however they do not know

how to place or use them while speaking English.

Eventually, 3rd year students have a good command over using the adversative type of linking adverbial cohesive device unlike the 2nd year students. This cannot be overgeneralized with other types of linking adverbial cohesive device, the results of the data collected revealed that the 2nd year students are more capable to use contrastive linking adverbial cohesive device than the 3rd year students.

*** References**

- Abdi Tabari, M., & Wind, A. M. (2023). Dynamic development of cohesive devices in English as a second language writing. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, (0).
- Alarcon, J. B., & Morales, K. N. S. (2011). Grammatical cohesion in students' argumentative essay. *Journal of English and Literature*, 2(5), 114-127.
- Alobaid, A. (2020). Smart multimedia learning of ICT: role and impact on language learners' writing fluency—YouTube online English learning resources as an example. *Smart Learning Environments*, 7(1), 24.
- Alyousef, H. S. (2021). Text cohesion in English scientific texts written by Saudi undergraduate dentistry students: A multimodal

- discourse analysis of textual and logical relations in oral biology texts. *SAGE Open*, 11(3), 21582440211032194.
- Arisandi, N. K. L. (2023). *Improving Descriptive Text Writing Ability Of The Eighth-Grade Students Of Smpn 2 Selat In The Academic Year 2022/2023 Through Collaborative Writing Technique* (Doctoral Dissertation, Universitas Mahasaraswati Denpasar).
- Berwick, R. C., Friederici, A. D., Chomsky, N., & Bolhuis, J. J. (2013). Evolution, brain, and the nature of language. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 17(2), 89-98.
- Chen, M., & Cui, Y. (2022). The effects of AWE and peer feedback on cohesion and coherence in continuation writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 57, 100915.
- Chicho, K. Z. H. (2022). An analysis of factors influencing EFL learners' writing skills. *Canadian Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 2(2), 28-38.
- Chomsky, N., & Dinozzi, R. (1972). *Language and mind*: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. New York.
- Coskun, E. (2011). *Cohesion in Compositions of Turkish and Immigrant Students*. Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 11(2), 892-899.
- Crible, L. (2020). Weak and strong discourse markers in speech, chat, and writing: Do signals compensate for ambiguity in explicit relations?. *Discourse processes*, 57(9), 793-807.
- Crossley, S. A., Yang, H. S., & McNamara, D. S. (2014). What's so Simple about Simplified Texts? A Computational and Psycholinguistic Investigation of Text Comprehension and Text Processing. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 26(1), 92-113.
- Crossley, S., & McNamara, D. (2011). Text coherence and judgments of essay quality: Models of quality and coherence. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society* (Vol. 33, No. 33).
- D'Anna, C. A., Zechmeister, E. B., & Hall, J. W. (1991). Toward a meaningful definition of vocabulary size. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 23(1), 109-122.
- Dinda Damila, D. D. (2021). *An Analysis Of Cohesion And Coherence In Writing Analytical Exposition Text Of Second Grade Students At Sman 8 Pekanbaru* (Doctoral Dissertation, Uin Suska Riau).
- Field, Y., & Oi, Y. L. M. (1992). A comparison of internal conjunctive cohesion in the

- English essay writing of Cantonese speakers and native speakers of English. *RELC journal*, 23(1), 15-28.
- Fontaine, L. (2012). *Analysing English grammar: A systemic functional introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers?. *Journal of pragmatics*, 31(7), 931-952.
- Gernsbacher, M. A., Varner, K. R., & Faust, M. E. (1990). Investigating differences in general comprehension skill. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 16(3), 430.
- Guo, L., Pan, L., Lv, Z., & Chen, Y. (2023). Cohesive zone model of asphalt-aggregate interface under compression and shear. *Molecular Simulation*, 49(7), 643-654.
- Halliday, M. A. (1994). *A Language Development Approach to Education*.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (2014). *Cohesion in english*. Routledge.
- Hauser, M. D., Chomsky, N., & Fitch, W. T. (2002). The faculty of language: what is it, who has it, and how did it evolve?. *science*, 298(5598), 1569-1579.
- Henderson, B., Chipchase, L., Golder, F., & Lewis, L. K. (2023). Developing student nurses' evaluative judgement in clinical practice tertiary education: A systematic scoping review of teaching and assessment methods. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 73, 103818.
- Hoey, M. (1991). Another perspective on coherence and cohesive harmony. *Functional and systemic linguistics: Approaches and uses*, 385-414.
- Hu, W. C. (2004). *Televised presidential debates: A study of reference in cohesive discourse*. Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Imen, L., & Wiam, Z. (2022). *Discourse Analysis of Grammatical Cohesion in Students Writing* (Doctoral dissertation, university center of abdalhafid boussouf-MILA).
- Jafarpur, A. (1991). Cohesiveness as a basis for evaluating compositions. *System*, 19(4), 459-465.
- Jalilifar, A. (2008). *Discourse Markers in Composition Writings: The Case of Iranian Learners of English as a Foreign Language*. *English Language Teaching*, 1(2), 114-122.
- Johnson, P. (1992). Cohesion and coherence in compositions in Malay and English. *RELC journal*, 23(2), 1-17.
- Kirana, R. P., Mukhrizal, M., & Jayanti, F. G. (2020). Types of lexical cohesion and grammatical cohesion in thesis abstracts. *Jadila: Journal of*

- Development and Innovation in Language and Literature Education, 1(1), 57-68.
- Kirkpatrick, E. A. (1891). Number of words in an ordinary vocabulary. *Science*, (446), 107-108.
- Lee, J. S. (2002). The Korean language in America: The role of cultural identity in heritage language learning. *Language culture and curriculum*, 15(2), 117-133.
- Liu, M., & Braine, G. (2005). Cohesive features in argumentative writing produced by Chinese undergraduates. *System*, 33(4), 623-636.
- Lumbangaol, R. R. (2022). The Using Of Linking Words to Enhance Students' Writing Ability at Universitas Potensi Utama. *Journal MELT (Medium for English Language Teaching)*, 7(1), 01.
- Lund, B. D., & Naheem, K. T. (2024). Can ChatGPT be an author? A study of artificial intelligence authorship policies in top academic journals. *Learned Publishing*, 37(1), 13-21.
- Madanipour, A., Shucksmith, M., & Brooks, E. (2022). The concept of spatial justice and the European Union's territorial cohesion. *European Planning Studies*, 30(5), 807-824.
- Mahlberg, M. (2006). Lexical cohesion: Corpus linguistic theory and its application in English language teaching. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 11(3), 363-383.
- Masykuri, E. S., Nugraheni, I. I., & Kumar, J. A. (2022). Performing discourse students' skill by using video. In *Islam, Media and Education in the Digital Era* (pp. 336-342). Routledge.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge University.
- Molinari, J. (2022). *What makes writing academic: Rethinking theory for practice*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Neuner, J. L. (1987). Cohesive ties and chains in good and poor freshman essays. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 21(1), 92-105.
- Nindya, M. A., & Widiati, U. (2020). Cohesive devices in argumentative essays by Indonesian EFL learners. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 10(2), 337-358.
- Nunan, D. (1993). From Learning-Centeredness to Learner-Centeredness. *Applied Language Learning*, 4, 1-18.
- Nurul, A., & Amrin, S. (2021, November). Discourse Markers Used by Students in Nonformal Education. In *6th Annual International Seminar on Transformative Education and Educational Leadership*

- (AISTEEL 2021) (pp. 472-475). Atlantis Press.
- Pinker, S. (1995). *The language instinct: The new science of language and mind* (Vol. 7529). Penguin UK.
- Poe, M. (2022). Learning to unlearn the teaching and assessment of academic writing. *Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie*, 32, 161-190.
- Quílez, J. (2021). Supporting Spanish 11th grade students to make scientific writing when learning chemistry in English: the case of logical connectives. *International Journal of Science Education*, 43(9), 1459-1482.
- Rizki, P. N. M., Handoko, I., Purnama, P., & Rustam, D. (2022). Promoting self-regulated learning for students in underdeveloped areas: The case of Indonesia Nationwide Online-Learning Program. *Sustainability*, 14(7), 4075.
- Safaie, S. (2020). The effects of explicit and implicit teaching of connectors on the reading comprehension performance of Iranian EFL learners. *Cogent Education*, 7(1), 1777806.
- Saputra, A., & Hakim, M. A. R. (2020). The usage of cohesive devices by high-achieving EFL students in writing argumentative essays. *Indonesian TESOL Journal*, 2(1), 42-58.
- Schmied, J. (2020). Limits of discourse: Examples from political, academic, and human-agent interaction. *Discourse and interaction*, 13(2), 89-118.
- Schumann, J., Zufferey, S., & Oswald, S. (2021). The Linguistic Formulation Of Fallacies Matters: The Case Of Causal Connectives. *Argumentation*. [Springer.Com](https://www.springer.com)
- Shuman, A. (2021). Narrative Breakdown in the Political Asylum Process. *Journal of American Folklore*, 134(532), 180-195.
- Suprihatiningsih, S., & Christina, C. (2021). Discourse Markers in Muniba Mazari's "We All are Perfectly Imperfect" Speech (2017). *Metaphor*, 3(2), 64-74.
- Thompson, G. (1996). Voices in the text: discourse perspectives on language reports. *Applied linguistics*, 17(4), 501-530.
- Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*.
- Umar, M., & Ko, I. (2022). E-learning: Direct effect of student learning effectiveness and engagement through project-based learning, team cohesion, and flipped learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sustainability*, 14(3), 1724.
- Usher, R. (2023). A Free Can. *Humanising Language Teaching*, 25(4).

- Vyčítal, F. Linking adverbials in written academic discourse
Bachelor thesis Brno 2023.
- Zhang, A. (2010). Use of cohesive ties in relation to the quality of compositions by Chinese college students.
- Zinkeová, A. (2023). The Use of Selected Linking Words in Academic Discourse.
- Zulfiani, H. (2022). An analysis of conjunctions as cohesive devices in the opinion page of The Jakarta Post. *Jurnal Komunikata*, 2(2).