

# **COHESION IN WRITTEN ENGLISH**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Language Education,  
University Campus, Kirtipur in Partial Fulfilment for  
Master's Degree in Education  
(Specialization in English Language Education)**

**By  
Deepak Prasad Jamkatel**

**Faculty of Education  
Tribhuvan University  
Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal  
2008**

# **COHESION IN WRITTEN ENGLISH**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Language Education,  
University Campus, Kirtipur  
in Partial Fulfilment for Master's Degree in Education  
(Specilization in English Language Education)**

**By  
Deepak Prasad Jamkatel  
M.Ed. (Second Year)**

**Faculty of Education  
Tribhuvan University  
Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal  
2008**

**T.U. Reg. Number: 9-2-268-32-96**

**Campus Roll Number: 745/058**

**Exam Roll Number (2<sup>nd</sup> Year): 280135/060**

**Date Approval of the Thesis**

**Proposal: 2064/08/25**

**Date of Submission: 2064/12/3**

## **RECOMMENDATION FOR ACCEPTANCE**

This is to certify that **Mr. Deepak Prasad Jamkatel** has prepared this thesis entitled **Cohesion in Written English** under my guidance and supervision.

I recommend this thesis for acceptance.

Date:

---

**Mr. Prem Bahadur Phyak**

Lecturer,

Department of English Language Education,

Faculty of Education,

University Campus, T.U.

Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal

## RECOMMENDATION FOR EVALUATION

This thesis has been recommended for evaluation by the following Research Guidance Committee:

**Dr. Chandreshwar Mishra**

Reader and Head,  
Department of English Language Education  
Tribhuvan University

---

Chairperson

**Dr. Bal Mukunda Bhandari**

Lecturer,  
Department of English Language Education  
Tribhuvan University

---

Member

**Mr. Prem Bahadur Phyak**

Lecturer,  
Department of English Language Education  
Tribhuvan University

---

Member

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## EVALUATION AND APPROVAL

This thesis has been evaluated and approved by the following Thesis Evaluation Committee:

**Dr. Chandreshwar Mishra**

Reader and Head,  
Department of English Language Education  
Tribhuvan University

---

Chairperson

**Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi**

Professor and Chairperson,  
English and Other Foreign Language Education  
Subject Committee  
Tribhuvan University

---

Member

**Mr. Prem Bahadur Phyak**

Lecturer, (Guide)  
Department of English Language Education  
Tribhuvan University

---

Member

# DEDICATION

*I dedicate this thesis to my parents who helped me become a person that I am today.*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Mr. Prem Bahadur Phyak, Lecturer, Department of English Education, for his regular guidance, invaluable suggestions, co-operation and encouragement from the very beginning to the end of the thesis.

Likewise, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Chandreshwor Mishra, Head of the Department of English Education, for providing invaluable suggestions for this research. Thanks are also due to Prof. Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi, Prof. Dr. Shanti Basnyat, Prof. Dr. Govinda Raj Bhattarai, Prof. Dr. Tirth Raj Khaniya, Dr. Bal Mukunda Bhandari and Dr. Anjana Bhattarai for their valuable suggestions during this study. I am also grateful to Mr. Ram Ekwel Singh, Mr. Vishnu Singh Rai, Mr. Lekhnath Sharma Pathak and other teachers of the Department of English Education.

My special thanks go to my friend Mr. Anup Pyakurel for his help. Similarly, thanks go to my wife Mrs. Kabita Jamkatel who inspired me to complete this thesis. I would also like to thank my daughter Ms. Dilasha Jamkatel, brother Mr. Uddab Prasad Jamkatel and daughter-in-law Ms. Sita Jamkatel for their support during this period. Finally, I should also express my thanks to Mr. Rajesh Dongol, *My Computer Service*, Lainchaur, Kathmandu for attractive computer type setting.

**Deepak Prasad Jamkatel**

## ABSTRACT

This study entitled 'Cohesion in written English' attempts to find out frequency of cohesive devices in written English of higher secondary level students. To accomplish the objectives of the study the researcher collected data from the students of higher secondary level in Kathmandu valley. The sample size of the study consisted of 45 students who were selected using random sampling procedure. Only essay type of questions were used to find out cohesion in written English. The finding of the study shows that the students were more better in reflective essay than other two essays.

Moreover, the frequency of 'Pronouns' was the highest one; frequency of 'additive words' was the second highest, and frequency of 'demonstratives' was the third highest. Similarly, the students of all the three higher secondary schools were in the first position in writing reflective essay. The students of all the three schools were in the second position in writing argumentative essay. And the students of all the three schools were in the third position. The thesis consists of four chapters.

Chapter one consists of general background, review of the related literature, objectives of the study, significance of the study and definition of specific terms.

Chapter two deals with methodology. It includes sources of data, sample of the study, sampling procedure, tools for data collection, process of data collection, limitations of the study.

Chapter three consists of analysis and interpretation of the data. The analysis of data has been made in terms of students' performance, use of cohesive device and transitional expression, higher secondary school, and essay description. Various statistical tools such as mean, percentage were used for comparative and analytical study.

Chapter four deals with the findings and recommendations of the study which were drawn on the basis of analysis and interpretations. Also, this chapter follows references and appendices.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page number</u>
Recommendation for Acceptance	i
Recommendation for Evaluation	ii
Evaluation and Approval	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Abstract	vi
Table of Contents	vii
List of Tables	x
Abbreviations	xii
<b>CHAPTER-ONE : INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1-12</b>
1.1 General Background	1
1.1.1 Definition of Writing	1
1.1.2 Stages of Writing Skill	2
1.1.3 The Essential Characteristics of Good Writing	4
1.1.4 Cohesion in Writing	5
1.1.5 Organization	8
1.1.6 Importance of Cohesion in Writing	10
1.2 Review of Related Literature	11
1.3 Objectives of the Study	11
1.4 Significance of the Study	12
1.5 Definition of Specific Terms	12
<b>CHAPTER-TWO : METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>13-15</b>
2.1 Sources of Data	13
2.1.1 Primary Source of Data	13
2.1.2 Secondary Sources of Data	13
2.2 Sample of the Study	13
2.3 Sampling Procedure	13
2.4 Tools for Data Collection	14
2.5 Process of Data Collection	14

2.6	Limitations of the Study	15
<b>CHAPTER-THREE : ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION</b>		<b>16-51</b>
3.1.	Holistic Description of Cohesion in Written English	16
3.2	Students' Performance-wise Description	17
3.2.1	Jitpur Higher Secondary School (JHSS) in Argumentative Essay	17
3.2.2	Youth Vision College (YVC) in argumentative essay	19
3.2.3	Global College of Management (GCM) in argumentative essay	20
3.2.4	Jitpur Higher Secondary School (JHSS) in expository essay	21
3.2.5	Youth Vision College (YVC) in Expository Essay	22
3.2.6	Global College of Management (GCM) in Expository Essay	23
3.2.7	Jitpur Higher Secondary School (JHSS) in Reflective Essay	25
3.2.8	Youth Vision College (YVC) in Reflective Essay	26
3.2.9	Global College of Management (GCM) in Reflective Essay	27
3.3	Use of Transitional Mark and Cohesive Device-wise Description	28
3.3.1	Argumentative Essay	28
3.3.2	Expository Essay	30
3.3.3	Reflective Essay	33
3.3.4	Argumentative, Expository and Reflective Essay	35
3.4	Higher secondary school-wise and Essay-wise Description	37
3.3.1	Argumentative Essay of JHSS	37
3.4.2	Argumentative Essay of YVC	38
3.4.3	Argumentative Essay of GCM	39
3.4.4	Expository Essay of JHSS	41
3.4.5	Expository Essay of YVC	42
3.4.6	Expository essay of GCM	43
3.4.7	Reflective Essay of JHSS	45
3.4.8	Reflective Essay of YVC	46
3.4.9	Reflective Essay of GCM	47
3.4.10	Argumentative, expository and reflective essays	49

<b>CHAPTER-FOUR : FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>52-53</b>
4.1 Findings	52
4.1.1 Types of Cohesive Devices	52
4.1.2 Cohesive Device and Transitional Mark-wise Findings	52
4.1.3 Students' Performance-wise Findings	52
4.1.4 Higher Secondary school Performance-wise Findings	52
4.1.5 Essay-wise Findings	53
4.2 Recommendations	53
References	54
Appendix-1	55
Appendix-2	

## LIST OF TABLES

	<b>Page number</b>
Table number 1 : Sample Population of the Study	13
Table number 2 : Description of the Research Tools	14
Table number 3 : Comparative Study of Marking Done in Three Essays in Different Areas of the Students of JHSS, YVC and GCM	16
Table number 4 : Frequency of Cohesive Devices of the Students of JHSS in Argumentative Essay	18
Table number 5 : Frequency of Cohesive Devices of the Students of YVC in Argumentative Essay	19
Table number 6 : Frequency of Cohesive Devices of the Students of GCM in Argumentative Essay	20
Table number 7 : Frequency of Cohesive Devices of the Students of JHSS in Expository Essay	21
Table number 8 : Frequency of Cohesive Devices of the Students of YVC in Expository Essay	22
Table number 9 : Frequency of Cohesive Devices of the Students of GCM in Expository Essay	24
Table number 10 : Frequency of Cohesive Devices of the Students of JHSS in Reflective Essay	25
Table number 11 : Frequency of Cohesive Devices of the Students of YVC in Reflective Essay	26
Table number 12 : Frequency of Cohesive Devices of the Students of GCM in Reflective Essay	27
Table number 13 : Comparative Study of Total Number of Cohesive Devices of Argumentative Essay in Three Different Higher secondary schools	28
Table number 14 : Comparative Study of Total Number of Cohesive Devices in Expository Essay in Three Different Higher secondary schools	31
Table number 15 : Comparative Study of Total Number of Cohesive Devices in Reflective Essay in Three Different Higher secondary schools	33

Table number 16 :	Comparative Study of Total Number of Cohesive Devices in all Three Essays of the Students of JHSS, YVC and GCM	35
Table number 17 :	Scoring on Organization of an Argumentative Essay of the Students of JHSS	37
Table number 18 :	Scoring on Organization of an Argumentative Essay of the Students of YVC	38
Table number 19 :	Scoring on Organization of an Argumentative Essay of the Students of GCM	40
Table number 20 :	Scoring on Organization of an Expository Essay of the Students of JHSS	41
Table number 21 :	Scoring on Organization of an Expository Essay of the Students of YVC	42
Table number 22 :	Scoring on Organization of an Expository Essay of the Students of GCM	44
Table number 23 :	Scoring on Organization of a Reflective Essay of the Students of JHSS	45
Table number 24 :	Scoring on Organization of a Reflective Essay of the Students of YVC	46
Table number 25 :	Scoring on Organization of a Reflective Essay of the Students of GCM	47
Table number 26 :	Comparative Study of the Students of JHSS, YVC and GCM in Three Different Essays	49

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

F.M.	Full Marks
G. Total	Grand Total
GCM	Global College of Management
i.e.	That is
JHSS	Jitpur Higher Secondary School
O.M.	Obtained Marks
S.N.	Serial Number
YVC	Youth Vision College

# CHAPTER-ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 General Background

A language consists of four major skills: reading, listening, speaking, and writing. Among them writing is an important skill to express oneself in a particular language. It is a productive skill, which needs proper handling of the mechanics to make it sensible. Moreover, writing is an activity by which we communicate with one another and transmit our culture, ideas and experiences from one generation to another. It provides us the chance to acquire others' ideas, feelings and thoughts in a proper way. Writing skills thus can also be considered as the output of listening, speaking and reading.

Writing is an important skill especially for students. It is also a difficult skill to acquire, particularly in the context of Nepal. It needs a great effort, sufficient practice and tedious technicalities. Cohesion is hence one of the components to measure the writing proficiency that plays a vital role in effecting writing. Teaching and learning programs mostly rest upon the writing proficiency of the students. Writing is also a means through which we can obtain knowledge and experiences of others as well as spread our knowledge and experience to others.

Thus, writing is an act of transmitting thoughts, feelings and ideas from the past to the present and from the present to the future. It is like a transparent mirror which can present our literary knowledge as well as experiences. Writing, for this reason, needs cohesion and coherence, connectedness and appropriate transitions to make it more communicative.

#### 1.1.1 Definition of Writing

Generally the term 'writing' has been defined variously by different writers. Richards et al. (1985:101) state that "written language is primarily transactional or message-oriented. The goal of written language is to convey information accurately, effectively and appropriately." To quote Harmer (1991:114), "cohesion in writing refers to the activity that involves not only the ordering of sentences, but also the use of cohesive devices (i.e. language that is used to join sentences together)." Similarly, Arnold (1970:340) opines

that writings have something to say and say it as clearly as you can. That is the only secret of style. We can, therefore, say that students who learn the English language cannot be perfect without good writing skills. They can learn to express their ideas explicitly when they are efficient in writing. Harmer (1991) points out that the importance of writing is further gauged by the fact that writing is used:

- ) to interact with a person or people who can not be reached easily by verbal communication,
- ) to promote thoughts for clearer and more reliable communication.
- ) to express our ideas more clearly and convincingly.
- ) to record texts for documentation, and
- ) to make such texts accessible to many people.

### 1.1.2 Stages of Writing Skill

According to Rivers (1968:70), there are three important stages of writing. The first stage is 'manipulation' of the shapes or the graphic marks. The writer, in this stage, simply manipulates the shapes or the phonological items or spoken words in its written form. The second stage of writing is 'structuring' in which the learner learns the spellings of words, syntactic rules of structuring words, sentences, paragraphs and texts. The third stage is the 'semantic stage'. This is the highest level in the process of writing. In this stage, the learner learns not only the mechanics of writing and rules of structuring but also standard and meaningful sentences. The learner has to learn to write correct sentences, be able to design, classify and organize a description to relate the subject matter. However, Rivers (1968:45) states that "To be able to write in the foreign language, the students must be trained systematically throughout the five stages of development: copying, reproduction, recombination, guided writing and composition." These are explained as:

**i) Copying:** This stage is also called the stage of transcription. In this stage, the learner becomes familiar with many aspects of language. Discussing the significance of this stage in learning writing skills, Rivers (1968:49) emphasizes that "as the student is copying s/he should repeat to, what s/he is writing. In this way, s/he deepens the impression in his/her mind of the sounds, the symbols represented, and s/he has further repetition practice of basic dialogue or pattern sentences. After s/he has had some

practice in copying accurately, with correct diacritical and punctuation marks, s/he may continue to copy as an aid to memorization." When a learner continues the copying activities, s/he learns the scripts of the target language, the orthographic rules and syntactic rules thoroughly. Learners are encouraged if they are given credit in this early of age of copying.

**ii) Reproduction:** In the reproduction stage, the learner attempts to write without originality what s/he has always learned orally. If the learner has successfully been trained to be accurate during the copying stage, s/he will be able to practise different aspects of language relating to the reproduction stage.

**iii) Recombination:** In this stage, the learner combines the learnt skills in drills. It is a more appropriate way because the learner rebuilds on former experiences and ideas. In this stage, it is necessary to manipulate grammatical structure and to have a sound knowledge of ideas. The learners can apply the substitution words, phrases or sentences by expanding them more explicitly. The way of dictating is also a very fruitful method for recombining ideas. Learners can approach this with the help of a dialogue, narration and conversation. It is better if, at the end of dictation, certain time is allowed for rechecking the writing.

**iv) Guided writing:** The stage of guided writing is a more developed stage than the earlier ones. The learners in this stage are given some freedom in the selection of lexical items and structural patterns, but they have to follow the given suggestions regarding the content.

The learners are given different types of exercises such as completion, replacement, expansion or summarizing the stories or elaborating some topics. In such a situation, the individual ideas can partly be included. Similarly, the learners can expand simple sentences by adding or modifying words or phrases. Students may supply the skeleton or a story or dialogue or an outline given for a description or narration for the development of writing. But s/he, in this stage, is not semantically free because s/he should follow the guided frame. An example of this is the students of higher secondary school being frequently provided guided exercises. They are asked to develop their ideas and imagination with the help of guided words or phrases.

**v) Composition:** Writing composition is a complex activity requiring a variety of skills. It involves the production and arrangement of written sentences in a manner appropriate to the purposes of the writer. The learner therefore has already to know how to select the appropriate vocabulary and structure to express his/her ideas in a meaningful way. So, every learner can show his/her individual attitudes or ideas freely. Furthermore, s/he can expose his/her sound knowledge to others. Hence, s/he should be encouraged from time to time so that his/her creativity develops. Thus, if a learner is carefully guided through all these stages, s/he can hope to master the necessary writing skills.

### **1.1.3 The essential characteristics of good writing**

Writing is an art of using language, but it is a very complex task to write clearly and explicitly. In this context, Richards et. al. (1985:7) state "learning to write in either the first or second language is one of the most difficult tasks." Moreover, correct and effective writing using logical sentence structures is the most desired thing. Additionally, simplicity and directness are the most useful properties of good writing. In fact, making a simple and clear writing is difficult from the syntactic and semantic point of views. This is because it requires good imagination and logical sequence of thoughts. Thus, Richards et. al. (1985) rightly points out the essential characteristics of good writing. These are:

**i) Economy:** A good writer can express his/her ideas or thoughts briefly and effectively. S/he does this through economy of words or minimization of words to express meaning clearly and quickly. A short but effective writing can be popular for every reader because it saves time, energy and materials. Also, the writing should be direct, definite and exact so that it can be understood easily. In writing, the more there is economy of words, the less there are the chances of occurrence of faults. Good writing is like a gold coin, small in size but great in value. That is why economy of words without loss of meaning is one of the best qualities of good writing.

**ii) Simplicity:** The second quality of a good writing is reduction of the complexities and expression of ideas or thoughts in a natural way; this has the effect of avoiding extra stylistic words, genres, jargons, and other ambiguous words. Simplicity and smoothness make writing understandable and readable because they do not hinder the readers' understanding of the texts.

**iii) Clarity:** Good writing should not add complications but should be clear. The writing must be unambiguous and the explicit. It must not bewilder and confuse the readers but present the information in a clear, orderly, readable and understandable manner. The writer should have a clear idea of what to say, how to sequence, what is said and also how to express what is said. In addition, good writing should avoid exaggeration and self-contradictory statements.

**iv) Continuity:** Continuity of thought and ideas is an important feature in writing. Continuity of thought should flow from one word to the next, from one phrase to the next, from one sentence to another, from one paragraph to another and from one chapter to the next. This concept of continuity of thoughts is based on the natural linkage of ideas. A certain standard should be maintained from the beginning to the end for this to be possible.

**v) Free from Errors:** Because writing is a permanent record of one's thoughts or ideas, it must be accurate. In other words, every written piece has to be free from lexical, syntactic, semantic, and grammatical errors. Besides that, good writing must have examples and illustrations to explain abstract and difficult ideas and new information. There should be appropriate facts, figures and depth of knowledge, specificity, and maximum objectivity in every piece of writing for its effectiveness. Writing therefore involves thinking, planning, assembling, classifying and organizing. Thus, ability to write good or effective English is not a God-given gift to a few people. Writing, in fact, is based upon one's own mental capability.

#### **1.1.4 Cohesion in writing**

Cohesion refers to grammatical and lexical relationship between the different elements of a text. This is the relationship between different sentences or between parts of a sentence. Halliday and Hasan (1985) define the term cohesion "as the relationship, which links the meaning of utterances in a discourse or of the sentences in a text. These links may be based on the speakers' shared knowledge." Labov and David (1977) state that- "cohesion is a part of system of a language. The potential for cohesion lies in the systematic discourses of reference, ellipsis and so on that are built into language itself". Likewise, Mishra (2005) defines cohesion as "grammatically and lexically sticking words, sentences, and paragraphs together logically."

### 1.1.4.1 Cohesive Devices

Cohesive devices help us to bring a flow in writing. It helps us to join one word to next, one phrase to another. Similarly, it works as a glue to join one clause to next, and one sentence to other. It not only makes a cohesion between sentences but it also sticks one paragraph to next. Therefore, Halliday and Hasan (1996) have identified the following cohesive devices:

**i) Reference:** A common way of linking sentences is through back references by using the pronouns like 'it', 'this', 'he/she' and so on. Pronouns and demonstratives are the most common reference words in English. Mishra (2005) exemplifies as: a) Three blind mice, three blind mice see now they run! see now they run! (b) Doctor Foster went to Gloucester in a shower of rain. He stepped in puddle right up to his middle and never went there again. (c) There were two wrens upon a tree, another came and there were three'. In "(a)" 'they' refer to three blind mice; in "(b)" 'there' refers to Gloucester; and in "(c)" 'another' refers to wrens.

**ii) Conjunction:** The following words are used to cohere the parts of sentences: 'and', 'since', 'however', 'in addition to', 'moreover', 'furthermore', 'similarly', 'likewise', 'in a similar way', 'in contrary', 'hence', 'thus' and so on. For example: a) John had been missing for five weeks. (b) the eldest son worked in the farm, the second son worked in the black smith's shop, but the youngest son left home to see his fortune.

**iii) Substitution:** Sometimes a word phrase substitutes an earlier item in the text in order to avoid repetition. For example: (a) my axe is too blunt, I must get a sharper one. (b) You think John already knows? I think everybody does.

**iv) Ellipsis:** Substitution and ellipsis are very similar to each other. Ellipsis is simply substitution by zero. Although substitution and ellipsis embody the same fundamental relation between parts of a text (a relation between words or groups or clauses as distinct from reference, which is relation between meanings); they are two different kinds of structural mechanisms and hence show rather different patterns. For example: (a) hardly anyone left the country before the war, (b) And how many hours a day did you do lessons? Said Alice, in a hurry to change the subject. 'Ten hours the first day' said the mock Turtle 'nine the next and so on!

v) **Lexical cohesion:** The repetition of words and phrases or the careful choice of synonyms can create unity in a piece of writing to complete the picture of cohesion.

Jordan (1990) has pointed out the following cohesive devices:

**A) Pronouns:** Pronouns refer back to nouns or other pronouns and therefore link sentences together. The pronouns like 'it', 'this', 'he/she', 'they' and so on link sentences together.

**B) Repetition of key words and phrases:** It refers to deliberately repeating a key word, related words, or Phrases to weave together the ideas within one or more paragraphs. The repeated words or phrases should be related to the main idea of the text.

**C) Transitional expressions:** It refers to the expressions to indicate a connection between ideas. Transitional expressions can be used in a wide variety. Some of these words and word groups are:

i) **Additive words:** Also, and, as well as, at the same time, as, besides, equally important, further, furthermore, in addition, likewise, moreover, too, not only ..... but also are some of the additive words to make a text coherent.

ii) **Amplifications words:** As, for example, for instance, in fact, specifically, such as, that is, to illustrate are some of the amplification words to make a text coherent.

iii) **Repetitive words:** Again, in other words, that is, to repeat are also some of the repetitive words to make a text coherent.

iv) **Contrast words:** The words but, conversely, despite, even though, however, in contrast, not withstanding, on the one hand/ on the other hand, still, although, though, whereas, yet, nevertheless, on the contrary, in spite of this are contrast words.

v) **Cause and effect words:** The words accordingly, as a result, because, consequently, for this reason, since, as, so, then, therefore, thus are also some of the words that show cause and effect.

vi) **Qualifying words:** The words although, if, even, therefore, unless are some of the qualifying words.

**vii) Emphasizing words:** The words above all, more / most importantly and significantly are emphasizing words.

**viii) Order words:** Afterwards, at the same time, before, firstly / secondly, formerly, lastly, finally, later, meanwhile, next, now, presently, today / yesterday/ last week / next year, subsequently, then, until, ultimately, while, historically, in the end, and eventually are also some of the words that keep sentences orderly.

**ix) Reason words:** For this reason, owing to this, therefore are some of the reason words.

**x) Example :** For example, for instance are some of the example words.

**xi) Explanation:** In other words, that is to say are some of the words that give explanation.

**xii) Attitude:** Naturally, of course, certainly, strangely, enough, oddly enough, luckily, fortunately, unfortunately, admittedly, undoubtedly are also the words that show writer's attitude and make a writing coherent.

**xiii) Summary:** Finally, in conclusion, in short, to sum up are some of the words that are used to summarize a text.

**D) Parallel Structures:** When a sentence pattern or other grammatical structure is deliberately back and forth to create a kind of linkage is known to be parallel structure. It suggests similarity of meaning among the repeated elements and thus helps tie them together. It can be appeared throughout the text. A good writing has tense to tense, voice to voice and other such parallel structures.

**E) Old/new information:** English is a language with subject-verb-object word order. English is most readable when sentences begin with a subject that refers back to some 'old information' in the previous sentence and end with a predicate that provides some 'new information'

### **1.1.5 Organization**

When one writes any composition, whether guided or free, s/he should define or introduce the topics of subject matter with a clear view. Then, s/he can elaborate his/her view on the text developing the main phrases, clauses, sentences and paragraphs. The

paragraphs should be divided with different ideas or stages of the subject matter. Then s/he should justify statements and illustrate the topic with suitable examples. Finally, s/he can conclude all his/her ideas or thoughts in a single paragraph. The following points, therefore, always help to organize any composition on articles:

- ) Introductory part of the text,
- ) Ideas on the text,
- ) Developing the phrase, clause, sentence and paragraph,
- ) Paragraph division
- ) Justifying the statements, illustrating the topics and
- ) Concluding the paragraphs.

Therefore, we can discuss some of the free writing text, for instance, three types of essays such as an argumentative essay, reflective essay and expository essay. They are:

#### **a. Argumentative essay**

Argumentative essay refers to the refutation of opposing views with evidence. Refutation comes elsewhere in the argument, after the introduction or throughout the body. The choice depends mainly on where one thinks the readers need the opposition to be dealt with right away or can wait. A writer, therefore, should be skilled in putting his points strongly. Flower et al. (1997: 155) have discussed the following organization of writing an argumentative essay.

**i) Introduction:** It involves statement of the significance of the argument, background on the issue, and statement of thesis. The introduction may be one or more paragraphs, depending on the complexity of the issue, reader's knowledge about it and the length of the whole paper.

**ii) Body:** It involves assertions relating to the thesis, each developed in one or more paragraphs with evidences. If the argument consists of a string of supporting assertions, they are usually best arranged in order of increasing importance or persuasiveness. Sometimes the body of the argument will break into distinct sections, such as description of a problem, proposal for solving the problem, and the advantage of the proposal.

**iii) Answering the opposition:** It refers to the refutation of opposing views with evidence. Refutation comes elsewhere in the argument, after the introduction or

throughout the body. The choice depends mainly on where one thinks the readers need the opposition to be dealt with right away or can wait.

**iv) Conclusion:** It means restatement of the thesis, summary of the argument, or the last appeal to readers. It may be of one or more paragraphs, depending on the complexity and the length of the argument.

### **b. Reflective essays**

A reflective essay is one in which, from the nature of the subject set, the writer is called upon to express his thoughts on some subject of a general or abstract nature. It is, therefore, quite distinct from a narrative or a descriptive essay which deals with some person, object, or event that is necessarily concrete. The title for such essays may be: true friendship, punctuality, discipline, courage, contentment, politeness, character, good manner, honesty, kindness, charity, and co-operation.

### **c. Expository essays**

An expository essay is one in which, from the nature of the subject set, the writer is called upon to explain or expound something. Being concerned with facts rather than thoughts, with results rather than opinions, an expository essay is of a less abstract character than a reflective one, or deals with a reflective subject in a less abstract way. The titles of expository essays, for instance, may be: electricity, the cinema, the triumphs of science, modern advertisements, holidays, sports and games, town life, books.

### **1.1.6 Importance of cohesion in writing**

In order to analyze a discourse, or any kind of writing, it is necessary to consider the grammatical and semantic aspects of language. Grammatical forms which are used to link sentences and create cohesion can be of several kinds such as: logical connectors such as 'and', 'but', conjuncts such as 'also', 'equally', 'furthermore', contracts such as 'instead' and similarly 'for', 'thus', substitutes for noun such as pronoun forms 'he' or 'she', 'they' 'one'; ellipsis, where some parts of a sentence are deleted; deixis, where one item points forward or backwards to what is being said or what has been said before. Deictic elements such as 'here', 'there', also indicate other references and are thus important in creating cohesion in writing.

## **1.2 Review of the Related Literature**

A few researches have been carried out on cohesion in writing as well as reading.

Masatosi (1984) conducted a research entitled "On the text forming connectives in English" His study showed that various adverbials, which can function as connectives and play an important role in text forming, are not the only expressions which comprise the category of connectives but also the linkage words as a whole.

Irwin (1986) carried out a research on cohesion in reading comprehension. His study shows how matured readers make use of cohesion in text. It also shows that increasing number of cohesive ties can improve readers' comprehension.

Sharma (2003) carried out a research on cohesion in written discourse of B. Ed. students and found that the students performed more exactly and appropriately in a given context than a free context.

Paudel (2005) studied cohesion in English writing of B.Ed. first year students and found that B.Ed. students are better in receptive ability than productive ability to establish cohesion in writing.

Paudel (2006) carried out a research on students ability to establish cohesion in reading and found that the students were very good in producing cohesion in reading.

The present study, differs from the previous studies. The researcher has attempted to analyze the frequency of cohesive devices in free writing to detect whether students are proficient enough to link their ideas together from sentence to sentence and from paragraph to paragraph.

## **1.3 Objectives of the study**

This study had the following objectives:

1. To find out the types and frequency of cohesive devices used in writing.
2. To analyze the performance of frequency of cohesive devices in writing.
3. To suggest some pedagogical implications of the study.

#### **1.4 Significance of the study**

This study is useful to those who are involved in professional or academic writing. This study is equally useful to students and teachers who are teaching/learning writing courses. Similarly, prospective researchers find this study helpful. This study contributes to teaching as it shows how to write properly to those who want to acquire writing skill.

#### **1.5 Definition of Specific Terms**

This study has included some specific terms which has been defined as follows:

Argumentative essay:	It refers to the topic "Pros and Cons of Television"
Cohesiveness:	It refers to the flow in writing that link one word to next, one sentence to other and one idea to other.
Demonstratives:	It refers back to nouns or other pronouns and therefore link sentences together. For instance: this, that, these, those etc.
Economy:	It refers to words that is used to in writing which avoids repeated and redundant words.
Expository essay:	It refers to the topic" The most Interesting Event in Your Life"
Organization:	It refers to the way of writing that the students has used in essay writing. It includes the ideas in the text that they have put logically.
Pronouns:	It refers back to nouns or other pronouns and therefore link sentences together in the text. For instance: it, he, she, they, this etc.
Reflective essay:	It refers to the topic" Discipline" that has been given to the students for essay writing.
Simplicity:	It refers to writing as a whole that seems to be simple and plausible.
Transitional marks:	It refers to connecting words and phrases to join ideas and sentences that are necessary to link clearly and smoothly.

## **CHAPTER-TWO**

### **METHODOLOGY**

Methodology is very important in carrying out any research work. This chapter deals with the sources of data, processes of data collection and the limitations of the study that the researcher applied.

#### **2.1 Sources of Data**

This study was carried out on the basis of both primary and secondary sources of data.

##### **2.1.1 Primary Sources of Data**

The primary sources of data were the students of grade XII studying in three different higher secondary school in Kathmandu valley.

##### **2.1.2 Secondary Sources of Data**

Apart from the primary sources, the researcher studied various books, journals reports, articles and other theses submitted to the department of English Language Education, T.U., mainly Paudel (2005), Sharma (2003) and the books; Halliday and Hassan (1996), Mishra (2005), and Bhattarai (2005) were also taken as secondary sources of data.

#### **2.2 Sample of the Study**

The sample of the study consisted of 45 students of Grade XII of three different higher secondary schools in Kathmandu valley.

#### **2.3 Sampling Procedure**

For this study, the researcher randomly selected forty-five students from three higher secondary schools using purposive sampling procedure. The sample size has been shown in the table below:

**Table number 1: Sample of the study**

<b>Higher secondary schools</b>	<b>Students</b>
JHSS	15
Y.V.S	15
GCM	15
Total Population	45

## 2.4 Tools for Data Collection

The researcher used a test which included essay type of questions on argumentative essay, reflective essay and expository essay on topics like: "Pros and Cons of Television" "The most exciting event in your life", and "Discipline". (Appendix-1)

i. The following table shows the description of research tools.

**Table number 2: Description of the Research Tools**

S.N.	Assessing Quality for Cohesion	Mode of Items	F.M.
1.	Introductory part of the text	Subjective	3
2.	Ideas on the text	Subjective	3
3.	Developing the phrase, clause, sentence and paragraph	Subjective	3
4.	Paragraph division	Subjective	3
5.	Justifying the statements, illustrating the topics	Subjective	3
6.	Appropriateness of transitional marks	Subjective	3
7.	Concluding paragraphs	Subjective	3
8.	Economy	Subjective	3
9.	Simplicity	Subjective	3
10.	Cohesiveness	Subjective	3

## 2.5 Process of Data Collection

After preparing the test for the students for data collection, the researcher visited the selected higher secondary schools and explained the purpose of his visit to the authorities of higher secondary schools. He went to classroom introduced himself and explained his purpose, and administered the test. Instructions were clearly explained for each types of essay writing and no individual treatment was given to the students. He provided only one hour for each type of essay. The students had to write each essay in about 150-200 words. Most of them finished within the given time. After taking the exam, the researcher counted the cohesive devices on the basis of their types such as pronouns, demonstratives, additive words, amplification words, repetitive words, contrast words, cause and effect words, qualifying words, reason words, example words, attitude words and summary words.

After that, he separated the types of cohesive devices and the types of transitional expressions. Later on, he assigned marks for organization of writing as a whole to check cohesion in writing. For that he assigned 3 marks for each areas. There were 10 areas such as 'introductory part of the text'; 'ideas on the text'; 'developing the phrase, clause, sentence and paragraph'; 'paragraph division'; 'justifying sentences and illustrating the topics'; 'appropriateness of using transitional marks'; 'concluding paragraphs'; 'economy'; 'simplicity'; and 'cohesiveness' in total.

## **2.6 Limitations of the Study**

The study had following limitations:

- a. The study was limited to three higher secondary schools of Kathmandu valley.
- b. Only forty-five students were included as sample of this study.
- c. The primary data for this study was collected only from written text.
- d. The data of the research was based on three kinds of essays-argumentative essay, expository essay and reflective essay.

## CHAPTER-THREE

### ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter is concerned with the analysis and interpretation of data obtained from students. For this research work, the researcher selected three topics of essay writing for argumentative, reflective and expository essays respectively. He administered containing test three different essays and calculated total scores achieved by students. Here, the researcher used different statistical tools, namely percentage and mean to analyze and interpret data.

The researcher analyzed data in terms of the following variables:

- (a) students' performance
- (b) use of transitional mark and cohesive device
- (c) higher secondary school performance
- (d) Types of essay

#### 3.1 Holistic description of cohesive devices

Forty five students of Grade XII of three higher secondary schools in Kathmandu valley were used to obtain the information. The description is presented below.

**Table number 3: Comparative Study of the Students of JHSS, YVC and GCM in three different essays.**

Higher secondary school	JHSS	YVC	GCM	G. Total Percentage
Essays	% of Marking done	% of marking done	% of marking done	
Argumentative	44.44	44.55	44.66	<b>44.55%</b>
Reflective	44.33	44.0	46.11	<b>44.81%</b>
Expository	45.77	43.77	42.88	<b>44.14%</b>
<b>G. Total</b>	<b>44.84%</b>	<b>44.10%</b>	<b>44.55%</b>	<b>44.50%</b>

The above table shows a comparative study in 'marking done' in cohesion in written English of three different higher secondary schools. The students of JHSS obtained

44.44% marks in argumentative essay, 44.33% of marks in reflective essay, and 45.77% of marks in expository essay. Likewise, the students of YVC obtained 44.55% of marks in argumentative essay, 44.0% of marks in reflective essay, and 43.77% of marks in expository essay. Beside that,, the students of GCM obtained 44.66% of marks in argumentative essay, 46.11.% of marks on reflective essay, 42.88% of marks in expository essay. Also, all the students of JHSS obtained 44.84% of marks in three essays as a whole. The students of GCM obtained 44.55% of marks. And the students of YVC obtained 44.10% of marks.

Thus, the students of JHSS were better in expository essay than in argumentative and reflective essay. However, the students of YVC were better in argumentative essay than reflective and expository essay. The students of GCM were much better in reflective essay than in argumentative and expository essay. In conclusion, the students of JHSS in argumentative, reflective and expository essays, as a whole, were better than the students of YVC and GCM. Again, the students of GCM in argumentative, reflective and expository essays, as a whole, were better than the students of YVC.

### **3.2 Students' performance-wise description**

To find out performance of the students, the researcher divided 12 different cohesive devices such as pronouns, demonstratives, additive words. Also, he divided cohesive devices such as amplification words, repetitive words, contrast words and cause and effect words. Besides, he divided qualifying words, reason words, example words, attitude words, summary words.

#### **3.2.1 Jitpur Higher Secondary School (JHSS) in argumentative essay.**

The fifteen students of this higher secondary school were given the same topics to write essays and on the basis of their writing the researcher found out the following cohesive devices. The description is given below:

**Table number 4 : Frequency of Cohesive devices of students of JHSS in argumentative essay**

S.N.	Cohesive devices	Pronouns	Demonstratives	Additive Words	Amplification words	Repetitive words	Contrast Words	Cause and effect words	Qualifying words	Reason words	Example words	Attitude words	Summary words	Total
	Name of the students													
1.	Ram Nepali	13	8	10	4	2	6	2	2	3	1	1	1	53
2.	Sashi Lamichhane	10	7	9	3	1	5	2	2	2	1	-	1	43
3.	Sachhi Ghimire	11	6	10	3	-	4	1	1	2	-	-	1	39
4.	Dashrath Ghimire	9	6	6	2	1	4	1	-	1	-	-	-	30
5.	Puskar Tiwari	10	7	5	2	2	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	32
6.	Sakar Aryal	12	9	7	1	-	6	-	-	2	-	-	-	37
7.	Ravi Tamang	10	3	8	-	1	3	2	-	2	-	-	-	29
8.	Santoki Shrestha	11	3	3	-	-	2	1	1	1	-	-	-	22
9.	Geeta Dhakal	9	4	3	-	2	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	21
10.	Shobha Ghimire	7	5	4	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	20
11.	Ranju Dahal	8	4	8	2	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	25
12.	Bhawani Jamkatel	8	3	7	1	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	23
13.	Harisaran Poudel	10	6	4	-	2	2	1	1	3	-	-	-	29
14.	Ramchandra Dhungana	11	9	6	-	-	4	1	1	2	-	-	-	34
15.	Pabita Pariyar	12	8	8	-	-	3	2	-	1	-	-	-	34
	<b>G. Total</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>471</b>

The above table shows the total number of cohesive devices of students of JHSS in argumentative essay. They used 151 pronouns, 88 demonstratives, 98 additive words. Besides that, they also used 19 amplification words, 11 repetitive words, 51 contrast words. Also they used 13 cause and effect words, 8 qualifying words, 26 reason words, 2 example words, 1 attitude word, and 3 summary words. Therefore, the occurrence of the highest number of cohesive device was 'pronouns', and it was 151. The lowest number of cohesive device was 'additive words' and it was only 1. Similarly, according to student-wise comparison, the highest number of total cohesive device was 53, and it was used by one student and the lowest number of total cohesive device was 20 and it was also used by only one student. The total number of cohesive devices used by all the fifteen students was 471.

### 3.2.2 Youth Vision College (YVC) in argumentative essay

The fifteen students of this higher secondary school were given the same topic of argumentative essay to find out the use of cohesive devices. The description is presented below.

**Table number 5: Frequency of cohesive devices of students of YVC in argumentative essay**

S.N.	Cohesive devices Name of the students	Pronouns	Demonstratives	Additive Words	Amplification words	Repetitive words	Contrast Words	Cause and effect words	Qualifying words	Reason words	Example words	Attitude words	Summary words	Total
1.	Bhuwan Thapa	15	13	8	2	2	8	2	3	2	-	-	1	56
2.	Sushil Thapa	10	8	9	1	1	8	2	2	2	-	-	2	45
3.	Alisha Lama	8	7	10	-	-	6	1	-	4	-	-	1	37
4.	Anoj Thapalia	7	10	7	-	-	7	3	-	-	-	-	1	35
5.	Arbind K. Mahato	11	7	3	-	-	5	-	-	-	2	1	2	31
6.	Bikash Shrestha	12	10	8	2	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	1	42
7.	Pramila Khadka	6	9	3	2	-	6	-	2	1	1	-	2	32
8.	Gyanendra M. Shrestha	8	11	10	1	1	7	1	1	-	-	1	1	42
9.	Prakash Thapa	13	8	8	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	1	1	35
10.	Narayan Poudel	6	9	6	2	-	4	-	1	-	-	1	-	29
11.	Bhoj Raj Ale	7	10	7	1	-	2	-	-	1	2	-	-	30
12.	Yam Karki	9	12	3	-	-	5	-	1	-	1	-	-	31
13.	Anil Thapa	11	6	4	1	-	5	2	1	-	-	-	-	30
14.	Rita Bhattarai	14	7	4	-	-	8	-	-	2	-	-	1	36
15.	Rabin Gurung	8	8	6	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	26
	G. Total	145	135	96	12	4	86	12	11	12	6	5	13	537

The above table shows the total number of cohesive devices in argumentative essay of the students of YVC. They used 145 pronouns, 135 demonstratives, 96 additive words, and 12 amplification words. Besides using that, they also used 4 repetitive words, 86 contrast words. Also, they used 12 cause and effect words, 11 qualifying words, 12 reason words, 6 example words, 5 attitude words, and 13 summary words. The occurrence of the highest number of cohesive device was 'pronouns' and it was 145 and the lowest number of cohesive device was 'repetitive words' and it was only 4.

According to marks obtained by students, the highest number of total cohesive device was 56 and it was used by one student. The lowest number of total cohesive device was 26, and it was also used by one student. The total number of cohesive devices used by all the fifteen students was 537.

### 3.2.3 Global College of Management (GCM) in argumentative essay

Fifteen students of this higher secondary school were given the same topic of argumentative essay to find out the use of cohesive devices. The description is presented below.

**Table number 6: Frequency of cohesive devices of students of GCM in argumentative essay**

S.N.	Cohesive devices Name of the students	Pronouns	Demonstratives	Additive Words	Amplification words	Repetitive words	Contrast Words	Cause and effect words	Qualifying words	Reason words	Example words	Attitude words	Summary words	Total
1.	Alka Uprety	13	11	12	1	1	7	3	1	1	1	1	1	53
2.	Anjeela Neupane	15	10	8	2	1	6	2	1	1	1	1	2	50
3.	Arati Dhimi	10	14	6	1	2	7	2	2	2	1	1	1	49
4.	Arjun Bir Khatri	9	8	10	-	-	9	1	2	1	-	-	2	42
5.	Dipesh Chand	13	7	9	-	-	8	1	1	-	-	-	-	39
6.	Kesher Rawal	14	9	7	-	-	5	-	1	-	-	-	-	36
7.	Navaraj Basnet	8	10	10	1	-	7	-	-	-	-	1	-	37
8.	Srijana Oli	8	13	12	3	1	9	-	-	-	-	1	1	48
9.	Subash Gautam	7	14	8	2	-	8	-	-	-	-	1	2	42
10.	Poonam Thapa	6	9	6	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	31
11.	Sajal Shrestha	10	8	7	-	2	11	2	-	-	-	-	2	43
12.	Sapana Shrestha	11	10	9	1	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	1	38
13.	Ramesh Uprety	12	6	11	1	-	8	1	-	-	-	-	-	39
14.	Nishana Sharma	10	8	10	1	-	9	1	-	-	-	-	-	39
15.	Keshav Rawal	13	11	8	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	39
	<b>G. Total</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>625</b>

The above table shows the total number of cohesive devices of students of GCM in argumentative essay. All the fifteen students used 159 pronouns, 148 demonstratives, 133 additive words, and 13 amplification words. Besides these, they used 7 repetitive

words, 117 contrast words and, 13 cause and effect words. Also, they used 8 qualifying words, 5 reason words, 4 example words, 6 attitude words, and 12 summary words. Thus, the occurrence of the highest number of cohesive device was 'pronouns' and it was 159. The lowest number of cohesive device was 'example words' and it was only 4. According to student-wise comparison, the highest number of total cohesive device was 53 and it was used by one student. The lowest number of total cohesive device was 31. It was also used by one student. The total number of cohesive devices used by all the fifteen students was 625.

### 3.2.4 Jitpur Higher Secondary School (JHSS) in expository essay

Fifteen students of this higher secondary school were given the same topic of expository essay to find out the use of cohesive devices. The detail description is presented below.

**Table number 7: Frequency of cohesive devices of the students of JHSS in expository essay**

S.N.	Cohesive devices Name of the students	Pronouns	Demonstratives	Additive Words	Amplification words	Repetitive words	Contrast Words	Cause and effect words	Qualifying words	Reason words	Example words	Attitude words	Summary words	Total
1.	Ram Nepali	10	3	8	3	8	4	2	1	1	2	2	1	45
2.	Sashi Lamichhane	8	4	7	2	9	3	1	2	1	2	2	1	42
3.	Sachhi Ghimire	10	6	6	1	10	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	42
4.	Dashrath Ghimire	9	5	6	-	10	1	-	1	1	1	4	-	38
5.	Puskar Tiwari	8	2	7	-	6	-	-	-	1	1	3	-	28
6.	Sakar Aryal	3	1	3	-	3	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	14
7.	Ravi Tamang	2	3	8	-	4	-	-	-	-	3	4	-	24
8.	Santoki Shrestha	4	4	6	1	7	-	2	1	-	1	2	1	29
9.	Geeta Dhakal	6	1	7	-	8	-	-	1	1	2	3	-	29
10.	Shobha Ghimire	7	3	4	-	6	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	22
11.	Ranju Dahal	6	6	3	2	7	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	27
12.	Bhawani Jamkatel	5	7	1	-	8	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	24
13.	Harisaran Poudel	6	2	2	-	9	-	3	-	-	2	2	-	26

14.	Ramchandra Dhungana	7	4	4	1	10	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	29
15.	Pabita Pariyar	6	2	4	-	6	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	20
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>439</b>

The above table shows the total number of cohesive devices of the students of JHSS in expository essay. The total fifteen students used 97 pronouns, 53 demonstrative, 76 additive words, 10 amplification words, and 111 repetitive words. Besides that, they also used 11 contrast words, 11 cause and effect words, 8 qualifying words, and 9 reason words. Also, they used 20 example words, 29 attitude words, and 4 summary words. Hence, the occurrence of the highest number of cohesive device was 'repetitive words' and it was 111. And the lowest number of cohesive device was 'summary words' and it was only 4. According to student-wise comparison, the highest number of total cohesive devices was 45 and it was used by one student. The lowest number of total cohesive devices was 14 and it was also used by one student. Moreover, the total number of cohesive devices used by the fifteen students was 439.

### 3.2.5 Youth Vision College (YVC) in expository essay

Fifteen students of this higher secondary school were given the same topic of expository essay to find out the use of cohesive devices. The description is presented below.

**Table number 8: Frequency of cohesive devices of the students of YVC in expository essay**

S.N.	Cohesive devices Name of the students	Pronouns	Demonstratives	Additive Words	Amplification words	Repetitive words	Contrast Words	Cause and effect words	Qualifying words	Reason words	Example words	Attitude words	Summary words	Total
2.	Sushil Thapa	10	4	8	2	5	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	39
3.	Alisha Lama	7	3	4	1	7	1	1	1	-	1	3	1	30
4.	Anoj Thapalia	5	6	3	4	4	1	1	-	-	1	2	2	29
5.	Arbind K. Mahato	7	3	2	-	5	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	20
6.	Bikash Shrestha	8	4	6	-	6	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	28
7.	Pramila Khadka	7	3	7	1	6	2	-	2	1	1	2	-	32

8.	Gyanendra M. Shrestha	8	4	5	-	6	1	1	1	2	1	3	1	33
9.	Prakash Thapa	9	5	3	-	7	2	-	2	1	1	4	-	34
10.	Narayan Poudel	6	6	4	-	5	1	-	1	1	2	3	-	29
11.	Broj Raj Ale	10	5	6	1	8	3	-	-	-	2	2	-	37
12.	Yam Kumari Karki	6	4	5	2	6	1	-	-	-	2	2	-	28
13.	Anil Thapa	7	3	6	-	3	-	1	-	-	1	2	1	24
14.	Rita Bhattarai	8	4	4	-	4	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	23
15.	Rabin Gurung	5	5	3	-	6	-	-	-	-	2	3	-	24
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>447</b>

The above table shows the total number of cohesive devices of the students of YVC in expository essay. The fifteen students used 111 pronouns, 61 demonstratives, 73 additive words, and 14 amplification words. Similarly, they used 84 repetitive words, 17 contrast words, 7 cause and effect words, and 11 qualifying words. Also, they used 8 reason words, 21 example words, 32 attitude words, and 8 summary words. Hence, the occurrence of the highest number of cohesive device was 'pronouns' and it was 111. And the lowest number of cohesive device was 'cause and effect words', and it was only 7. According to student-wise comparison, the highest number of total cohesive devices was 39. It was used by one student. The lowest number of total cohesive device was 20. It was also used by one student. The total number of cohesive devices used by all the fifteen students was 447.

### 3.2.6 Global College of Management (GCM) in expository essay

Fifteen students of this higher secondary school were given the same topics of expository essay to find out use of cohesive devices. The description is presented below.

**Table number 9: Frequency of cohesive devices of the students of GCM in expository essay**

S.N.	Cohesive devices Name of the students	Pronouns	Demonstratives	Additive Words	Amplification words	Repetitive words	Contrast Words	Cause and effect words	Qualifying words	Reason words	Example words	Attitude words	Summary words	Total
2.	Anjeela Neupane	7	4	8	2	4	1	2	2	1	2	3	1	37
3.	Arati Dhama	5	6	4	1	3	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	28
4.	Arjun Bir Khatri	7	3	2	2	2	-	-	-	1	2	2	2	23
5.	Dipesh Chand	10	4	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	23
6.	Kesher Rawal	8	3	6	-	6	-	-	-	-	2	3	1	30
7.	Navaraj Basnet	8	5	5	-	2	1		-	-	1	1	1	25
8.	Srijana Oli	7	5	3	1	3	2		-	-	1	1	1	24
9.	Subash Gautam	6	3	3	-	4	1		-	1	1	1	2	22
10.	Poonam Thapa	6	4	5	-	5	-	1---	-	-	2	2	2	26
11.	Sajal Shrestha	9	6	7	1	3	-	-	-	-	3	3	-	32
12.	Sapana Shrestha	8	3	3	-	2	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	21
13.	Ramesh Uprety	7	4	4	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	19
14.	Nishana Sharma	5	5	3	1	3	-	-	1	-	2	1	-	21
15.	Keshav Rawal	6	4	4	-	5	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	23
	<b>G. Total</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>387</b>

The above table shows the total number of cohesive devices of the students of GCM in expository essay. The fifteen students used 107 pronouns, 61 demonstratives, 67 additive words, and 10 amplification words. Besides that, they used 52 repetitive words, 10 contrast words, 7 cause and effect words, and 6 qualifying words. Likewise, they used 7 reason words, 22 example words, 24 attitude words, and 14 summary words. Therefore, the occurrence of the highest number of cohesive device was 'pronouns' and it was 107. The lowest number of cohesive device was 'qualifying words' and it was only 6. Similarly, on the basis of student-wise comparison, the highest number of total cohesive device was 37. It was used by one student. The lowest number of total cohesive device was 19 and it was also used by only one student. The total number of cohesive devices used by all the fifteen students was 387.

### 3.2.7 Jitpur Higher Secondary School (JHSS) in Reflective Essay

Fifteen students of this higher secondary school were given the same topic to find the use of cohesive devices. The description is presented below.

**Table number 10: Frequency of cohesive devices of the students of JHSS in reflective essay**

S.N.	Cohesive devices Name of the students	Pronouns	Demonstratives	Additive Words	Amplification words	Repetitive words	Contrast Words	Cause and effect words	Qualifying words	Reason words	Example words	Attitude words	Summary words	Total
1.	Ram Nepali	10	4	8	2	4	2	1	1	1	1	4	1	39
2.	Sashi Lamichhane	11	2	7	2	5	1	1	2	2	1	5	1	40
3.	Sachhi Ghimire	6	6	4	1	3	1	2	1	1	2	3	-	30
4.	Dashrath Ghimire	5	3	2	2	2	1	1	-	1	2	2	-	21
5.	Puskar Tiwari	8	3	3	-	3	-	-	-	2	-	6	2	27
6.	Sakar Aryal	9	4	6	-	6	-	-	-	2	-	4	1	32
7.	Ravi Tamang	10	5	5	1	2	-	-	1	1	-	3	1	29
8.	Santoki Shrestha	5	5	7	-	4	-	2	-	-	-	2	2	27
9.	Geeta Dhakal	8	3	3	-	5	1	-	-	2	-	2	1	25
10.	Shobha Ghimire	11	4	4	2	3	-	-	-	2	-	5	1	32
11.	Ranju Dahal	6	6	3	-	2	-	1	2	1	1	4	-	26
12.	Bhawani Jamkatel	5	4	4	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	3	1	20
13.	Harisaran Poudel	7	3	6	1	3	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	22
14.	Ramchandra Dhugana	4	5	4	-	5	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	21
15.	Patita Pariyar	4	4	5	-	4	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	21
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>412</b>

The above table shows the total number cohesive devices of the students JHSS in reflective essay. The fifteen students used 109 pronouns, 61 demonstratives, 71 additive words, and 11 amplification words. Besides that, they also used 53 repetitive words, 9 contrast words, 8 cause and effect words, and 7 qualifying words. Also, they used 17 reason words, 7 example words, 48 attitude words, and 11 summary words. Thus, the

occurrence of the highest number of cohesive device was 'pronouns' and it was 109. The lowest number of cohesive device was 'qualifying' and 'example words'. And it was only 7. On the basis of student-wise comparison the highest number of total cohesive device was 40. It was used by one student. The lowest number of total cohesive device was 21 but it was used by three students. Similarly, the total number of cohesive devices used by the fifteen students was 412.

### 3.2.8 Youth Vision College (YVC) in reflective essay

Fifteen students of this higher secondary school were given the same topic of reflective essay to find out the use of cohesive. The description is presented below.

**Table number 11: Frequency of cohesive devices of the students of YVC in reflective essay**

S.N.	Cohesive devices Name of the students	Pronouns	Demonstratives	Additive Words	Amplification words	Repetitive words	Contrast Words	Cause and effect words	Qualifying words	Reason words	Example words	Attitude words	Summary words	Total
2.	Sushil Thapa	9	6	8	2	5	1	1	2	1	1	5	1	42
3.	Alisha Lama	5	3	4	1	4	2	2	1	2	1	4	1	30
4.	Anoj Thapalia	6	2	2	2	2	2	-	-	1	2	2	1	22
5.	Arbind K. Mahato	11	4	3	-	3	-	-	-	1	-	3	-	25
6.	Bikash Shrestha	10	5	6	-	6	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	29
7.	Pramila Khadka	8	5	5	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	4	-	25
8.	Gyanendra M. Shrestha	5	3	7	1	5	1	-	2	2	-	3	-	29
9.	Prakash Thapa	11	4	3	-	4	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	27
10.	Narayan Poudel	6	3	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	19
11.	Broj Raj Ale	5	6	4	-	4	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	23
12.	Yam Kumari Karki	7	4	7	1	5	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	28
13.	Anil Thapa	4	2	6	-	2	-	1	-	1	1	5	-	22
14.	Rita Bhattarai	5	3	4	-	3	-	-	-	1	-	3	1	20
15.	Rabin Gurung	3	6	5	-	6	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	23
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>398</b>

The above table shows the total number of cohesive devices of the students of YVC in reflective essay. All the students YVC used 103 pronouns, 60 demonstratives, 74

additive words, and 9 amplification words. Similarly, they used 57 repetitive words, 8 contrast words, 6 cause and effect words, and 9 qualifying words. Besides using that, they also used 14 reason words, 7 example words, 45 attitude words, and 6 summary words. Hence, the occurrence of the highest number of cohesive device was 'pronouns' and it was 103. And the lowest number of cohesive device was 'cause and effect words' and 'summary words'. It was only 6. The highest number of total cohesive device was 43 and it was used by one student. The lowest number of total cohesive device was 19, and it was also used by one student. Similarly, the total number of cohesive devices used by fifteen students was 398.

### 3.2.9 Global College of Management (GCM) in reflective essay

Fifteen students of this higher secondary school were given the same to find out the use of cohesive. The description is presented below.

**Table number 12: Frequency of cohesive devices of the students of GCM in reflective essay**

S.N.	Cohesive devices Name of the students	Pronouns	Demonstratives	Additive Words	Amplification words	Repetitive words	Contrast Words	Cause and effect words	Qualifying words	Reason words	Example words	Attitude words	Summary words	Total
1.	Alka Uprety	6	6	8	2	2	2	1	-	1	1	2	1	32
2.	Anjeela Neupane	11	4	7	1	4	1	1	-	1	1	5	1	37
3.	Arati Dharmi	9	3	4	1	5	1	2	1	2	1	4	1	34
4.	Arjun Bir Khatri	5	2	2	-	3	-	1	2	-	-	3	-	18
5.	Dipesh Chand	8	5	3	-	6	-	-	1	-	-	4	-	27
6.	Keshar Rawal	5	9	6	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	23
7.	Navaraj Basnet	6	10	5	-	5	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	30
8.	Srijana Oli	11	4	4	-	4	-	-	1	-	-	6	-	30
9.	Subash Gautam	10	3	6	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	2
10.	Poonam Thapa	9	3	5	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	25
11.	Sajal Shrestha	8	4	7	-	5	-	-	2	1	-	3	1	31
12.	Sapana Shrestha	5	3	4	-	6	-	-	-	2	-	3	-	23
13.	Ramesh Uprety	7	4	3	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	25
14.	Nishana Sharma	5	5	4	-	4	-	3	-	1	-	6	-	28
15.	Keshav Rawal	6	4	2	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	21
	<b>G. Total</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>412</b>

The above table shows the total number of cohesive devices of the students of GCM in reflective essay. All the fifteen students of GCM used 111 pronouns, 659 demonstratives, 70 additive words, and 5 amplification words. Besides that, they also used 65 repetitive words, 4 contrast words, 8 cause and effect words, and 8 qualifying words. Also, they used 8 reason words, 3 example words, 57 attitude words, and 4 summary words. Thus, the occurrence of the highest number of cohesive device was 'pronouns' and it was 111. The lowest number of cohesive devices was 'example words' and it was only 3. Moreover, on the basis of student-wise comparison, the highest number of total used cohesive device was 37 and it was used by one student. The lowest number of total used cohesive device was 18 and it was also used by one student. Similarly, the total number of cohesive device used by fifteen students was 412.

### **3.3 Use of Transitional Mark, Cohesive Device-wise and Higher secondary school-wise Description**

Three higher secondary schools were used to obtain this information. Cohesive device and higher secondary school-wise description is presented below:

#### **3.3.1 Argumentative essay**

Forty-five total students of JHSS, YVC and GCM were given the same topic of argumentative essay. And a comparative study among cohesive devices was made. The description is presented below.

**Table number 13: Comparative Study of Total number of Cohesive Devices of Argumentative Essay in Three Different Higher secondary schools**

<b>Schools</b>	<b>JHSS</b>	<b>YVC</b>	<b>GCM</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Cohesive devices in numbers</b>				
Pronouns	151	145	159	455
Demonstratives	88	135	148	371
Additive words	98	96	133	327
Amplification words	19	12	13	44
Repetitive words	11	4	7	22
Contrast words	51	86	117	254
Cause and effect words	13	12	13	38

Qualifying words	8	11	18	27
Reason words	26	12	5	43
Example words	2	6	4	12
Attitude words	1	5	6	12
Summary words	3	13	12	28
<b>G. Total</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>537</b>	<b>625</b>	<b>1633</b>

The mean of cohesive devices of the students of JHSS in argumentative essay.

Number of frequency of cohesive devices (N) =12

Total Number ( $\phi X$ ) = 471

$$\text{Mean } (\bar{X}) = \frac{\phi X}{N} = \frac{471}{12} = 39.25$$

The mean value ( $\bar{X}$ ) of cohesive devices of the students of JHSS out of number of frequency of cohesive device (N) 12, and total number ( $\phi X$ ) 471, was 39.25.]

The mean of cohesive devices of the students of YVC in argumentative essay.

Number of frequency of cohesive devices (N) = 12

Total Number ( $\phi X$ ) = 537

$$\text{Mean } (\bar{X}) = \frac{\phi X}{N} = \frac{537}{12} = 44.75$$

The mean value of cohesive devices of the students of YVC out of number of frequency of cohesive devices (N) 12, and total number ( $\phi X$ ) 537 was 44.75.]

The mean of cohesive devices of the students of GCM in argumentative essay.

Number of frequency of cohesive device (N) = 12

Total Number ( $\phi X$ ) = 625

$$\text{Mean } (\bar{X}) = \frac{\phi X}{N} = \frac{625}{12} = 52.08$$

The mean value ( $\bar{X}$ ) of cohesive devices of the students of GCM out of number of frequency of cohesive devices (N) 12, and total number ( $\phi X$ ) 625, was 52.08.]

The above table shows a comparative study of cohesive devices of all the students of JHSS, YVC and GCM in argumentative essay. All fifteen students of JHSS used 151 pronouns, 88 demonstratives, 98 additive words, and 19 amplification words. Apart from that, they also used 11 repetitive words, 51 contrast words, 13 cause and effect words, and 8 qualifying words. Also, they used 26 reason words, 2 example words, 1 attitude word, and 3 summary words. Similarly, all fifteen students of YVC used 145 pronouns,

135 demonstratives, 96 additive words, and 12 amplification words. Besides that, they also used 4 repetitive words, 86 contrast words, 12 cause and effect words, and 11 qualifying words. Also, they used 12 reason words, 6 example words, 5 attitude words, and 13 summary words. Likewise, all fifteen students of GCM used 159 pronouns, 148 demonstratives, 133 additive words, and 13 amplification words. Besides that, they also used 7 repetitive words, 117 contrast words, 13 cause and effect words, and 18 qualifying words. Also, they used 5 reason words, 4 example words, 6 attitude words, 12 summary words.

Above all, all forty-five students from JHSS, YVC and GCM used 455 pronouns, 371 demonstratives, 327 additive words, and 44 amplification words. Besides that, they also used 22 repetitive words, 254 contrast words, 38 cause and effect words, and 27 qualifying words. Also, they used 43 reasons, 12 example words, 12 attitude words, and 28 summary words.

Moreover, the students of JHSS used 471 cohesive devices. The mean value of JHSS was 39.25, whereas the students of YVC used 537 cohesive devices and the mean value of YVC was 44.75. Similarly, the students of GCM used 625 number of cohesive devices, and the mean value of GCM was 52.08. All the students of three higher secondary schools totally used 1633 cohesive devices. The students of GCM used more cohesive devices than the students of YVC and JHSS. Likewise, the students of YVC used more cohesive devices than the students of JHSS. In the similar way, the students of GCM used 117 contrast words, the students of YVC used 86 contrast words, and the students of JHSS used 51 contrast words. The use of contrast words made argumentative essay more cohesive. Therefore, the students of GCM used more contrast words than the students of JHSS and YVC. Thus, the students of GCM were better in argumentative essay than the students of JHSS and YVC.

### **3.3.2 Expository essay**

Forty-five total students of JHSS, YVC and GCM were given the same topic of expository essay. And a comparative study among cohesive devices was made. The description is presented below:

**Table number 14: Comparative study of total number of cohesive devices in expository essay in three different higher secondary schools.**

S.N.	Schools	JHSS	YVC	GCM	Total
	<b>Cohesive devices in numbers</b>				
1.	Pronouns	97	111	107	315
2.	Demonstrative	53	61	61	175
3.	Additive words	76	73	67	216
4.	Amplification words	10	14	10	34
5.	Repetitive words	111	84	52	247
6.	Contrast words	11	17	10	38
7.	Cause and effect words	11	7	7	25
8.	Qualifying words	8	11	6	25
9.	Reason words	9	8	7	24
10.	Example words	20	21	22	63
11.	Attitude words	29	32	24	85
12.	Summary words	4	8	14	26
	<b>G. Total</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>447</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>1273</b>

The mean of cohesive devices of the students of JHSS in expository essay

Number of frequency of cohesive devices (N) =12

Total Number ( $\phi X$ ) = 439

$$\text{Mean } (\bar{X}) = \frac{\phi X}{N} = \frac{439}{12} = 36.85$$

The mean value ( $\bar{X}$ ) of cohesive devices of the students of JHSS, out of number of frequency of cohesive devices (N) 12, and total no ( $\phi X$ ) 439, was 36.85.

The mean of cohesive devices of the students of YVC in expository essay

Number of frequency of cohesive devices (N) = 12

Total Number ( $\phi X$ ) = 537

$$\text{Mean } (\bar{X}) = \frac{\phi X}{N} = \frac{447}{12} = 37.25$$

The mean value ( $\bar{X}$ ) of cohesive devices of the students of YVC out of number of frequency of cohesive devices (N) 12, and total number ( $\phi X$ ) 537, was 37.25.]

The mean of cohesive devices of the students of GCM in expository essay

Number of frequency of cohesive device (N) = 12

Total Number ( $\phi X$ ) = 387

$$\text{Mean } (\bar{X}) = \frac{\phi X}{N} = \frac{625}{12} = 29.75$$

The mean value ( $\bar{X}$ ) of cohesive devices of the students of GCM, out of number of frequency of cohesive devices (N) 12, and total number ( $\phi X$ ) 387, was 29.75.]

The above table shows a comparative study of cohesive devices used by all the students of JHSS, YVC and GCM. All fifteen students of JHSS in expository essay used 97 pronouns, 53 demonstratives, 76 additive words, and 10 amplification words. Besides, they used 111 repetitive words, 11 contrast words, 11 cause and effect words, and 8 qualifying words. Also, they used 9 reason words, 20 example words, and 29 attitude words, 4 summary words. Similarly, all fifteen students of YVC used 111 pronouns, 61 demonstratives, 73 additive words, and 14 amplification words. Also, they used 84 repetitive words, 17 contrast words, 7 cause and effect words, and 11 qualifying words. Besides using that, they also used 8 reason words, 21 example words, 32 attitude words, and 8 summary words. Likewise, all fifteen students of GCM used 107 pronouns, 61 demonstratives, 67 additive words, and 10 amplification words. Besides using that, they also used 52 repetitive words, 10 contrast words, 7 cause and effect words, and 6 qualifying words. Also, they used 7 reason words, 22 example words, 24 attitude words, and 14 summary words.

Additionally, all forty five students from JHSS, YVC and GCM used 315 pronouns, 175 demonstratives, 216 additive words, and 34 amplification words. Besides using that, they also used 247 repetitive words, 38 contrast words, and 25 cause and effect words. Also, they used 25 qualifying words, 24 reason words, 63 example words, 85 attitude words, and 26 summary words.

Hence, the students of YVC totally used 447 cohesive devices.. The mean value of it was 37.25. Similarly, the students of JHSS totally used 439 cohesive devices and the mean value of it was 36.58. Besides that, the students of GCM totally used 387 cohesive

devices and the mean value of it was 29.75. All the students of three higher secondary schools totally used 1273 cohesive devices. The students of YVC used more cohesive devices than the students of JHSS and GCM Likewise, the students of JHSS used more cohesive devices than the students of GCM in expository essay.

### 3.3.3 Reflective essay

Forty-five total students of JHSS, YVC and GCM were given the same topic of expository essay. And a comparative study among cohesive devices was made. The description is presented below.

**Table number 15: Comparative Study of cohesive devices in reflective essay in three different higher secondary schools.**

S.N.	Cohesive devices in numbers	Schools			Total
		JHSS	YVC	GCM	
1.	Pronouns	109	103	111	323
2.	Demonstrative	61	60	69	190
3.	Additive words	71	74	70	215
4.	Amplification words	11	9	5	25
5.	Repetitive words	53	57	65	175
6.	Contrast words	9	8	4	21
7.	Cause and effect words	8	6	8	22
8.	Qualifying words	7	9	8	24
9.	Reason words	17	14	8	39
10.	Example words	7	7	3	17
11.	Attitude words	48	45	57	150
12.	Summary words	11	6	4	21
	<b>G. Total</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>1222</b>

The mean of cohesive devices of the students of JHSS in reflective essay

Number of frequency of cohesive devices (N) = 12

Total Number ( $\phi X$ ) = 412

$$\text{Mean } (\bar{X}) = \frac{\phi X}{N} = \frac{412}{12} = 34.33$$

The mean value ( $\bar{X}$ ) of cohesive devices of the students of JHSS, out of number of frequency of cohesive devices (N) 12, and total no ( $\phi X$ ) 412, was 34.33.]

The mean of cohesive devices of the students of YVC in reflective essay

Number of frequency of cohesive devices (N) = 12

Total number ( $\phi X$ ) = 398

$$\text{Mean } (\bar{X}) \frac{\phi X}{N} = \frac{398}{12} = 33.16$$

The mean value ( $\bar{X}$ ) of cohesive devices of the students of YVC, out of number of frequency of cohesive devices (N) 12, and total no ( $\phi X$ ) 398, was 33.16.]

The mean of the cohesive devices of the students of GCM in reflective essay

Number of frequency of cohesive devices (N) = 12

Total number ( $\phi X$ ) = 412

$$\text{Mean } (\bar{X}) \frac{\phi X}{N} = \frac{412}{12} = 34.33$$

The mean value ( $\bar{X}$ ) of cohesive devices of the students of YVC, out of number of frequency of cohesive devices (N)12, and total number of ( $\phi X$ ) 412, was 34.33.]

The above table shows a comparative study of cohesive devices of all the students of JHSS, YVC and GCM in reflective essay. All fifteen students of JHSS in reflective essay used 109 pronouns, 61 demonstratives, 71 additive words, and 11 amplification words. Besides that, they also used 53 repetitive words, 9 contrast words, 8 cause and effect words, and 7 qualifying words. Also, they used 17 reason words, 7 example words, 48 attitude words, and 11 summary words. Likewise, all fifteen students of YVC used 103 pronouns, 60 demonstratives, 74 additive words, and 9 amplification words. Besides using that, they also used 57 repetitive words, 8 contrast words, 6 cause and effect words, and 9 qualifying words. Also, they used 14 reason words, 7 example words, 45 attitude words, and 6 summary words. Similarly, all fifteen students of GCM used 111 pronouns, 69 demonstratives, 70 additive words, and 5 amplification words. Besides, they also used 65 repetitive words, 4 contrast words, 8 cause and effect words, and 8 qualifying words. Also, they used 8 reason words, 3 example words, 57 attitude words, and 4 summary words.

Furthermore, all forty five students from JHSS, YVC and GCM used 323 pronouns. They used 190 demonstratives, 215 additive words, 25 amplification words, and 175 repetitive words. Also, they used 21 contrast words, 22 cause and effect words, 24 qualifying words, and 39 reason words. Apart from that, they also used 17 example words, 150 attitude words, and 21 summary words. In this way, the students of GCM and JHSS used same number of cohesive devices that was 412. The mean value of students of both the higher secondary schools was 34.33. Whereas, the number of cohesive devices used by students of YVC was 398 and the mean value of it was 33.16. The total number of cohesive devices used by students of three higher secondary schools was 1222. The number of cohesive devices used by the students of JHSS and GCM was exactly the same. And the number of cohesive devices used by YVC was also nearly the same with JHSS and GCM in reflective essay.

### 3.3.4 Argumentative, expository and reflective essays

Forty-five total students of JHSS, YVC and GCM were given the same topic in argumentative, expository and reflective essays. To find our use of cohesive devices. The description is presented below.

**Table number 16 : Comparative study of total number of cohesive devices in all three essays of the students of JHSS, YVC and GCM**

S.N.	Schools	JHSS	YVC	GCM	Total
	<b>Cohesive devices in numbers</b>				
1.	Pronouns	357	359	377	1093
2.	Demonstratives	202	256	278	736
3.	Additive words	245	243	270	758
4.	Amplification words	40	35	28	103
5.	Repetitive words	175	145	124	444
6.	Contrast words	71	111	131	313
7.	Cause and effect words	32	25	28	85
8.	Qualifying words	23	31	22	76
9.	Reason words	52	34	20	106
10.	Example words	29	34	29	92

11.	Attitude words	78	82	87	247
12.	Summary words	18	27	30	75
	<b>G. Total</b>	<b>1322</b>	<b>1382</b>	<b>1424</b>	<b>4128</b>

The above table shows a comparative study of cohesive devices of all students of JHSS, Y.V.C and GCM in three essays. The fifteen students of JHSS used 357 pronouns, 202 demonstratives, 245 additive words, and 40 amplification words. Besides using that, they also used 175 repetitive words, 71 contrast words, 32 cause and effect words, and 23 qualifying words. Also, they used 52 reason words, 29 example words, 78 attitude words, and 18 summary words. Similarly, the students of YVC used 359 pronouns, 256 demonstratives, 243 additive words, and 35 amplification words. Besides that, they also used 145 repetitive words, 111 contrast words, 25 cause and effect words, and 31 qualifying words. Also, they used 34 reason words, 34 example words, 82 attitude words, and 27 summary words. Moreover, the students of GCM used 377 pronouns, 278 demonstratives, 270 attitude words, and 28 amplification words. Similarly, they used 124 repetitive words, 131 contrast words, 28 cause and effect words, 22 qualifying words. Besides, they used 20 reason words, 29 example words, 87 attitude words, and 30 summary words.

Furthermore, the total number of forty-five students of three higher secondary schools used 1093 pronouns. They used 736 demonstratives, 758 additive words, 103 amplification words, and 444 repetitive words. Besides that, also used 313 contrast words, 85 cause and effect words, 76 qualifying words, and 106 reason words. Also, they used 92 example words, 247 attitude words, and 75 summary words.

In this way, the students of GCM used more cohesive devices than students of YVC and JHSS, whereas the students of YVC used more cohesive devices than the students of JHSS. However, total number of cohesive devices of all the students of JHSS, YVC, and GCM was almost the same. Therefore, it was found that the written English of all the students of these three higher secondary schools was cohesive because they used cohesive devices such as pronouns, demonstratives, additive words, and amplification words. Similarly, they also used repetitive words, contrast words, cause and effect words, and qualifying words. Also, they used reason words, example words, attitude words and summary words in a proper way. Hence, their writing was cohesive.

### 3.4 Higher secondary school-wise and Essay-wise Description.

The researcher divided ten different areas to check whether students' writing was cohesive or not. The ten areas were 'introductory part of the text, 'ideas on the text'; developing the phrases, clauses, sentences and paragraph. Also, he divided areas in 'paragraph division', 'justifying the statement and illustrating the topics' and 'appropriateness of using transitional marks. Besides these, he also divided areas in 'Concluding paragraph, 'economy, 'simplicity and cohesiveness'. Similarly, he gave full marks 3 for each area and calculated by the 15 students.

#### 3.4.1 Argumentative essay of JHSS

Fifteen students of JHSS were given the same topic of argumentative essay. Ten different areas were given and 3 marks for each area was allocated. The description is presented below:

**Table number 17: Scoring on the organization of an argumentative essay of the students of JHSS**

S.N.	Areas Name of Students	Introductory part of the text	Ideas on the text	Developing the phrase, clause, sentences and paragraph	Paragraph division	Justifying the statement and illustrating the topics	Appropriateness of using transitional marks	concluding paragraph	Economy	Simplicity	Cohesiveness
1.	Ram Nepali	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2
2.	Sashi Lamichhane	2	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5
3.	Sachhi Ghimire	1.5	2	2	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5
4.	Dashrath Ghimire	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1	2	1	1.5
5.	Puskar Tiwari	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.5
6.	Sakar Aryal	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1	1	1.5	1
7.	Ravi Tamang	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	2	2	1	1.5	1.5	1
8.	Santoki Shrestha	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1	1	1.5	1	1.5
9.	Geeta Dhakal	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1	1.5	1	1	1
10.	Shobha Ghimire	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1	1.5	1
11.	Ranju Dahal	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1

12.	Bhawani Jamkatel	1	1.5	1	2	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5
13.	Harisaran Poudel	1	1	1	1.5	2	1	1	2	1	1.5
14.	Ramchandra Dhungana	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1
15.	Pabita Pariyar	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1
	<b>G. Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>18.5</b>	<b>19.5</b>

**Total Number = 200**

**Percentage of total scoring: 44.44%**

The above table shows area-wise scoring in the organization of an argumentative essay of students of JHSS. The total number of 15 students of the higher secondary school obtained 21 marks out of a total 45 in the area of 'introductory part of the text'. Similarly, they obtained 21.5 marks in 'ideas in the text'; 19.5 marks in 'developing phrase, clause, sentence and paragraph'. They obtained 21.5 marks in 'paragraph division'; 19.5 marks in 'justifying the statements and illustrating the topics'; 19.0 marks in 'appropriateness of using transitional marks'; 19 marks in 'concluding paragraphs'; 21.0 marks in 'economy'; 18.5 marks in 'simplicity'. And eventually, 19.5 marks in 'cohesiveness'. Similarly, they obtained total 200.0 marks out of a total 450. Hence, the 15 students of JHSS in argumentative essay got 44.44% of marks.

### 3.4.2 Argumentative essay

Fifteen students of YVC were given the same topic of argumentative essay. Ten different areas were given and 3 marks for each area was allocated. The description is presented below.

**Table number 18: Scoring on organization of an argumentative essay of the students of YVC**

S.N.	Areas Name of Students	Introductory part of the text	Ideas on the text	Developing the phrase, clause, sentences and paragraph	Paragraph division	Justifying the statement and illustrating the topics	Appropriateness of using transitional marks	Concluding paragraph	Economy	Simplicity	Cohesiveness
1.	Bhuwan Thapa	2	1.5	2	2	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	2	2
2.	Sushil Thapa	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1	2	2

3.	Alisha Lama	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1.5
4.	Anoj Thapalia	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1.5
5.	Arbind K. Mahato	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1	1
6.	Bikash Shrestha	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1	1	1
7.	Pramila Khadka	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1	1	1.5	1	1.5
8.	Gyanendra M. Shrestha	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1.5
9.	Prakash Thapa	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1
10.	Narayan Poudel	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1	1
11.	Broj Raj Ale	1.5	1.5	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
12.	Yam Kumari Karki	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
13.	Anil Thapa	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5
14.	Rita Bhattarai	1	1	1.5	1	1.5	2	1.5	1.5	2	1
15.	Rabin Gurung	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
	<b>G. Total</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>18.5</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>20.5</b>

**Total Number = 200.5**

**Percentage of scoring: 44.55%**

The above table shows the area-wise scoring in organization of an argumentative essay of students of YVC. The 15 students of the higher secondary school obtained 22.5 marks out of total 45 in the area of 'introductory part of the text'. Similarly, they obtained 21.5 marks in 'ideas on the text'; 20 marks on 'developing the phrase, clause, sentence and paragraph'; 20 marks on 'paragraph division'. Likewise, they got 19 marks on 'justifying the statements and illustrating the topics'; 18.5 marks on 'appropriateness of using transitional marks'; 19.5 marks on 'concluding paragraphs'; 19 marks on 'economy'; 20 marks on 'simplicity', and 20.5 marks on 'cohesiveness' out of 45. They obtained total 200.5 marks out of 450. Thus, the 15 students of YVC in argumentative essay got 44.55 %.

### **3.4.3 Argumentative essay of GCM**

Fifteen students of GCM were given the same topic of argumentative essay. Ten different areas were given and 3 marks for each area was allocated. The description is presented below.

**Table number 19: Scoring in organization of an argumentative essay of the students of GCM**

S.N.	Areas		Introductory part of the text	Ideas on the text	Developing the phrase, clause, sentences and paragraph	Paragraph division	Justifying the statement and illustrating the topics	Appropriateness of using transitional marks	Concluding paragraph	Economy	Simplicity	Cohesiveness
	Name of Students											
1.	Alka Uprety		2.0	2	2	2.0	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2
2.	Anjeela Neupane		1.5	1.5	1.5	1	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	2
3.	Arati Dhama		2	1.5	2	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
4.	Arjun Bir Khatri		1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	2	1	1.5	1	1.5
5.	Dipesh Chand		1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1	1.5	1.5
6.	Keshar Rawal		1	1.5	1	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1	1
7.	Navaraj Basnet		2	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1
8.	Srijana Oli		1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
9.	Subash Gautam		1	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1	1	1.5
10.	Poonam Thapa		1.5	1	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1	1	1
11.	Sajal Shrestha		1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1.5	1
12.	Sapana Shrestha		1.5	1.5	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1
13.	Ramesh Uprety		1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1	1	1	1.5
14.	Nishana Sharma		1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1.5
15.	Keshav Rawal		1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1
	<b>G. Total</b>		<b>22.5</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>18.5</b>	<b>18.5</b>	<b>20.5</b>

**Total Number = 201**

**Percentage of total scoring: 44.66%**

The above Table shows area-wise scoring in organization of an argumentative essay of students of GCM. The 15 students of the higher secondary school obtained 22.5 marks out of total of 45 on the area of 'introductory part of the text'. Similarly, they secured 21 marks on 'ideas on the text'; 22.5 marks on 'developing the phrase, clause, sentence, and paragraph'; 19.5 marks on 'paragraph division'. Beside that, they got 20 marks on

'justifying the statements and illustrating the topics'; 19 marks on 'appropriateness of using transitional marks'. Likewise, they got 19 marks on 'concluding paragraph'; 18.5 marks on 'economy'; 18.5 marks on 'simplicity'; and 20.5 marks out of a total of 45 in 'cohesiveness'. They obtained total 201 marks out of a total of 450. In other words, the 15 students of GCM in argumentative essay got 44.66% of marks.

### 3.4.4 Expository essay of JHSS

Fifteen students of JHSS were given the same topic of argumentative essay. Ten different areas were given and 3 marks for each area was allocated. The description is presented below.

**Table number 20: Scoring in organization of an expository essay of the students of JHSS**

S.N.	Areas Name of Students	Introductory part of the text	Ideas on the text	Developing the phrase, clause, sentences and paragraph	Paragraph division	Justifying the statement and illustrating the topics	Appropriateness of using transitional marks	Concluding paragraph	Economy	Simplicity	Cohesiveness
1.	Ram Nepali	2	2.0	1.5	1.5	1	2.0	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
2.	Sashi Lamichhane	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
3.	Sachhi Ghimire	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1
4.	Dashrath Ghimire	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1	1.5	2	1	1.5	1.5
5.	Puskar Tiwari	2	2	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5
6.	Sakar Aryal	1.5	1.5	2	2	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
7.	Ravi Tamang	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1
8.	Santoki Shrestha	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1
9.	Geeta Dhakal	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1
10.	Shobha Ghimire	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	1
11.	Ranju Dahal	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5
12.	Bhawani Jamkatel	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1	1	1	1	1.5
13.	Harisaran Poudel	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
14.	Ramchandra Dhugana	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1

15.	Patita Pariyar	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	2	1.5	1
	<b>G. Total</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>22.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>20.5</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>19.0</b>

**Total Number = 206**

**Percentage of total scoring: 45.77%**

The above table shows the area-wise scoring on organization of an expository essay of students of JHSS. The 15 students of the higher secondary school obtained 21.5 marks out of total of 45 in the area of 'introductory part of the text'. Similarly, they got 21.5 marks on 'ideas on the text'; 22.5 marks on 'developing the phrase, clause, sentence and paragraph'; 22 marks on 'paragraph division'; 21 marks on 'justifying the statements and illustrating the topics'. In the similar way, they secured 19.5 marks on 'appropriateness of using transitional marks'; 20.5 marks on 'concluding paragraphs'; 19 marks on 'economy'; 19.5 marks on 'simplicity'; and 19 marks on 'cohesiveness' out of 45. Moreover, they obtained total 206 marks out of 450. The 15 students of JHSS in expository essay got 45.77% of marks.

### 3.4.5 Expository essay of YVC

Fifteen students of YVC were given the same topic of expository essay. Ten different areas were given and 3 marks for each area was allocated. the description is presented below.

**Table number 21: Scoring in Organization of an Expository Essay of students of YVC**

S.N.	Areas Name of Students	Introductory part of the text	Ideas on the text	Developing the phrase, clause, sentences and paragraph	Paragraph division	Justifying the statement and illustrating the topics	Appropriateness of using transitional marks	Concluding paragraph	Economy	Simplicity	Cohesiveness
1.	Bhuvan Thapa	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	2	2	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
2.	Sushil Thapa	1	1.5	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	1	1.5
3.	Alisha Lama	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1
4.	Anoj Thapalia	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5
5.	Arbind K. Mahato	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5
6.	Bikash Shrestha	1	1.5	2	1.5	2	1	1.5	1	1	1.5

7.	Pramila Khadka	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1	1	1	1	1	1
8.	Gyanendra M. Shrestha	1.5	1	1	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1
9.	Prakash Thapa	1	1	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5
10.	Narayan Poudel	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5
11.	Broj Raj Ale	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5
12.	Yam Kumari Karki	1	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1
13.	Anil Thapa	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1	1
14.	Rita Bhattarai	1	1	1	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
15.	Rabin Gurung	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.5	1.5
	<b>G. Total</b>	19.5	20.0	21.5	20.5	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5	17.5	20.0

**Total Number = 197**

**Percentage of total scoring: 43.77%**

The above table shows the area-wise scoring on organization of an expository essay of the students of YVC. The 15 students of the higher secondary school obtained 19.5 marks in a total of 45 in the area of 'introductory part of the text'. Similarly, they got 20 marks on 'ideas on the text'; 21.5 marks in 'developing the phrase, clause, sentence and paragraph'; 20.5 marks in 'paragraph division'; 19.5 marks on 'justifying the statements and illustrating topics'. Likewise, they got 19.5 on 'appropriateness of using transitional marks'; 19.5 marks on 'concluding paragraph'; 19.5 marks on 'economy'; 17.5 marks on 'simplicity'; and 20 marks on 'cohesiveness'. In fact, they obtained 197 marks out of 450. In this way, 15 students of YVC on organization of an expository essay got 43.77% of marks.

### **3.4.6 Expository essay of G.C.M.**

Fifteen students of GCM were given the same topic. Ten different areas were given and 3 marks for each area was allocated. The description is presented below:

**Table number 22: Scoring on organization an expository essay of students of GCM**

S.N.	Areas	Introductory part of the text	Ideas on the text	Developing the phrase, clause, sentences and paragraph	Paragraph division	Justifying the statement and illustrating the topics	Appropriateness of using transitional marks	concluding paragraph	Economy	Simplicity	Cohesiveness
	Name of Students										
1.	Alka Uprety	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	2	2	1.5	2	1.5
2.	Anjeela Neupane	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	1	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5
3.	Arati Dhama	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5
4.	Arjun Bir Khatri	1	1.5	1	1	11	1	11	1.5	1.5	1
5.	Dipesh Chand	1.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
6.	Kesher Rawal	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1
7.	Navaraj Basnet	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5
8.	Srijana Oli	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1	1	2	1	1.5
9.	Subash Gautam	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1	1
10.	Poonam Thapa	1	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1	1.5
11.	Sajal Shrestha	1	1.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.5	1.5
12.	Sapana Shrestha	2	1	1.5	1	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1
13.	Ramesh Uprety	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.5
14.	Nishana Sharma	1.5	1	1	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1
15.	Keshav Rawal	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1	1.5	1
	<b>G. Total</b>	<b>20.5</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>20.5</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>

**Total Number = 193**

**Percentage of total scoring: 42.88%**

The above table shows the area-wise scoring in organization of an expository essay of students of GCM. The 15 students of the higher secondary school obtained 20.5 marks on the area of 'introductory part of the text' out of 45. Similarly, they got 19 marks on 'ideas on the text'; 19.5 on 'developing the phrase, clause, sentence and paragraph'; 19 marks on 'paragraph division'; 18 marks on 'justifying the statements and illustrating the topics'. Furthermore, they got 19.5 marks on 'appropriateness of using transitional marks'; 19 marks on 'concluding paragraph'; 20.5 marks on 'economy'; 19 marks on 'simplicity'; and eventually 19 marks on 'cohesiveness' out of 45. In fact, they obtained 193 marks out of

45. Thus, the 15 students of GCM on organization of an expository essay got 42.88% marks.

### 3.4.7 Reflective essay of JHSS

Fifteen students of JHSS were given the same topic of reflective essay. Ten different areas were given and 3 marks for each area was allocated. The description is presented below.

**Table number 23: Scoring on organization of a reflective essay of the students of JHSS**

S.N.	Areas Name of Students	Introductory part of the text	Ideas on the text	Developing the phase, clause, sentences and paragraph	Paragraph division	Justifying the statement and illustrating the topics	Appropriateness of using transitional marks	Concluding paragraph	Economy	Simplicity	Cohesiveness
1.	Ram Nepali	1.5	2	2	1	2	1.5	2	2	1.5	2
2.	Sashi Lamichhane	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	2	1.5	2	1.5	1	1.5
3.	Sachhi Ghimire	2	1.5	2	1.5	1	1.5	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
4.	Dashrath Ghimire	1	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	1	2	1.5	1	1.5
5.	Puskar Tiwari	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
6.	Sakar Aryal	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1
7.	Ravi Tamang	1	1	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1
8.	Santoki Shrestha	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1	1
9.	Geeta Dhakal	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1.5
10.	Shobha Ghimire	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5
11.	Ranju Dahal	1	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	2	1	1	1
12.	Bhawani Jamkatel	1	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1.5
13.	Harisaran Poudel	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1
14.	Ramchandra Dhungana	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1	1	1.5
15.	Pabita Pariyar	1	1	1.5	1	1	1.5	1	1	1	1.5
	<b>G. Total</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>22.0</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>18.5</b>	<b>20.5</b>

**Total Number = 199.5**

**Percentage of total scoring: 44.33%**

The above table shows the area-wise scoring on organization of a reflective essay of the students of JHSS. The total number of 15 students of the higher secondary school obtained 19.0 marks on the area of 'introductory part of the text' out of 45 full marks. In the similar way, they obtained 19.5 marks on 'ideas on the text'; 21 marks on 'developing'

the phrase, clause, sentences and paragraph; 20 marks on 'paragraph division'; 20 marks on 'justifying the statements and illustrating the topics'. Likewise, they got 19.5 marks on 'appropriateness of using transitional marks'; 22 marks on 'concluding paragraph'; 19.5 marks on 'economy'; 18.5 marks on 'simplicity'; and 20.5 marks on 'cohesiveness'. They obtained 199.5 marks out of 450 full marks. The total number of 15 students of JHSS obtained 44.33% of marks on organization of a reflective essay.

### 3.4.8 Reflective essay of YVC

Fifteen students of YVC were given same topic of reflective essay. Ten different areas were given and 3 marks for each area was allocated. The description is presented below.

**Table number 24: Scoring in organization of a reflective essay of the students of YVC**

S.N.	Areas Name of Students	Introductory part of the text	Ideas on the text	Developing the phrase, clause, sentences and paragraph	Paragraph division	Justifying the statement and illustrating the topics	Appropriateness of using transitional marks	concluding paragraph	Economy	Simplicity	Cohesiveness
1.	Bhuvan Thapa	1.5	2	2.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	1	1.5
2.	Sushil Thapa	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	2	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5
3.	Alisha Lama	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	2	1	1.5	1.5
4.	Anoj Thapalia	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1	1
5.	Arbind K. Mahato	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1
6.	Bikash Shrestha	2	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5
7.	Pramila Khadka	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5
8.	Gyanendra M. Shrestha	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1	1.5	1.5
9.	Prakash Thapa	1	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	2	1.5
10.	Narayan Poudel	1.5	2	1.5	1	1	1	2	1.5	1	1
11.	Broj Raj Ale	1.5	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1	1
12.	Yam Kumari Karki	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	1
13.	Anil Thapa	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1.5
14.	Rita Bhattarai	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1	1	1
15.	Rabin Gurung	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1	1	1.5	1	1
	<b>G. Total</b>	<b>20.5</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>20.5</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>20.5</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>

**Total Number = 193**

**Percentage of total scoring: 44.0%**

The above table shows the area-wise scoring on organization of a reflective essay of the students of YVC. The 15 students of the higher secondary school obtained 20.5 marks on the area of 'introductory part of the text' out of 45 full marks. Likewise, they obtained 22.5 marks on 'ideas on the text'; 20.5 marks on 'developing the phrase, clause, sentence and paragraph'; 20 marks on 'Paragraph division'; 19 marks on 'justifying the statements and illustrating the topics'. Meanwhile, they got 19 marks on 'appropriateness of using transitional marks'; 20.5 on 'concluding paragraphs'; 19 marks on 'economy'; 18 marks on 'simplicity'; and 19 marks on 'cohesiveness'. They obtained 198 marks out of 450. The 15 students of YVC obtained 44% of marks on organization of a reflective essay.

### 3.4.9 Reflective essay of GCM

Fifteen students of GCM. were given same topic of reflective essay. Ten different areas were given and 3 marks for each area was allocated. The description is presented below.

**Table number 25: Scoring in organization of a reflective essay of the students of GCM**

S.N.	Name of Students	Introductory part of the text	Ideas on the text	Developing the phrase, clause, sentences and paragraph	Paragraph division	Justifying the statement and illustrating the topics	Appropriateness of using transitional marks	concluding paragraph	Economy	Simplicity	Cohesiveness	Total percentage
1.	Alka Uprety	1.5	2	1.5	2.0	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	15
2.	Anjeela Neupane	1.5	1.5	2	2	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	17
3.	Arati Dhama	1.5	1	1	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	13
4.	Arjun Bir Khatri	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	14
5.	Dipesh Chand	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5	1	2	1	1	1	12.5
6.	Kesher Rawal	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	13
7.	Navaraj Basnet	1.5	2	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	14.5
8.	Srijana Oli	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	1	1	1.5	1.5	13
9.	Subash Gautam	1.5	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	13.5
10.	Poonam Thapa	2	1.5	1.5	1	2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1	14.5

11.	Sajal Shrestha	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1	1	1.5	1.5	2	1	13.5
12.	Sapana Shrestha	2.0	1	1	2	2.0	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	14.5
13.	Ramesh Uprety	1	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	2	1	2	1.5	14.5
14.	Nishana Sharma	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1	1.5	1	1	1.5	13
15.	Keshav Rawal	1	1	1.5	1	1	1	2	1.5	1	1	12
	<b>G. Total</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>20.5</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>22.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>207.5</b>

**Total Number = 207.5**

**Percentage of total scoring: 46.11%**

The above table shows the area-wise scoring on organization of a reflective essay of the students of GCM. They obtained 21.5 marks out of total of 45 on the area of 'introductory part of the text'. Likewise, they obtained 21.5 marks on 'ideas on the text'; 20.5 marks on 'developing the phrase, clause, sentence and paragraph'; 21 marks on 'paragraph division'; 22 marks on 'justifying the statements and illustrating the topics'. Meanwhile, they got 19 marks on 'appropriateness of using transitional marks'; 21.5 marks on 'concluding paragraph'; 19.5 marks on 'economy'; 21.5 on 'simplicity'; 19.5 marks on 'cohesiveness'. They obtained 207.5 marks out of 450. The 15 students of GCM obtained 46.11% of marks on organization of a reflective essay.

### 3.4.10 Argumentative, expository and reflective essays

Forty-five students of JHSS, YVC and GCM were given same topic of argumentative, expository and reflective essays to find out cohesion in written English. The description is presented below:

**Table number 26: Comparative study of marking done in three essays in different areas of the students of JHSS, YVC and GCM**

Total Marking done on areas Higher secondary schools	Introductory part of the text			Ideas on the text			Developing the phase, clause, sentences and paragraphs			Paragraph division			Justifying the statement and illustrating the topics			Appropriateness of using transitional marks			Concluding paragraph			Economy			Simplicity			Cohesiveness		
	F.M.	O.M.	% of O.M.	F.M.	O.M.	% of O.M.	F.M.	O.M.	% of O.M.	F.M.	O.M.	% of O.M.	F.M.	O.M.	% of O.M.	F.M.	O.M.	% of O.M.	F.M.	O.M.	% of O.M.	F.M.	O.M.	% of O.M.	F.M.	O.M.	% of O.M.	F.M.	O.M.	% of O.M.
JHSS	135	61.5	45.55	135	62.5	46.29	135	63	46.66	135	63.5	47.03	135	60.5	44.81	135	58	42.96	135	61.5	45.55	135	60.5	44.81	135	56.5	41.85	135	59	43.70
YVC	135	62.5	46.29	135	62	45.92	135	62	45.92	135	60.5	44.81	135	57.5	42.59	135	57	42.22	135	59.5	44.07	135	57.5	42.59	135	55.5	41.11	135	59.5	44.07
GCM	135	64	47.40	135	61.5	45.55	135	62.5	46.29	135	59.5	44.07	135	60	44.44	135	57.5	42.59	135	59.5	44.96	135	58.5	43.33	135	59	43.70	135	59	43.70
<b>G. Total</b>	405	188	46.41	405	186	45.92	405	187.5	46.29	405	183.5	45.30	405	178	43.94	405	172.5	42.59	405	180.5	44.56	405	176.5	43.57	405	171	42.22	405	177.5	43.82

The above table shows a comparative study in 'marking done' in written English of the students of JHSS, YVC and GCM in three essays. The mark percentage looked almost the same in the area of 'introductory part of the text'. The students of JHSS obtained 45.55%, the students of YVC obtained 46.29%, and the students of GCM obtained higher marks i.e. 47.40%. In the area of 'ideas on the text', the students of JHSS acquired higher marks i.e. 46.29%, and the students of YVC obtained 45.92%, and the students of GCM obtained 45.55%. In the same way, the students of JHSS got higher marks of 46.66%, the students of GCM obtained 46.29% and the students of YVC obtained 45.92% in the area of 'developing the phrase, clause, sentence and paragraph'.

Besides that, in the area of 'paragraph division', the students of JHSS obtained higher 47.03% of marks, the students of YVC obtained 44.81% and the students of GCM obtained 44.07%. The students of JHSS got about 3% more marks than the students of YVC and GCM. However, the students of JHSS got 44.81%, the student of GCM obtained 44.44% and the students of YVC obtained 42.59% in the area of 'justifying the statements and illustrating the topics'. Still, the students of JHSS, Y.V.C and GCM obtained almost the same percentage of marks on the area of 'appropriateness of using transitional marks'. In that area, the students of JHSS obtained 42.96%, the students of YVC obtained 42.22%, and the students of GCM obtained 42.59%. Similarly, the students of JHSS obtained 45.55%, the students of YVC obtained 44.07%, and the students of GCM obtained 44.07% in the area of 'concluding paragraph'. In that area, the mark percentage of YVC and GCM was exactly the same.

Furthermore, in the area of 'economy', the students of JHSS obtained 44.81%, the students of GCM obtained 43.33%, and the students of YVC obtained 42.59%. In the area of 'simplicity', the students of GCM obtained higher marks of 43.70%, the students of JHSS obtained 41.85% and the students of YVC obtained 41.11%. Eventually, in the area of 'cohesiveness', the students of YVC obtained 44.07%, the students of JHSS and GCM obtained exactly the same percentage of marks i.e. 43.70%

Moreover, all the students of JHSS YVC and GCM obtained higher percentage on the area of 'introductory part of the text' i.e. 46.41%. Similarly, they obtained 46.29% in the area of 'developing the phrase, clause, sentence and paragraph'. In the area of 'ideas on the text', they obtained 45.92%. Likewise, in the area of 'paragraph division', they secured 45.30%. They got 44.56% on the area of 'concluding paragraph'. Meanwhile, they got 43.94% in the area of 'justifying the statement and illustrating the topics'. Likewise, in the area of 'cohesiveness', they obtained 43.82% of marks. They obtained 43.57% on the area of 'economy', 42.59% in the area of 'appropriateness of using transitional marks'. And, in the area of 'simplicity', all the 45 students of JHSS, YVC and GCM obtained 42.22%.

Moreover, the students of JHSS in all the ten areas obtained 44.82%. The students of GCM obtained 44.51% and the students of YVC obtained 43.95%. In this way, the data above justify that the students of JHSS were better to make cohesion in written English

because they were more acquainted with the skill of organizing essay writing than the students of GCM and YVC. However, the students of JHSS, GCM and YVC were almost the same in cohesion. To sum up, the students of all these higher secondary schools had moderate skill of cohesion in written English.

## **CHAPTER-FOUR**

### **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **4.1 Findings**

The objective of the study was to find out types of cohesive devices and performance in frequency of cohesive devices in written English. After the analysis and interpretation of the data, the researcher drew the following findings.

##### **4.1.1 Types of cohesive devices**

On the basis of total marking done in argumentative, expository and reflective essays as a whole, the performance of the students of JHSS in cohesion in written English was the highest one, therefore the students of JHSS were found to be better in making it.

##### **4.1.2 Cohesive device and Transitional Mark-wise Findings**

- i. Frequency of 'Pronouns' was the highest one.
- ii. Frequency of 'additive words' was the second highest.
- iii. Frequency of 'demonstratives' was the third highest.

##### **4.1.3 Students Performance-wise findings**

- i. Frequency of cohesive devices and transitional expressions of the students of GCM was the highest.
- ii. Frequency of cohesive devices and transitional expressions of the students of YVC was the second highest.
- iii. Frequency of cohesive devices and transitional expressions of the students of JHSS was the third highest.

##### **2.1.4 Higher secondary school Performance-wise Findings**

- i. Performance of the students of JHSS in cohesion in written English was the best one.
- ii. Performance of the students of GCM in cohesion in written English was better.

- iii. Performance of the students of YVC in cohesion in written English was good.

#### **4.1.5 Essay-wise Findings**

- i. The students of all the three higher secondary schools were in the first position in writing reflective essay.
- ii. The students of all the three higher secondary schools were in the second position in writing argumentative essay.
- iii. The students of all the three higher secondary schools were in the third position in writing expository essay.

#### **4.2 Recommendations**

On the basis of the findings above the following recommendations have been made:

- i. Though all the students of the schools used cohesive devices and transitional marks, it was not satisfactory. Rather, they had used the same type of cohesive devices and transitional expressions repeatedly, it would have been better to bring variations in such devices and expressions.
- ii. Even if all the students used more or less, cohesive devices and transitional expressions it was found out that they should improve much more things in it.
- iii. Despite all the students' performance in making cohesive writing was good, it was not adequate. They therefore should improve a great deal.
- iv. All the students wrote three types of essays to their best, however it was found that they should give equal preference on three types of essays viz: argumentative, expository and reflective.

## REFERENCES

- Arnold, M. 1970. *Mathew Arnold: Selected Prose*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Bhattarai, G.R. 2005. *A Thematic Analysis of Research Report*. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.
- Flower, R.M. et. al. (ed). 1997. *The Little, Brown Handbook*. New York: Longman
- Halliday, M. A. K. and R. Hasan 1996. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman
- Halliday, M.A.K and R. Hassan 1985. *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harmer, J. 1991. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Irwin, J. 1986. *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jordan, R.R. 1990 . *Academic Writing Course*. London: Collins.
- Labov, W. and F. David. 1977. *Therapeutic Discourse*. New York: Academic Press.
- Mastatosi, S. 1984, *On Text Forming Connectives in English*. An Unpublished B.A Thesis, Tokyo: Waseda University.
- Mishra, C. 2005 *Discourse Analysis*. Kathmandu: Nilam Publication.
- Paudel, P 2006, *Student's Ability to Establish Cohesion in Reading* . An Unpublished M. Ed. Thesis, Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University
- Paudel, R, 2005. *Cohesion in English Writing* .An Unpublished M. Ed. Thesis, Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University.
- Richards, J. et.al. 1985. *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Rivers, W.M. 1968. *Teaching Foreign Language Skills*. Chicago. New York: Chicago Press.
- Sharma, B. 2003. *A Study of Cohesion in Written Discourse*. An unpublished M. Ed. Thesis. Kathmandu: Trubhuvan University.
- Syal, P. and D.V. Jindal 2002. *An Introduction to Linguistics: Language, Grammar and Semantics*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall.
- Taylor, G. 1989. *The Student's Writing Guide for the Arts and Social Sciences*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## APPENDIX-1

### Test Item

Name: F.M.  
Higher secondary school: P.M.  
Subject: Time: 1hr.

1. Write an essay on "Pros and Cons of Television" in about 150-200 words.
2. Write an essay on "The most exciting event in your life" in about 150 - 200 words.
3. Write an essay on "Discipline" in about 150-200 words.