FINAL-YEAR ENGLISH-MAJORED STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE CONJUNCTIONS IN ESSAY WRITING AT NAM CAN THO UNIVERSITY, VIETNAM

Nguyen Hoang Phuong[i],
Luong Trong Linh
Faculty of Foreign Languages,
Nam Can Tho University,
168 Nguyen Van Cu Street,
An Binh Ward, Ninh Kieu District,
Can Tho City, Vietnam

Abstract:

Academic writing has become an indispensable part for students studying English as a foreign language at universities in Vietnam in general. This descriptive study conducted a survey of 193 final-year English-majored students at Nam Can Tho University to analyze their perceptions of the use of conjunctions in academic essay writing. The results showed that although final-year English-majored students at Nam Can Tho University are highly aware of the importance of conjunctions in academic writing, their actual use is still inconsistent and sometimes inadequate. This concludes that students have a relatively high awareness of the important role of conjunctions in writing essays, but they still encounter many difficulties in applying them in practice, though. Recommendations for future writing instruction should incorporate explicit, contextual, and visually reflective approaches to help students develop both technical accuracy and rhetorical flexibility in the use of conjunctions in their writing. Only through such comprehensive pedagogical support can learners move beyond the difficulties of using conjunctions to sophisticated, reader-aware academic discourse.

Keywords: perceptions, final-year students, English Studies, conjunctions, essay writing

1. Introduction

In today's era of increasing globalization and internationalization, English is recognized as an international language used in many fields such as communication, education, technology and commerce. Of the four language skills, writing is considered a difficult skill, especially in the academic context. Knowledge of English vocabulary and grammar is not enough to write academic content in class to express the learners' logical thoughts.

[i] Correspondence: email nhphuong@nctu.edu.vn

For academic writing, especially for final-year English majors, it is considered an indispensable skill, demonstrating their communication skills, critical thinking skills and their preparation for work and higher education. There is an important aspect that helps organize an academic text and make it a whole: cohesion in general and linking words in particular. Such words and phrases are used to establish connections between sentences and paragraphs to help make the writing more coherent. A grammatically correct essay may be structurally incorrect if conjunctions are not used effectively, making it difficult to understand or impossible to see the logical flow of the essay.

Even though conjunctions are considered to be a very important concept in academic writing, some students still find it difficult to use them correctly. Sometimes students may overuse conjunctions or misrepresent them in their writing, such as adding them where they are not needed or simply replacing one word with another (Bui, 2022). Sometimes they lack conjunctions for practical purposes, resulting in disjointed and incoherent writing that is difficult to understand. These findings provide some clues about the disconnect between what students should know theoretically and what they actually know about the function of conjunctions in academic writing.

Theoretically, conjunctions have been extensively studied in the fields of discourse analysis and applied linguistics. The theoretical framework proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) remains one of the most popular models and identifies five types of cohesion: reference, substitution, omission, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. Their work suggests that a connective is a linguistic feature that links different segments of a text together and allows them to be understood in relation to each other. Meanwhile, many researchers, such as Fraser (1999), have expanded the definition of discourse markers as well as their uses. These studies provide a solid theoretical basis for exploring how students use and understand conjunctions. However, the use of such ideal models in local educational contexts remains limited.

It is important to study the perceptions of final-year English-majored students regarding conjunctions in academic writing. They are the ones who have the most exposure to English writing instruction and are likely to be ready to graduate and enter the workforce or continue their education. Their perceptions and experiences provide insight into the effectiveness of the university curriculum and the writing modules they have taken. In addition, their opinions can help us improve future modules so that new generations of students are more effectively trained in academic writing.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Definition of Conjunctions

Halliday & Hasan (1976) argued that conjunctions are essential linguistic elements used to establish logical, semantically or textually coherent relationships between sentences and paragraphs. Conjunctions provide cohesion and coherence to a text, thus enhancing the reader's ability to follow the flow. Some researchers say that conjunctions are central to academic discourse because they allow writers to construct relationships between

ideas in a clear and coherent manner. They defined conjunctions as elements that link parts of language together to create a clear logical flow to the text. Conjunctions function in a pragmatic way to indicate relationships between discourse segments, while some other studies consider them as grammatical and lexical items that contribute to the cohesion of the text. This is demonstrated in the studies of Fraser (1999) and Biber *et al.* (2021).

According to Fraser (1993), conjunctions act as cohesive links that reflect the speaker or writer's intention in connecting ideas. Taboada (2006) emphasizes that conjunctions are not only grammatical elements but also play an important role in structuring discourse by guiding the interpretation of relationships in a text. Similarly, some scholars assert that conjunctions act as textual cues that help readers process complex information structures (Degand and Simon-Vandenbergen, 2011).

2.2 Classification of Conjunctions

There are many different classifications of conjunctions, but many scholars agree on their fundamental role in enhancing the cohesion of a text, facilitating logical flow, and guiding the reader's comprehension. This view is also expressed in the studies of Fraser (1999), Schiffrin (1987), Biber *et al.* (1999). Fraser (1999) classified four different groups of conjunctions: explanatory (e.g., furthermore, in addition), contrastive (e.g., however, nevertheless), inferential (e.g., therefore, thus), and topical (e.g., by the way). Redeker (1990) distinguished conjunctions according to function into ideational, interpersonal, and textual groups, indicating their multifunctionality. Schiffrin (2001) argued that conjunctions serve multiple functions at different levels of linguistic expression, including those of arrangement, contrast, and explanation. As emphasized in Blakemore's (2002) study, conjunctions do not contribute to the content of the sentence in the expression but rather to its relevance and interpretive structure in the text.

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), cohesive devices are divided into five main types: reference, substitution, omission, conjunctions, and lexical cohesion. Among these, conjunctions function by connecting clauses and sentences through complementary (and, also), contrastive (however, on the other hand), causal (because, so), and temporal (then, after that) relationships. Although these devices are small in form, they play a big role in shaping the logical structure of academic writing and supporting the reader's comprehension (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Flowerdew, 2013).

The classification of conjunctions also varies depending on whether one takes a syntactic, semantic, or pragmatic perspective. For example, Ben-Anath (2005) classified conjunctions based on their role in discourse processing, emphasizing their function in inferential coherence. Villaverde (2018) argues that the classification of conjunctions should also take into account intonation and contextual features in addition to syntax. Integrating corpus analysis with discourse theory demonstrates that connectives not only link clauses but also reflect the writer's rhetorical strategies. These classifications highlight the diversity of analytical approaches and the continuing scholarly interest in how conjunctions contribute to textual cohesion and discourse coherence (Bui, 2022).

2.3 Role of Conjunctions

2.3.1 Contribution to Logical Organization and Clarity of Ideas

Logical organization is one of the most essential characteristics of well-developed academic writing, and conjunctions serve as an important tool for achieving clarity and coherence. As cohesive devices, conjunctions not only link sentences together, but they also allow writers to express relationships between ideas, such as cause and effect, contrast, sequence, and examples, thus facilitating a clearly structured argument (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Liu & Braine, 2005; Hyland, 2005).

The effective use of conjunctions contributes significantly to the organization of a text, especially in essay genres where logical progression is a fundamental element that must be met. As Ferris and Hedgcock (2014) noted, writers who use conjunctions such as "however, moreover, consequently, and in contrast" are more likely to guide readers smoothly from one idea to the next. These conjunctions act as discourse cues that cue readers into logical flow, helping them predict what type of information will appear and how that information relates to information that has come before. This is especially important in texts for learners of English as a foreign language, where language learners may not have absorbed all the rhetorical conventions of academic English.

2.3.2 Influence on Readers' Comprehension and Textual Flow

Numerous studies have demonstrated that conjunctions play an important role in enhancing comprehension by making semantic relationships explicit. For example, Sanders and Noordman (2000) and Millis and Just (1994) found that texts containing explicit logical conjunctions were processed more efficiently and recalled more accurately than texts without them. These findings are supported by empirical data showing that the absence of conjunctions increases the inferential burden on readers, often leading to confusion or misunderstanding (Carrell, 1982; Crossley & McNamara, 2010; McNamara *et al.*, 2010). The presence of conjunctions not only connects ideas but also influences the logical progression of arguments.

2.3.3 Contribution to Coherence and Overall Quality of Writing

The effective use of cohesive devices — particularly conjunctions — has long been recognized as an important predictor of writing quality, especially in academic and second-language contexts. Numerous studies have demonstrated that texts that exhibit higher levels of cohesion tend to be evaluated more positively in terms of organization, clarity, and argumentative strength (McNamara *et al.*, 2010; Crossley & McNamara, 2010; Witte & Faigley, 1981). Conjunctions not only signal logical relationships between ideas but also reflect a writer's ability to structure thoughts coherently, which is a core element of academic writing assessment criteria across a variety of educational systems. McNamara *et al.* (2010), in their study of linguistic features of writing quality, reported that cohesion indices such as conjunctions, overlapping of content words, and lexical diversity were positively correlated with human assessments of text quality.

Conjunctions also play an important role in the assessment practices of large-scale English proficiency tests. In these frameworks, conjunctions are key criteria, and poor performance in this area can significantly reduce scores (Weir *et al.*, 2012). Research has shown that writing samples that use insufficient or inappropriate conjunctions are often marked as disorganized or poorly developed, especially when readers are unable to follow the intended flow of ideas (Uccelli *et al.*, 2013; McNamara *et al.*, 2010). Therefore, the teaching and assessment of conjunctions is not only a stylistic issue but also a substantive issue tied to assessment validity.

2.4 Conjunctions in Academic Writing

In academic writing, especially in the context of English as a foreign language or second language, conjunctions play an important role in achieving cohesion and coherence. They not only provide logical transitions between ideas but also structure arguments and clarify relationships within and between sentences (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Liu & Braine, 2005). Although seemingly simple, their effective use requires a deep understanding of both syntax and discourse pragmatics, which makes them one of the persistent challenges for non-native English writers. The foundational theory of conjunctions in academic English was put forward by Halliday and Hasan (1976), who classified conjunctions as one of five cohesive devices that contribute to the overall coherence of a text. Later, they extended this model, explaining conjunctions as part of a text metafunction, organizing the content of ideas in a reader-friendly way. These theoretical frameworks emphasize the systematic role of conjunctions in guiding readers through the logic of a text, an essential skill in argumentative or expository writing.

Research across EFL and second language contexts shows that underuse, misuse, or overuse of conjunctions among learners, especially in academic writing, is a persistent problem. Liu and Braine (2005), in a study of Chinese university students, observed a limited number and repetitive use of conjunctions, often limited to basic forms such as "and, but, and because," which affected the rhetorical quality of their writing. This finding is reflected in some English as a foreign language contexts in some other countries, where students often have difficulty in using appropriate conjunctions to convey causal or adversarial relationships (Johnson, 1992; Jalilifar, 2008; Narita, Sato & Sugiura, 2004; Kashiha, 2022).

The misuse of conjunctions often results in writing that is too mechanical or logically incoherent. Students may use "however" when it is necessary, or repeat "moreover" when it is not semantically necessary, reflecting a lack of sensitivity to the logical organization of the text (Altenberg & Tapper, 1998; Witte & Faigley, 1981; Crossley & McNamara, 2010). Furthermore, learners of English as a foreign language tend to rely heavily on a few fixed expressions or phrases, making their writing monotonous and overly structured (Granger & Tyson, 1996). These tendencies are particularly pronounced in the context of formulaic or exam-oriented writing instruction, which limits opportunities for students to experiment with different forms of cohesion.

Notably, conjunctions are not only markers of cohesion in writing but also influence perceptions of cohesion and writing quality. Crossley and McNamara (2010) found that greater use of appropriate conjunctions correlated with higher scores on comprehensive writing assessments, supporting previous findings by Connor (1984) and Ferris (1994), who linked cohesion to reader comprehension and persuasiveness. Thus, conjunctions function not only as aesthetic devices but also as direct contributors to the rhetorical clarity and communicative success of writing.

2.5 Related Studies

In a study, Liu and Braine (2005) analyzed essays written by Chinese university students and found that they relied heavily on a narrow range of conjunctions, such as "however" and "so," indicating limited conjunction vocabulary diversity. Similarly, Alarcon and Morales (2011) studied the use of conjunctions by Filipino university students and found that while students used a variety of conjunctions, many used them incorrectly or redundantly. The misuse of complementary conjunctions such as "and" and "also" was particularly frequent.

In addition, a study by Jalilifar (2008) comparing the use of conjunctions by advanced and intermediate students of EFL found significant differences in the frequency and type of conjunctions used. This highlights a positive correlation between writing proficiency and the appropriate deployment of conjunctions. Students at higher proficiency levels not only used more conjunctions but also used them more functionally and flexibly.

Several comparative studies have sought to determine how conjunction use differs between learners with different proficiency levels or educational backgrounds. For example, Yang and Sun (2012) found that college students with higher writing proficiency demonstrated greater accuracy in the use of causal and contrastive conjunctions, while students with lower proficiency levels did not use them or used them incorrectly.

In Vietnam and Southeast Asia in general, research on written English often highlights challenges related to cohesion and coherence. Studies have shown that Vietnamese students tend to translate directly from Vietnamese to English, resulting in awkward or inappropriate use of conjunctions (Bui, 2022). Interference from the mother tongue is a major factor contributing to the misuse or underuse of conjunctions. This study highlights that although students understand the general function of conjunctions, their application often lacks syntactic and rhetorical accuracy. Similarly, a study conducted by Hamed (2018) has shown similar patterns, in which students often misuse conjunctions due to interference from their mother tongue. These findings suggest a regional trend in which native language rhetorical structures significantly impact the ability of English as a foreign language learners to use cohesive devices effectively.

In Indonesia, a research by Sutopo & Faridi (2020) confirmed that even high-achieving students of English as a foreign language struggle with the logical sequencing

of ideas, often overusing basic conjunctions such as "and", "but", and "so", while ignoring more nuanced conjunctions such as "on the other hand" or "consequently".

3. Material and Methods

3.1 Research Instruments
The main instrument for data collection was a self-administered questionnaire. The items will be measured on a 5-point Likert scale.
The questionnaire is divided into different sections in line with the research questions:
- Section 1 collects students' personal information.
- Section 2 explores students' perceptions of the role of conjunctions in their essays.
- Section 3 examines students' assessments of the importance of conjunctions in achieving cohesion and coherence.
- Section 4 examines the frequency, purpose, and types of conjunctions students use.
- Section 5 identifies the difficulties or challenges students face when using conjunctions.

3.2 Participants
The target population of this study included 193 final-year English-majored students at Nam Can Tho University. Among them, regarding gender, the proportion of female participants was higher than that of males, accounting for 71.5% and 29.5% respectively.

4. Results and Discussion

Table 4.1: Students' Perceptions of the Conjunctions in Essay Writing

Group of perception	N of items	N	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
The role of conjunctions in English academic essay writing	8	193	4.052	4.024	3.938
Assessing the importance of conjunctions in achieving coherence and cohesion in essays	7	193	4.116	4.088	4.150
The frequency of conjunction usage in essay writing	9	193	4.037	3.969	4.093
Difficulties in using conjunctions in essay writing	6	193	3.259	3.207	3.290
Total	**30**	**193**	**3.859**	**3.259**	**4.116**

It can be seen from Table 4.1 that the overall mean score (Mean = 3.859) shows that students generally have a positive perception of the role and importance of conjunctions and frequently use them in their essay writing. However, the remaining difficulties indicate that the gap between awareness and practice is still quite large.

4.1 Students' Views on the Role of Conjunctions in Academic Writing in English

The results show that the group of perception related to the role of conjunctions has a fairly high mean score (Mean = 4.052), reflecting that final-year English-majored students at Nam Can Tho University clearly perceive the essential role of conjunctions in organizing arguments, ensuring logic and supporting coherence in writing. This is consistent with the views of Halliday & Hasan (1976), who argued that cohesive devices are an important element in creating cohesion in a text, as well as later studies by Hinkel (2001), Hyland & Tse (2004) and Fraser (1999), who emphasized that the presence and proper use of conjunctions act as a bridge between ideas to increase persuasiveness and clarity (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Hinkel, 2001; Hyland & Tse, 2004; Fraser, 1999).

This finding is also similar to the study of Alarcon & Morales (2011), where the authors demonstrated that students often perceive conjunctions as an important tool to help structure their essays more tightly. Similarly, studies by Granger & Tyson (1996) and Altenberg & Tapper (2014) showed that even at advanced levels, EFL learners still consider conjunctions as a fundamental element in academic writing (Alarcon & Morales, 2011; Granger & Tyson, 1996; Altenberg & Tapper, 2014).

4.2 Assessing the Importance of Cohesive Devices in Expressing Coherence and Cohesion

This group of perception has the highest mean score (Mean = 4.116), showing that students not only recognize the role but also highly appreciate the importance of conjunctions in ensuring coherence and cohesion. This reflects the increasingly clear understanding of the relationship between conjunctions and writing quality, which has been confirmed in many previous studies (Carrell, 1982; Witte & Faigley, 1981; Crossley & McNamara, 2010; McNamara, Crossley & McCarthy, 2010).

The findings of students' perceptions are similar to those of Yang & Sun (2012) and Liu & Braine (2005), who concluded that Asian students use conjunctions as a way to compensate for lexical variety or syntactic limitations, in order to make the text more understandable. However, as Crewe (1990) and Carrell (1982) pointed out, conjunctions only create cohesion but do not ensure coherence, meaning that appreciating the role of conjunctions is only half the problem (Carrell, 1982; Crewe, 1990; Liu & Braine, 2005; Yang & Sun, 2012).

4.3 Frequency of Using Conjunctions in Essay Writing

The group of frequency of using conjunctions achieved Mean = 4.037, indicating that students frequently used conjunctions in the writing process. This reflects the habits and strategies of EFL students in Vietnam, which were noted in previous studies by Jalilifar (2008), Ishikawa (2011) and Lei (2012), when students tend to overuse or use conjunctions disproportionately. This result is also consistent with the findings of Bui (2022) and Tuan, Trang & Nhu (2023), that Vietnamese students tend to rely on familiar conjunctions such as however, therefore, and, but instead of expanding their vocabulary. This was also emphasized by Altenberg & Tapper (2014) and Milton & Tsang (1993) in the context of

learners in other countries (Jalilifar, 2008; Milton & Tsang, 1993; Altenberg & Tapper, 2014; Bui, 2022).

4.4 Difficulties in Using Conjunctions in Essay Writing

This group has the lowest mean score (Mean = 3.259), indicating that students have many obstacles in using conjunctions in the right context, the right type and appropriate to the text. These difficulties are similar to the findings of Crewe (1990), who found that EFL students often make mistakes when using logical conjunctions in an "illogical" way; as well as the study of Nghi & Truong (2023), when pointing out that Vietnamese students often use conjunctions based on the habit of translating from their mother tongue.

In addition, Bui (2022) and Le & Nguyen (2025) also found confusion between types of conjunctions (additive, adversative, causal, temporal), leading to the presence of formal cohesion but not achieving meaningful coherence. Similarly, Bahaziq (2016) and Anindita (2024) also demonstrated that inappropriate use of conjunctions can make the text cumbersome and unnatural (Crewe, 1990; Bahaziq, 2016; Bui, 2022; Le & Nguyen, 2025).

Compared to previous studies in Vietnam and internationally, this result confirms a common paradox that EFL students often "know" the important role of cohesive devices but "have not yet mastered" how to use them to create real coherence (Connor, 1984; Hinkel, 2001; Hyland, 2005; Yang & Sun, 2012). Thus, the research results both reinforce previous findings and add evidence from the Vietnamese context, suggesting the need for clearer pedagogical interventions in the teaching of conjunctions, including functional differentiation, practice in real contexts, and detailed feedback on misuse.

5. Recommendations

Based on the research results, more attention should be paid to teaching how to use conjunctions consciously and appropriately in context, instead of just providing lists. Lecturers should combine text analysis activities, compare effective and ineffective conjunctions, and provide personalized feedback to help students correct their errors. On the research side, it is necessary to expand the survey scale, combine written product analysis and consider socio-cultural factors affecting conjunction usage habits, as well as apply modern approaches to have a more comprehensive perspective.

6. Conclusion

This study has shown that although final-year English-majored students at Nam Can Tho University are generally aware of the importance of conjunctions in academic writing, their use still faces many limitations and difficulties. The results show that students highly appreciate the role of conjunctions in ensuring the coherence and cohesion of the text. The frequency of using conjunctions in essays is quite common, but uneven and sometimes abusive or mechanical. However, the main difficulties include choosing

conjunctions that are not appropriate to the context, confusing grammatical and pragmatic functions, and being influenced by mother tongue expressions.

The above findings confirm that teaching and learning conjunctions is not simply providing vocabulary lists, but also requires attention to pragmatic, rhetorical and academic culture factors. Thereby, the study contributes a practical perspective for improving the academic writing skills curriculum in the context of English as a foreign language training in Vietnam.

Acknowledgements

About the Author(s)

Mr. Nguyen Hoang Phuong is a lecturer of English at Nam Can Tho University, Vietnam. With a strong passion for English language education, he has devoted his teaching career to enhancing students' competence in productive skills as well as their understanding of linguistic theories. His professional interests include English teaching methodology, academic writing and speaking.

Mr. Luong Trong Linh is a lecturer of English at Nam Can Tho University, Vietnam. He has been actively engaged in teaching a wide range of courses for English-majored students, focusing on both language skills and theoretical knowledge. His academic interests lie in English language teaching, curriculum development, and learner-centered approaches in higher education.

References

Alarcon, J. B., & Morales, K. N. S. (2011). Grammatical cohesion in students' argumentative essays. *Journal of English and Literature, 2*(5), 114–127. Retrieved from https://academicjournals.org/journal/IJEL/article-full-text-pdf/64155281112

Altenberg, B., & Tapper, M. (2014). The use of adverbial connectors in advanced Swedish learners' written English. In Learner English on computer (pp. 80–93). Routledge. Retrieved from https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315841342-6/use-adverbial-connectors-advanced-swedish-learners-written-english-bengt-altenberg-marie-tapper

Anindita, P. (2024). Cohesion and coherence problems among non-native English students' writing essays. *Journal of Lensa: Linguistics, Literature, and Culture, 14*(1), 58–79. Retrieved from https://jurnal.unimus.ac.id/index.php/lensa/article/view/14263

Bahaziq, A. (2016). Cohesive devices in written discourse: A discourse analysis of a student's essay writing. *English Language Teaching, 9*(7), 112–119. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n7p112

Ben-Anath, D. (2005). The role of connectives in text comprehension. *Studies in Applied Linguistics and TESOL, 5*(2). http://dx.doi.org/10.7916/salt.v5i2.1569

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (2021). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English.* Longman. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Longman_Grammar_of_Spoken_and_Written_En.html?id=vjomAQAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y

Blakemore, D. (2002). *Relevance and linguistic meaning: The semantics and pragmatics of discourse markers.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486456

Bui, H. P. (2022). Vietnamese EFL students' use and misconceptions of cohesive devices in writing. *SAGE Open, 12*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221126993

Carrell, P. L. (1982). Cohesion is not coherence. *TESOL Quarterly, 16*(4), 479–488. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586466

Connor, U. (1984). A study of cohesion and coherence in English as a second language students' writing. *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 17*(3), 301–316. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351818409389208

Crewe, W. J. (1990). The illogic of logical connectors. *ELT Journal, 44*(4), 316–325. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ416712

Crossley, S., & McNamara, D. (2010). Cohesion, coherence, and expert evaluations of writing proficiency. In Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society (Vol. 32, No. 32). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228630581_Cohesion_coherence_and_expert_evaluations_of_writing_proficiency

Degand, L., & Simon-Vandenbergen, A.-M. (2011). Introduction: Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization and discourse markers. *Linguistics, 49*(2), 287–294. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/jhp.16.1.03deg

Ferris, D. R. (1994). Lexical and syntactic features of ESL writing by students at different levels of L2 proficiency. *TESOL Quarterly 28*(3), 414–420. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/3587446

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2014). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (3rd ed.). Routledge. Retrieved from https://www.routledge.com/Teaching-L2-Composition-Purpose-Process-and-Practice/Ferris-Hedgcock/p/book/9780367436780

Flowerdew, L. (2013). *Discourse in English language education.* Routledge. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203080870

Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*(7), 931–952. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00101-5

Granger, S., & Tyson, S. (1996). Connector usage in the English essay writing of native and non-native EFL speakers. *World Englishes, 15*(1), 17–27. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1996.tb00089.x

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315836010

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. (2013). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar*. Routledge. Retrieved from https://linguisticstudentindonesia.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/m.a.k.-halliday-christian-m.i.m.-matthiessen-hallidays-introduction-to-functional-grammar-2014-routledge-libgen.lc_.pdf

Hamed, M. (2018). Common linguistic errors among non-English major Libyan students writing. *Arab World English Journal, 9*(2). Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1312782.pdf

Hinkel, E. (2001). Matters of cohesion in L2 academic texts. *Applied Language Learning, 12*(2), 111–132. Retrieved from https://www.elihinkel.org/downloads/cohesion.pdf

Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. Continuum. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352101558_METADISCOURSE_EXPLORING_INTERACTION_IN_WRITING_Second_Edition_By_Ken_Hyland

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics, 25*(2), 156–177. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.2.156

Jalilifar, A. (2008). Discourse markers in composition writings: The case of Iranian learners of English as a foreign language. *English Language Teaching, 1*(2), 114–122. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v1n2p114

Johnson, P. (1992). Cohesion and coherence in compositions in Malay and English. *RELC Journal, 23*(2), 1–17. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/003368829202300201

Kashiha, H. (2022). An investigation of the use of cohesive devices in ESL students' essay writing. *Journal of Education and Practice, 1.* Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.7176/JEP/13-18-02

Le, L. V., & Nguyen, B. T. T. (2025). Cohesion in Vietnamese EFL argumentative writing: An analysis of types and erroneous use of cohesive devices. *Hue University Journal of Science: Social Sciences and Humanities, 134*(6B), 23–49. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.26459/hueunijssh.v134i6B.7705

Lei, L. (2012). Linking adverbials in academic writing on applied linguistics by Chinese doctoral students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 11*(3), 267–275. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2012.05.003

Liu, M., & Braine, G. (2005). Cohesive features in argumentative writing produced by Chinese undergraduates. *System, 33*(4), 623–636. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.02.002

McNamara, D. S., Crossley, S. A., & McCarthy, P. M. (2010). Linguistic features of writing quality. *Written Communication, 27*(1), 57–86. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0741088309351547

Millis, K. K., & Just, M. A. (1994). The influence of connectives on sentence comprehension. *Journal of Memory and Language, 33*(1), 128–147. https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1994.1007

Milton, J., & Tsang, E. S. C. (1993). A corpus-based study of logical connectors in EFL students' writing. In R. Pemberton & E. S. C. Tsang (Eds.), Studies in lexis (pp. 215–246). Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.

Narita, M., Sato, C., & Sugiura, M. (2004). Connector usage in the English essay writing of Japanese EFL learners. In *LREC* Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 1171–1174. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228813830_Connector_usage_in_the_English_essay_writing_of_Japanese_EFL_learners

Nghi, N. P. A., & Truong, T. N. (2023). Difficulties of Vietnamese students in learning academic writing. *International Journal of Asian Education, 4*(2), 106–114. Retrieved from https://ijae.journal-asia.education/index.php/data/article/view/340

Redeker, G. (1990). Ideational and pragmatic markers of discourse structure. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14*(3), 367–381. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90095-U

Sanders, T. J., & Noordman, L. G. (2000). The role of coherence relations and their linguistic markers in text processing. *Discourse Processes, 29*(1), 37–60. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326950dp2901_3

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611841

Schiffrin, D. (2001). Discourse markers: Language, meaning, and context. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), The handbook of discourse analysis (pp. 54–75). Blackwell. Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/book/10.1002/9781118584194

Sutopo, D., & Faridi, A. (2020). The use of cohesive devices in English education journal articles written by graduate students of UNNES. *English Education Journal, 10*(2), 208–213. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.15294/eej.v10i1.34209

Taboada, M. (2006). Discourse markers as signals (or not) of rhetorical relations. *Journal of Pragmatics, 38*(4), 567–592. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2005.09.010

Tuan, N. Q., Trang, N. T. B., & Nhu, N. V. Q. (2023). Use of cohesive devices in paragraph writing by EFL students at English language centers in Vietnam. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies, 39*(3), 152–169. https://doi.org/10.63023/2525-2445/jfs.ulis.5099

Villaverde, D. (2018). Approaching discourse markers in present-day English: A corpus-based study. Bachelor's thesis, Universidad de Santiago de Compostela. Retrieved from https://minerva.usc.gal/rest/api/core/bitstreams/0e0dd0a9-51d3-4bd4-a835-c8e54d8e1fd4/content

Weir, C. J., Hawkey, R., Green, A., & Unaldi, A. (2012). The cognitive processes underlying the academic reading construct as measured in the IELTS reading module. *IELTS Research Reports, 8*, 1–40. Retrieved from

https://ielts.org/researchers/our-research/research-reports/the-cognitive-processes-underlying-the-academic-reading-construct-as-measured-by-ielts

Witte, S. P., & Faigley, L. (1981). Coherence, cohesion, and writing quality. *College Composition and Communication, 32*(2), 189–204. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/356693

Yang, W., & Sun, Y. (2012). The use of cohesive devices in argumentative writing by Chinese EFL learners at different proficiency levels. *Linguistics and Education, 23*(1), 31–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2011.09.004