Error Analysis of College English Writing Based on the Cohesion and Coherence Theory

Qiangqiang Li[1]

[1] School of Foreign Languages, Taishan University, Taian, China

Correspondence: Qiangqiang Li, School of Foreign Languages, Taishan University, Taian, China.

Abstract

Although much has been discussed about error analysis around the world, it has been one of the least investigated learning/teaching writing in ELT in China. Cohesion and coherence are two important factors in the discourse analysis. The paper reports the results of a series of linguistic statistic methods, in which learners were invited to write a CET-4 composition, and two experienced teachers were asked to analyze errors based on Cohesion and Coherence Theory. The study reveals that students have difficulty in using conjunction and lexical cohesion and are weak in logical reasoning and argument. The paper argues that college students and teachers who teach English writing are supposed to focus more on how to improve cohesion and coherence in texts rather only on the linguistic level, which can be used for reference for the teaching of English writing.

Keywords: cohesion and coherence, college English writing, error analysis

1. Introduction

Error analysis theory mainly focuses on learners to identify the sources of errors, which is of great significance for learners to acquire a second language or foreign language and for teachers to explore the most effective teaching methodology. Five steps, which were put forward by S.P. Corder (1981), are as often as not used in error analysis. First of all, the researcher should collect the learners' samples, and identify errors, classify these collected errors, then analyze and explain the causes of errors, finally evaluate these errors (Corder, 1981). Through these five steps, error analysis can urge teachers to reflect on their teaching process and find common errors among students, therefore, improving teaching quality. Although there are some studies on error analysis of writing, most of which focus on the linguistic level. Zhang (2008) pointed out that errors could be categorized as form, lexicon, phrases, and syntax. Some researchers focus on error analysis of vocabulary and grammar. Luo (2007) collected students' errors on nouns in their English writing, and then classified and analyzed these errors according to five steps. However, college students and even writing teachers pay more attention to the linguistic level, and easily ignore the discourse level. Since the implementation of CET-4 and CET-6, the writing level of college students has been greatly improved. However, English writing has always been a weakness for college students, and college writing teaching has been at the basic stage (Dong, 1999). Therefore, only focusing on the linguistic level can too enough to improve students' writing levels. Even though vocabulary and grammar knowledge seem like the cornerstone of writing ability, students' compositions will be scattered without discourse knowledge. One of the main weaknesses of English writing is the poor discourse cohesion and coherence (Dong, 1999). Song and Xia (2002) compared and analyzed the features of discourse cohesion between the good and poor compositions written by 364 non-English majors of Chinese college freshmen. The results proved that the frequency distribution of both grammatical and lexical cohesion is much higher in the good compositions than the poor ones. Therefore, close attention should be paid to them, and the combination of discourse cohesion and coherence in teaching is significant to college English writing (Afnan, 2016). However most error analysis based on cohesion and coherence theory (Halliday & Hasan, 1976) are analyzed according to students' errors such as reference errors, vocabulary errors, and grammar errors, thus, their studies lack the characteristics of organization and system. Even if there are studies on error analysis based on cohesion and coherence theory, some cannot analyze coherence in detail such as Li and Shi (2011). They investigated the discourse cohesion and coherence consciousness of Russian majors in Russian writing, but the whole study just illustrated the discourse cohesion and little attention to coherence. Therefore, the paper is based on the error analysis theory and mainly launches from two aspects: First of all, the paper combines five cohesion devices

theorized by Halliday and Hasan and six cohesion devices pointed out by Song, and then collects and analyzes cohesion errors. Zhang Delu and Liu Rushan (2022) published a new book entitled Theories of Cohesion and Coherence: Development and Application, which makes a good review of the literature on cohesion and coherence. Afterward, the paper collects and analyzes coherence errors from the theme of the compositions, theme- rheme progression, demonstration of opinions. In this way, the purpose of the paper is to collect, classify, and analyze some common errors in cohesion and coherence in English writing, hoping to offer several feasible suggestions to college students and teachers.

2. Literature Review

In the field of discourse analysis, cohesion and coherence theory put forward by Halliday and Hasan has made great contributions. Generally, *Cohesion in English*, written by Halliday and Hasan, marks the establishment of cohesion theory. Afterward, more and more linguistic scholars in China have begun to generate doubt about the authority of this theory and develop this theory such as Hu Zhuanglin (2000), Zhang Delu (2001, 2022), and Zhu Yongsheng (1997). In the literature review part, the paper is divided into two parts, theoretical background and previous study. The first part firstly illustrates the cohesion and coherence theory of Halliday and Hasan, and mainly introduces theory development outside and inside China, then summarizes the error analysis put forward by Corder. In the second part, the paper illustrates some studies on error analysis of writing based on cohesion and coherence theory inside China, then summarizes their merits and demerits and lastly demonstrates this paper.

2.1 Theoretical Background

2.1.1 Cohesion and Coherence Theory

Cohesion and coherence are two important items in text linguistics. Due to different research views, linguistic scholars defined it differently. Halliday and Hasan (1976) defined cohesion as the "relationship of meanings that exist within the text, and that define it as a text". Cohesion belongs to a semantic connection. If one part of the text plays a key role in understanding the other part, then there is a cohesive relationship between the two parts. Cohesion does not necessarily exist between sentences, but also within sentences (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). For example:

> If you happen to meet the admiral, don't tell him his ship's gone down (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 8).

Within this sentence, "him" and "his" both depend on the word, admiral, which appears before. Thus, this phenomenon is called cohesion. However, since a sentence has its structure, and the structure itself indicates the discourse of a sentence, the significance of studying cohesion within sentences is not so great. Inter-sentential cohesion is different from cohesion within a sentence. Inter-sentential cohesion makes the connection between sentences and makes a group of sentences own the property of being a text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Halliday and Hasan gave five types of cohesion, namely reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. Although they mentioned many times that cohesion belongs to semantic connection, they also supplemented in the summary at the end of the book that some cohesion focuses on form such as substitution and ellipsis, while others focus on semantic meaning such as reference. Form and meaning cannot be separate, because cohesion must first pass through semantic selection and then be realized in the form of words or sentences (Michael Hoey, 2022).

Reference is also called anaphoric relation, which involves exophora and endophora. The former comes from the pragmatic level related to context outside text, and plays little role in discourse cohesion. While the latter comes from within the text and is further divided into anaphora and cataphora (Song& Xia, 2000). For the convenience of statistics and research, Song and Xia divided cohesion in English into six types. Their study compared the features of text discourse between the good and the poor compositions and found that the frequency distribution of cataphora is much higher in good compositions than in poor ones. The paper will analyze cohesion in students' compositions from these six aspects. Therefore, the paper also divided cohesion into six types:

1)   Anaphora: refers to using a pronoun or similar word to replace a word used earlier. For example:

(1) There is a storybook, I read *it*.

2)   Cataphora: refers to using a pronoun or similar word to replace a word used later. For example:

(2) *She* is so clever. Mary won two world championships.

3)   Reference: means one part can be substituted by another component, generally speaking, one(s), the same, do/ did, so, not, etc.

(3) The frequency distribution of lexical cohesion in good compositions is much higher than in poor *ones*.

4)   Ellipsis: means leaving out words deliberately without influencing the meaning of a sentence.

(4) I want to go but I can't.

5)   Conjunction (also called grammatical cohesion): refers to a word or group of words that joins together words, groups, and clauses. There are four types: additive (and, furthermore, for example, in addition, etc.), adversative conjunction (but, instead, in fact, on the one hand, etc.), causal conjunction (so, consequence, it follows, etc.) and space-time conjunction (at once, finally, meanwhile, etc.).

6)   Lexical cohesion: such as hyponym, part-whole relation, collocation, clausal substitution (so am I), comparatives, sentence repetition, and tense agreement.

Halliday and Hasan didn't mention "coherence", but they referred to "texture". Texture means the property of being text, which is similar to the concept of coherence. There are three components in texture, involving cohesion, information structure, and discourse structure (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). It means cohesion is one part of coherence. Halliday and Hasan believed that cohesion is a necessary though not a sufficient condition for the creation of text. That's to say, cohesion does not necessarily produce coherence, but it certainly does not produce coherence if there is no cohesion. As for the relationship between cohesion and coherence, some researchers hold different views. It was Widdowson (1973) who had first proposed the concept of coherence. To distinguish de-contextualized corpus from contextualized corpus, Widdowson put forward five pairs of linguistic terms: use/usage, sentence/utterance, locution/illocution, text/discourse, and cohesion/coherence. Widdowson believed that sentences are combined to form a text, in which the connections between sentences are called grammatical cohesion. While utterance is formed into a discourse, in which playing a role is called coherence. It means cohesion focuses on surface language forms, and coherence emphasizes communicative behaviors. Although Widdowson pointed out that cohesion is neither necessary nor sufficient for coherence, the differences between cohesion and coherence cannot be explained clearly.

The relationship between cohesion and coherence can be understood from the generation and interpretation of text. There are different views on the relationship between the two, and more and more opinions of linguistic scholars seemed to converge. Cohesion refers to the syntactic or semantic connection of linguistic forms in the surface structure, while coherence refers to the principle of organization assumed to understand the underlying functional identity of a spoken or written language. Specifically, it includes world knowledge, reasoning, assumptions, as well as the communication conducted through speech acts (Crystal, 1985). For example:

She didn't know the rule. Consequently, she died (Sun, 1997).

Texture connection has two meanings. One refers to the semantic connection, which is called coherence of the text; the other refers to tie, that is, cohesion, which belongs to the text itself and its formal characteristics (Sun, 1997). If the sentence is without the word, consequently, there will be no relation between "she didn't know the rule" and "she died". "Consequently" manifests the two sentences' existing causal relation, which is the requirement of cohesion and coherence.

All of the above are about the concept meaning of cohesion, coherence, and relation between the two. So how to judge the coherence of a article? Zhang Delu (2000) summarizes four basic features of the concept of coherence, including scalability, connectivity, wholeness, and functionality. First of all, scalability means whether the text performs appropriate functions in the context. Connectivity refers that each part of the text should be connected by a semantic relationship, in this way, text forms a whole semantic network. Besides, wholeness means the text should be a whole on a meaning level, that is, meaning coherence. Functionality focuses on the integration of language and context. The paper is based on what Zhang summarized and analyzed coherence errors in students' compositions from the theme of the compositions, theme-rheme progression, and demonstration of opinions.

2.1.2 Error Analysis Theory

Corder (1967) first put forward the Error Analysis Theory, which takes the place of the contrast analysis theory. In his article, entitled *The Significance of Learners' Errors*, he pointed out that the center of linguistics should be varied from teaching to learning. Error Analysis is intended to find learning strategies and give teaching instructions. It also provides helpful and practical methodologies to see a learner's language system while acquiring a second language.

According to Corder's theory of Error Analysis, five steps of error analysis are put forward to assist the Error Analysis, Which is mainly the author's guidance and ways to carry on the Error Analysis.

(1) The collection of the samples

During the Error Analysis, a very significant step is to collect learners' samples. It is also referred to among

Corder's five steps of Error Analysis theory. Ellis (1994) believes that the samples collected can reflect the learners' language ability. Researchers find the natural language useful as it can provide the best evidence for research on the learners' language study because learning language is impacted by a variety of factors.

(2) The identification of the errors

After collecting samples of learner language, the identification of Errors follows next. When it comes to error identification, it means the distinction between errors and mistakes. As we identify the students' errors, we can not just focus on the surface of the language form. Students acquire a foreign language mostly from books, not from the language environment. So when we identify the Chinese linguistic errors, we must pay more attention to both dominant and recessive errors.

(3) The classification of errors

There are two main approaches classifying the errors. Because linguists know different angles of the errors caused, so they have different related theories to classify errors at home and abroad. But here the paper just adapted Coder's classification, because this type is usually used in error analysis of college students' compositions. Corder (1971) divided errors into two major strategies: errors in performance and errors incompetence. Later Coder (1973) divides errors into three strategies: pre-systematic and systematic errors and post-systematic errors.

(4) The explanation of the causes of errors

In this process, it will find out the origins of errors, it is the help of these errors that can give a reasons why an error is made. It is designed to find a good correction solution. The cause of learners' errors is complex, but mainly on four aspects, it is language, cognition, emotion, and communication. It can be divided into the following parts. 1) The native language interference errors or inter-lingual transfer. 2)Target language interference errors. 3) Communication strategies inference errors, which is owing to the learner's own personality, learning habits, and lack of communication. 4) Induced errors which mean the errors input in the teaching material, teaching methods, and educators. 5) Psychological cognitive factors.

(5) The evaluation of errors

Corder (1974) points out that the evaluation is to consider "Whether these errors prevent understanding or communication, and whether these errors should be corrected". With the help of these results of the evaluation of errors, teachers can change their teaching methods and find out how to teach effectively to improve writing quality. It is also playing an increasing role in second language acquisition.

2.2 Previous Study

Error Analysis is based on cognitive psychology and generative linguistics, and one of its basic hypotheses is that there is a special mechanism in the human brain for processing language knowledge (Dai & Shu, 1994). Its purpose is to analyze and evaluate students' errors in second language acquisition, and, consequently to find out the strategies that they use in language learning and the reasons why they make errors or mistakes in a certain expression. At the end of twentieth century, there are quite a lot of studies on error analysis of English writing. Employing error analysis, Liu (2008) studied intralingual and interlingual errors in Chinese non-English major students' writing. Intralingual errors generally include substance errors (such as pronunciation errors), text errors (such as collocation, and grammar errors), and cohesion and coherence errors. Interlingual errors refer to errors caused by mother tongue transfer. Besides, many linguistic scholars analyze the errors of English majors in their English writing. Based on the Error Analysis, the paper took TEM-4 writing results as a reference and carried out empirical research for college students' writing training (Guo & Ou, 2010). They also proposed that college students should improve their pragmatic competence and awareness of cohesion and coherence.

Recently, writing teaching has attracted more and more attention among linguistic and language researchers. A large amount of error analysis of cohesion and coherence has been conducted, but many of them only focused on the use of cohesion devices, ignoring the analysis of coherence of articles to some extent. Dong Junhong (1999) conducted a study of cohesion and coherence in college students' writing, but he just analyzed cohesion errors such as ellipsis, and lexical conjunction, the problems in coherence were written roughly. Based on previous studies, the paper analyzes firstly cohesion errors in their writing from six aspects, and then analyzes coherence errors in detail such as theme demonstration, and opinion expression. Finally, the paper will give some feasible suggestions to college students and writing teachers.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants, Research Methods, and Purpose

The author randomly selected 60 sophomores of non-English majors in a foreign language university in Beijing. They were required to choose one of the CET4 and CET6 original tests and to write a composition. Since the paper aims to test the actual level of students' writing without any prompt, there are no specific requirements other than to have a clear point of view with no less than 300 words. For the 60 compositions, the author first, according to Song and Xia (2002) put forward six types of cohesion, namely anaphora, cataphora, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion, to analyze and test students' cohesion in English writing. Then the paper analyzed students' compositions from the aspects of themes, logical reasoning, explanation of opinions, and common sense, therefore, to find out and summarize some common coherence errors.

3.2 Results and Data Analysis

Table 1. Cohesion errors in English writing

	Total Numbers	Errors	Error Rates	Usage Rates
Anaphora	351	53	25.8%	18%
Cataphora	75	8	10.6%	3.8%
Substitution	70	9	12.9%	3.5%
Ellipsis	37	3	8.1%	1.8%
Conjunction	624	217	34.8%	32%
Conjunction	795	134	13.4%	40.7%

To facilitate understanding, the author drew the table in Chinese rather than English. According to the table, it's obvious that the usage frequency of conjunction and lexical cohesion is much higher than other cohesive devices. The results are similar to Song and Xia's study, which hypothesized that the frequency distribution of grammatical and lexical cohesion in the poor compositions is much lower than in the good ones. Furthermore, the error rates in lexical cohesion are much less than conjunctions in college English writing. It demonstrates that college students have difficulty in using English grammar properly, even if they expect using more conjunctions in their writing could improve the property of being text. In addition, students use lots of references, but most students choose to use anaphora. And cataphora is less used, but there is a low error rate, probably, it appeared in some good compositions.

3.2.1 Errors in Anaphora and Cataphora

According to the table, error distribution in anaphora is higher than in cataphora. When students use these cohesive devices, readers cannot find the object of references or their writing is ambiguous. For example:

"I think *they* are not conflict. *Many people* think *they* can't balance job responsibility and personal interests, because there is too much work to have time for personal interests."

3.2.2 Errors in Substitution and Ellipsis

Error rates in substitution and ellipsis are less than other cohesive devices, however, it doesn't mean college students master this cohesion well. Due to limited knowledge of these two cohesive devices, students seldom use substitution and ellipsis while writing. In this paper, substitution errors are more than ellipsis, which is different from the results in Li's study (2002). However there are some common errors in substitution usage. For example:

"And one day, when you're in need, the people who *has* received your help will help you."

The verb agreement with its subject in number and person should be mastered in students' high school, college students shouldn't have made this kind of mistake like above. Education departments or schools should determine the sub-goals of different levels of writing teaching from middle school to university, to gradually achieve steady development (Du, 2001).

3.2.3 Errors in Conjunction

Table 2. Coherence errors in English writing

	Additives	Adversative	Causal	Temporal
Total Numbers	237	131	191	65
Errors	85	57	64	11
Error Rates	35.8%	43.5%	33.5%	16.9%
Usage Rates	38%	21%	30.6%	10.4%

Through using conjunction, one can not only establish the semantic connection between sentences but also logically presuppose the semantic meaning of the following sentences. Halliday and Hasan divided conjunction into four types: additives, adversative, causal, and temporal. Most students with lower English proficiency reuse a few simple conjunctions such as and, but, so, etc. The usage of additives is much more than other conjunction devices according to Table 2. A few students try to use some conjunctions such as therefore, otherwise, actually, etc, but they often use them inaccurately and even create ambiguity. For example:

"Do you think it's important to build trust in a company? Actually, I think it's extremely important."

"Actually" in a sentence refers to introducing a new topic to show a contrast between the truth and one's belief. But here the two sentences don't belong to adversative relation, so it's inappropriate. Another common error is the usage of "otherwise". It is usually used to indicate negative inference. For example:

"No one will welcome a man with bad manners. Otherwise, a man who always acts politely will get on well with others."

The relationship between the two sentences is adversative, and students should use adversative conjunctions such as on the contrary or the other hand. Even though they represent the same semantic relationship, there are slight differences among these words and sometimes they cannot be interchangeable such as and, also, besides, in addition, what's more, and furthermore. As for these conjunction words, the latter words are used more formally and in a stronger tone than the former ones.

3.2.4 Errors in Coherence

From the above analysis, we can see that the appropriate usage of cohesive devices plays an important role in the coherence of a text, but it cannot guarantee the coherence of a text. Students should argue their views brightly and clearly, and the main body should demonstrate the argument appropriately so that the structure of the writing is rigorous, and their reasoning seems natural and logically reasonable (Li, 2002). Based on several previous studies, the paper analyzed some coherence errors from the following perspectives: theme illustration, the arrangement of theme, and rheme.

On the one hand, students lack the awareness of theme while writing, which always causes ambiguity in the meaning of the whole text. For example:

"Natural trust is achieved, and employees are likely to be more loyal to the employer. If the company is confronted with a crisis, some employees will offer to stand by the employer. They will help the company to get over troubles."

The above paragraph has a few grammatical problems and some cohesive devices, but it is difficult to read because it lacks a central point of view. The whole paragraph is more like the sum of some disordered sentences, which is very common in students' compositions. Paragraphs often have no topic sentence, and two or three or more sub-themes can be found in a paragraph, which seriously affects the overall coherence of the article.

On the other hand, there is no lack of cohesive devices between sentences, sometimes, and there are no obvious grammatical errors, but the essays do not read smoothly. Therefore, it is of great significance to study the coherence of students' work from the perspective of thematic position. For example:

"Language is a part of a nation's culture. People can study their culture and even history through studying its language."

Language in the first sentence is regarded as a theme, and people in the second sentence are considered as the theme. That's to say, the theme is changed in these two sentences. According to "R1–T2" put forward by Hu (2000), it can be changed into the following sentences:

"Language is a part of a nation's culture. Utilizing studying its language, people can study their culture and

even history.”

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1 Strengthen Reading Teaching at the Discourse Level

According to the results above, it's obvious that there are some errors in cohesion and coherence in students' compositions. Even if error rates of some cohesive devices are much lower, it doesn't mean students master these well, however, it is due to the lack of cohesion knowledge that students cannot use these in their compositions. Generally, reading and writing are not separate in language teaching. When students get some comprehensive input by reading a lot of original or authentic works, they can output what they have learned. Nowadays, some college teachers pay more attention to the linguistic level such as vocabulary, grammar, and sentence structure, and little attention is paid to the cohesion and coherence of a text. We can strengthen reading teaching at the discourse level, and combine it and writing teaching (Dong, 1999). Most of the articles were abridged from original English articles or works, which can guarantee language authority to provide a more genuine language environment for college students. Teachers can analyze or discuss together with students how to use these cohesive words and phrases in an appropriate ways such as the difference between “and” and “furthermore”, “otherwise” and “however”. In addition, most students are good at using “three-phase” in their compositions like *firstly*, *secondly*, *finally*. But not all compositions require “three-phase” structure, otherwise, the structure of the composition belongs to “total-description-total”. Fewer articles that we learned in the classroom are organized by these words. Most good compositions are full of conjunction and coherence devices (Song & Xia, 2002).

4.2 Train Writing in Different Stages and Methods

Students should be trained in the ability to write at different stages. Writing teaching is not planned and phased from students' high school to university, so students cannot learn the language step by step (Du, 2001). For example, “*She think it's important.*” “*think*” should be changed into, “*thinks*” because of the subject “*she*”. Subject-predicate agreement should be mastered in middle school, it should appear in college students' compositions. When students are in lower grades, teachers can combine the reading materials to rewrite, abbreviate and summarize so that students initially understand the characteristics of writing and urge them to focus on the accuracy of language usage. At the same time, some target training should be added. For example, based on a short article, students add appropriate cohesive devices in to make the paragraph or sentence more logical and closely-related. Recently, “the continuation-task” method (also called “writing after reading”) proposed by Wang (2018), aims to improve students' writing proficiency by creatively developing a given passage without an ending. Not only this writing method can expand students' vocabulary, but also can help students imitate the cohesion and coherence of the given article and then master these cohesive devices.

5. Conclusion

Through analysis of students' compositions, it can be seen that the problems in using cohesive devices are prominent, followed by lexical cohesion, mainly because of the inaccurate grasp of the word meanings. Another important reason for cohesion errors is that students tend to overuse cohesive devices. On the discourse coherence front, it is not only the language ability that causes the errors, but more importantly, thinking ways, logical reasoning, and the ability to elaborate ideas that cause the errors in students' compositions. Even though students have clear points of view, they're not good at elaborating and demonstrating coherence. Nowadays, teachers and students pay more attention to the structure of writing. There are three parts to a composition. The first paragraph demonstrates personal ideas, the next one explains their opinions, and the last paragraph summarizes what students expressed above. There is nothing wrong with such a requirement, but we should not overemphasize the superficial framework of the text and ignore the content of the text.

Writing is not only a process of producing written discourse, but also a process of thinking, reasoning, and communication (Li, 2002). Therefore, more attention should be paid to discourse cohesion and coherence training. In terms of cohesion, proper cohesion training should be strengthened for inter-sentence surface structure and semantic meaning so as to achieve intra-sentence and inter-sentence smoothness. In terms of coherence, students and teachers should emphasize the organization of content and logic of reasoning.

However, this study has some limitations. First of all, error analysis has not been a hot spot in language learning and teaching. Most of the references cited in this paper were written early such as Corder (1967), Luo (2007), and Liu (2008). However, the combination of error analysis and cohesion and coherence theory has been discussed in this field such as Zhang (2019). Furthermore, the paper couldn't invite exam-markers to find errors in students' compositions, the same as Song and Xia's. Errors adopted in this paper lack authority and reliability.

In recent years, there are some research gaps in cohesion and coherence. There are no doubtless definitions of

coherence, and few researchers can tell the relationship or the differences between cohesion and coherence in a clear way. For example, there is plenty of overlapped usage between the two connective devices, and few scholars can explain it clearly. In addition, it is generally agreed that "cohesion" belongs to a "semantic relationship" (Zhang & Liu, 2003). But Zhang Wei (2019) proposed that the concept of cohesion separated from the subject only by semantic relationship is one-sided, which can not reflect the social communication and psychological cognitive functions of language based on "subjects' accessibility". "Subjects' Accessibility" (SA) discourse analysis framework (Zhang, 2015) reinterpreted the relationship between cohesion and coherence, the division of cohesive devices, and the operation of cohesive mechanisms. But he couldn't illustrate what the relationship is in detail, the relationship between cohesion and coherence, and the theory of coherence should be studied in the future.

References

Bahaziq. A. (2016). Cohesion Devices in Written Discourse: A Discourse Analysis of a Student's Essay Writing. *English Language Teaching*, *9*(7). https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n7p112

Corder, S. P. (1967). *The Significance of Learners' Errors* (p. 169). Longman Singapore Publishers Ltd.

Corder, S. P. (1971). *Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis*. IRAL. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1971.9.2.147

Cordex, S. P. (1973). *Introducing Applied Linguistics* (p. 34). Miidlesex: Penguin Books.

Corder, S. P. (1974). *The Significance of Learners' Errors*. London: Longman.

Crystal, D. (1985). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. London Andre Deutch.

Dai, W. D., & Shu, D. F. (1994). Problems in Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis and Interlanguage study-Research on foreign language theory Ⅱ. *Journal of Foreign Languages*, *5*, 1–7.

Dong, J. H. (1999). The analysis of discourse cohesion and coherence in college students' English writing. *Foreign Language Education*, *1*, 84–87.

Du, J. B. (2001). English writing teaching based on error analysis. *Foreign Language Education*, *3*, 43–47.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Shanghai Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Guo, X. H., & Ou, Y. J. (2010). A new exploration of college English writing based on error analysis theory.

Foreign Language and Literature, *4*, 137–140.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Ruqaiya, H. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hoey, M. (2022). *Lexical Cohesion in Texts*. London and New York: Routledge.

Hu. Z. L. (2000). *Discourse Cohesion and Coherence*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Li, C. Z. (2002). Cohesion and coherence in college English writing. *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching*, *11*, 25–28.

Li, X. K., & Shi, T. Q. (2011). A survey on discourse cohesion and coherence in Russian writing. *Teaching Russian in China*, *4*, 51–54.

Liu, X. H. (2008). A case study of non-English majors' writing error analysis. *Foreign Language Research*, *2*, 140–142.

Luo, L. S. (2007). An analysis of English noun errors in learner's transitional language. *Foreign Language Education*, *1*, 56–59.

Song, M. H., & Xia, W. R. (2002). Cohesive devices in English writing and writing teaching. *Foreign Language World*, *6*, 40–44.

Sun, Y. (1997). On the origin, nature and relationship of cohesion and coherence. *Journal of Foreign Languages*, *1*, 32–36.

Wang, C. M. (2018). How to enhance interaction of the continuation task. *Foreign Language World*, *5*, 40–45.

Widdonson, H. G. (1973). *An applied linguistic approach to discourse analysis*. University of Edinburgh.

Widdowson, H. G. (1979). *Explorations in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Zhang, D. L. (2000). On coherence. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, *3*, 103–109.

Zhang, D. L. (2001). On cohesion. *Journal of Foreign Languages*, *2*, 23–28.

Zhang, D. L. (2022). *Theories of Cohesion and Coherence: Development and Application*. London and New York: Routledge.

Zhang, D. L., & Liu, R. S. (2003). *The development and application of cohesion and coherence theory*. Shanghai: Foreign Language Education Press.

Zhang, L. X. (2008). Error analysis and autonomous and collaborative modification – A study of college English composition based on the online corpus. *Computer-Assisted Foreign Language Education in China*, *6*, 16–21.

Zhang, W. (2015). Subjects accessibility in discourse studies: Theoretical model and its applications. *Foreign Languages in China*, *12*(04), 26–32.

Zhang, W. (2019). Towards the subjects' accessibility approach to discourse cohesion. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, *2*, 239–249.

Zhu, Y. S. (1997). Halliday's discourse coherence standard external misunderstanding and their own shortcomings. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, *1*, 23–27.