

Examining the most common conjunction errors in argumentative writing of Jordanian EFL learners

Ayman Talahin, Department of English Language and Translation, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Amman Arab University, Jordan, A.abdallah@aau.edu.jo, <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-2887-4360>.

Abdullah S. Aldelaa, Language Center, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan, abdullahs@hu.edu.jo, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6553-7998>

Ibtehaj M. Akhoirsheda, Language Center, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan ibtihaj@hu.edu.jo, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-48554-0295>

Majid Tarawneh, Qatar Foundations, Qatar, Doha, Maltarawneh@qf.org.qa, 0000-0001-8608-9330

Rawhi Alshamalat, phd Department of English Language and Translation, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Amman Arab University, Jordan, a.alshammalat@aau.edu.jo.

Abstract

Conjunctions are essential components that unify the pieces of a written text, ensuring its cohesiveness. EFL learners encounter difficulties in the efficient utilization of conjunctions in their writing. This research utilizes Halliday and Hassan's (1976) Taxonomy of Cohesive Devices. It analyzes the prevalent conjunction errors in argumentative essays written by EFL undergraduates. This qualitative study comprised sixty (n=60) undergraduates from the Department of English Language and Literature at Mu'tah University in Jordan. The study subjects were chosen purposively. The research employed textual and thematic analysis of students' essays to evaluate the cohesiveness of their argumentative writing. The density and precision of cohesive devices, textual unity, topic coherence, logical sequencing, and the writer's background knowledge were analyzed. The research methodology employed was text analysis. The articles contained several errors, including semantic, syntactic, stylistic, mechanical, redundancy, omission, unnecessary addition, and improper conjunction placement. The results indicated that the writing quality of students need enhancement, since the majority of the writing samples exhibited grammatical errors and insufficient use of conjunctions. The research delineates its results in connection with its context and the principal studies within the discipline. It analyzes the cohesion and accuracy of argumentative essays.

Keywords Conjunction, cohesive device, argumentative, English as a foreign language writing.

Introduction

Theories in the field of teaching languages in recent decades, particularly on writing in second or foreign languages, have endeavored to provide a consistent explanation for the chaos of incoherent writing among language learners (Mustafa, Arbab, & El Sayed, 2022). Diverse academic institutions have used simplified categories of these theories in collegiate writing. Furthermore, educational systems in schools and colleges have unique traditions that grow throughout time, influenced by cultural values and rhetoric. The introduction of pragmatics in the 1970s sparked the creation of several writing theories and models in universities and educational institutions (Tardy, 2025).

The objective was focused on establishing a fundamental framework for language function (Ellis, 1994). As the cultural context has evolved, the functions of writing in communication have also transformed. Linguists and writing instruction experts have thus faced the challenge of identifying critical, finite sets of educational objectives. An indicator of how various regions have addressed this issue is evident in the substantial disparity of genres in written educational materials across time and across borders. This genre distinction directly or indirectly reflects the diverse cultural requirements for interactional goals (Liu and Chen, 2022).

While writing in higher education serves numerous purposes, it mostly serves two basic functions. This includes communicative and epistemic writing. Communicative writing involves the interchange of thoughts, ideas, and knowledge. Epistemic writing is used to facilitate learning and clarify concepts (Pearson and Abdollahzadeh, 2023).

Learners may utilize the latter kind of writing with less focus on structural and genre development, concentrating instead on articulating ideas and concepts in the final written result. The former type of writing, or communicative writing, necessitates advanced writing skills and abilities for learners to attain cohesiveness and coherence within a certain genre or written material. This requires student writers to produce phrases and grammatical fragments in accordance with a specified logical framework organization. This necessitates their acquisition of proficiency in diverse writing styles and procedures for various writing purposes. Proficiency in grammatical structures and logical organization can assist a student in producing a cohesive and well-developed written content (Al Khotaba, 2022).

Consequently, writing students may improve their comprehension of the distinctions between written and spoken language by examining the different applications of writing, as well as the meanings and stylistic roles of vocabulary across different cultural settings or genres. Individuals proficient in English as a foreign or second language may often get admission to college or university with a practical command of everyday language and terminology (Altarawneh et al., 2026a). Writing and reading abilities may vary according to their broader linguistic context; nevertheless, one cannot depend on this variation without establishing a systematic method for teaching writing and a comprehensive grasp of the writing processes involved (Zhang, 2018).

At this stage of education, a student will become familiar with more scholarly applications of written language and other types of written genres and literature. The advanced linguistic knowledge, skills, capacities, and structures are fundamental components of language as a writing system. Some language learners gain advantages from cultural contexts that consistently offer a combination of academic and social language applications, whereas learners in exposed groups rely on educational and academic environments to aid their comprehension of the diverse cultural and linguistic codes inherent in formal language use. For many learners, curriculum objectives such as generating and refining a written work remain unclear and only tangentially connected to the mastery of various writing genres. The writing process is crucial for assisting novice authors with a straightforward framework to adhere to when composing. It also offers student writers an infallible strategy that consistently produces suitable outcomes. Facilitating student writers in effectively employing the writing processes will enable them to freely articulate their ideas and thoughts without constraints. From the perspective of writing instructors, writing processes are crucial as they offer solutions to several fundamental writing challenges (El-Freihat, 2021).

Literature Review

The term "text" is frequently used in linguistics, despite its various definitions. Halliday and Hasan (1976) describe text as a semantic unit. As a result, its link with a sentence is based on the fact of encoding one symbolic system within another, not its quantity. Malta and Sousa (2016) presume that the coherence of the overall meaning of the created text, as well as the cohesion between sentences and phrases, has been integrated. Silva (1990) defines a text as a coherent written work that can advance to the discourse level from the sentence level. It is the result of a communication event, which includes both units and constituents. Readers and authors interact to create a text. It is considered coherent, meaningful, ordered, well-developed, and communicative if it efficiently meets the communication goals of the encoder and decoder while complying to the context's syntactic and grammatical standards (Cook, 1994).

This viewpoint was previously suggested by De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981). Such definitions of a book introduce the concept of coherence (Al Maagbeh et al., 2026b). According to Ranalli et al. (2018), the presence of a decoder requires a text to be coherent and organized. This will allow individuals to easily explore and comprehend the shape and content of the text, eliminating unnecessary complexity. Bex (1996) describes a literary work as coherent when its words and clauses have structural integrity and are understandable to readers. A written text is considered cohesive if it follows grammatical rules and meets the communicative goals of the decoders, readers, and writers.

The researcher aims to highlight that, although the diverse methodologies and perspectives of various scholars regarding the interpretation of a written text, there is agreement that such a text must be composed of sentences that are cohesively linked in both form and content to ensure coherence and significance for the reader. A logical and relevant piece of writing should be presented in a way that allows the reader to process the content structurally and cognitively.

Statement of the Problem

The majority of Jordanian university students struggle to describe complicated concepts in writing resulting from an absence of both technical and general language abilities, according to the respondents. According to the findings, respondents with insufficient proficiency failed to arrange, review, and edit their written works, and their limited vocabulary had a negative impact on the quality of their writing.

In contrast, study did not assess the cohesion of the students' writing. Al Khotaba (2010) examined how Jordanian EFL students' compositions used lexical repetition and patterning. However, the study did not incorporate any other components of cohesiveness, such as conjunction devices.

The employment of conjunction devices in argumentative writing has not been considered (Al-Natsheh, 2007). The study, the researcher investigated the differences in using cohesive ties in the writings of students in 10th grade at private and public schools of Al-Karak Directorate of Education. Nevertheless, the study did not include undergraduate EFL learners. Similarly, Asassfeh, et al. (2013) examined the usage of logical connectors (LCs) in the expository writing of Jordanian undergraduate students majoring in English. The findings showed that students frequently utilized the same logical connectors, misused them both syntactically and semantically, and used them redundantly. Yet, there is no study conducted in the Jordanian context to examine the impact of using cohesive devices on argumentative writing. Various recommendations were made to solve students' difficulties of using cohesion in their composition (Alayaydeh, E'layan, et al., 2026b). However, problems persist as highlighted previously in this study. This is due to the fact that the majority of earlier research concentrated on some aspects of cohesive devices. Also, none of the studies examined the usage of conjunctions in argumentative composition. Therefore, researcher believes that conjunction devices have not received the attention they deserve in EFL context particularly in Jordan as revealed by the lack of investigation on cohesion (Al-Khotaba, 2010; Al-Natsheh, 2007; Bataineh and Zghoul, 2006 and Asassfeh, et al., 2013). Thus, this study examining the most common conjunction errors committed by Jordanian EFL students when writing argumentative.

Objective

By examining how Jordanian EFL learners employ conjunctions as cohesive devices in their argumentative writing, this study addresses gaps in the literature on the concept of cohesion. It examines the most common conjunction errors in argumentative written essays by Jordanian EFL undergraduates.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative design to investigate the utilization of cohesive devices in argumentative essays written by 60 undergraduate students majoring in English language and literature at Mu'tah University in Jordan for the academic year 2025/2026. Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2009) assert that employing qualitative design in a research project allows a researcher to cross-validate the study's research instruments and the findings of the investigations.

Participants

This study's purposive sample consisted of sixty Jordanian students. The sample included 39 males and 21 females. The sample size for this investigation was similar to that used in previous studies by Al Khresheh (2010) and Nawal (2014). The participants' ages ranged from 21 to 22 years. Arabic is the basic language for all fields. They had spent four years in a public university in Jordan and twelve years studying English in school.

Instrument

The ESL Essays Profile was the instrument used in this study. Jacob et al. (1981) developed this profile, which has been widely used (Ting, 2003; Meisuo, 2000; Sasaki & Hirose, 1999; Perkins, 1983). Writing is separated into five components, each with a different percentage in ESL essays. Profile: 30% content, 20% organization, 20% vocabulary, 25% language usage, and 5% mechanics. Each component has a specific set of criteria and a score range ranging from "excellent" to "very poor." Procedures attempted to determine whether the writing of the Jordanian EFL students showed such a link. Thus far, two raters have chosen and evaluated sixty purposively sampled writings from Jordan's Mu'tah University's higher education level. The raters initially assigned a score based on the papers' quality. They then determined the frequency counts of various conjunctive device examples in each piece of writing.

Procedures

This study was conducted because learners typically make errors in both comprehension and production. To achieve this purpose, the study applied Coder's (1974) error analysis model. This covered the following steps:

1. Collection of samples.
2. Identification of errors.
3. Description of errors.
4. Explanation of errors.
5. Evaluation of errors.

This study excluded Step 5, because Ellis (1994) claims that assessing learner errors is often viewed as a separate subject with its own specialized technique. The first four steps involve an analysis of errors from the learner's perspective, whereas error evaluation entails a commentary on the outcome. Table 1 shows the findings of the most common conjunction errors in argumentative essays written by EFL undergraduates.

Table 1: The Most Common Conjunction Errors in Argumentative Essays

Common Errors	Percentage	Frequency
1. Syntactic Errors	17	28.3%
2. Semantic Errors	15	24.0%
3. Stylistic Errors	8	13.3%
4. Mechanical	6	10.0%
5. Positional	6	10.0%
6. Unnecessary Addition	3	5.0%
7. Omission	3	5.0%
8. Redundant	2	3.3%

As depicted in Table 1, many errors were found in the essays, respectively: syntactic, semantic, stylistic, mechanical, positional, unnecessary addition, omission, and redundant errors.

Syntactic Misuse of Conjunctions

Syntactic misuse of conjunctions is another criterion of measuring errors in using conjunctions. The examples given show varied syntactic errors in students' written compositions. These syntactic errors can be taken into account as typos or spelling errors. For example, if the "s" in "beside" is taken out, it may be considered a spelling error. Furthermore, this may be a common problem for most of the EFL students.

[T12-H] **Beside** the author, a book is also the result of the corporation of many individuals.

[T1-L] **Beside that**, it's usually good to save the price of books and save time, but it is usually bad for eyes, neck and back health. In the age of technology (internet) has everywhere the necessities of life and fundamentals of education, especially universities, internet illuminations the lives of thousands of people by spreading knowledge internationally there by making us global citizen.

[T2-H] **As a conclusion**, modern technology has changed the way that we look at books and the way we read and write.

[T9-H] **As the conclusion**, based on the above mentions reasons, internet make the thing easier than in the past in term of books usage.

[T10-H] **As the result**, a lot of people used the internet to write down their thought, ideas, and inventions.

[T11-L] **Conclusion**, technology is a very important for our present and future, it is depending on the usage of it.

[T19-L] **In the conclusion**, technology in my opinion human being should use internet to express more to share wide.

[T23-L] **Conclusions**, the internet is important in our life time.

[T19-H] **For conclusion**, I don't encourage people to leave books, at the same time technology is very good thing.

It seems that "*as a conclusion*" and "*in the conclusion*" are misused syntactically. "*As a conclusion of something*" or "*as the conclusion from the something*" could be the correct form, in which neither case will act as a DC. These examples indicate students' unawareness of correct form. They should have used "*in conclusion*" instead. The student in examples T12-H, T1-L, T2-H, T9-H, T10-H, T11-L, T19-L, and T23-L misused "*conclusion*" in place of "*in conclusion*" and similar summation CDs.

[T3-H] **for an example**, books have been an essential source of knowledge for long time and they were a habit for many people.

[T15-H] **For an example**, Google and Yahoo are search engine information on the internet that provide all kind of topics.

These students syntactically misused "for example" by adding "an." She or he might have assumed that since "example" begins with a vowel sound, "an" is required before it. However, she or he might not have been aware that it is a CD to give an example and there is no need to add "an" before the noun "example" as indicated in T3-H, and T15-H, (Rababah and Melhm, 2015; Obeiah and Bataineh, 2016).

[T16-L] **At my point of view**, the most of readers prefer to read from real book because they think they will accept more idea and more information from whatever every one could download the same book from internet we could surfing and get the same information from that book.

[T11-H] **In my point of view**, the technological revolution helped us greatly, just with the click of button.

This example shows that the student was thinking in a particular way or trying to judge a situation “in/at my point of view”. However, the expression was syntactically misused, and the correct form is “from my point of view” or “in my view” as indicated in T16-L and T11-H.

Semantic Misuse of Conjunctions as Cohesive Devices

The following extracts from the writing of Jordanian EFL students show that some students misused conjunctions semantically. In each case, the conjunction was used to express meanings that were not usually associated with it.

Example:

[T27-L] one more advantage is that when we go for any picnic, we will ask our teachers about amazing places. Other than that, there is negatives for a student to use internet instead of using book to read about places”.

This sentence shows that other than that is semantically misused instead of on the other hand. It appears the student was attempting to demonstrate the difference between two sentences. In fact s/he did not have the knowledge about use of conjunctions on the other hand which means rather or the contrary.

[T24-H] Consequently, if you reading the eBook from electronic devices, then you have to carry special charger all time for your devices to keep it running. Otherwise, the devices will switch off when the battery goes low, and stopping you from continue reading.

In this sentence, “otherwise” is semantically misused in place of “on the other hand” and “in other respect”. It is obvious that student intended to add details to earlier sentences, but s/he chose an inappropriate conjunction.

[T21-L] Technology has not only changed the way of our looking at book but also it helps us to find our goal in so easy way. Using internet or technology provides great opportunities for making learning more effective not only one or two students but also to many students.

It appears that this student attempted to create parallelism with “but also”. However, a semantic misuse is evident. The problem is the use of “but also” without “not only”. Hence, the correct form would be “not only --- but also”. The subject could use “not only” at the sentence initial position instead of “but also”.

Stylistic Misuse of Conjunctions

Some students used certain conjunctions, while others used the official written form of language. A lack of register knowledge on conjunction usage may have a negative impact on writing and communication, and it is a common issue for EFL learners attempting to use cohesive devices effectively (Zewitra, Bakhti, and Ramadhan, 2023; Al Maagbeh et al., 2026). Furthermore, recognizing the style and register of cohesive devices requires comprehension and categorization of conjunctions. Some studies classify "for a start" and "so" as informal language, but "thus" and "furthermore" are considered formal (Quirk et al., 1985: 634). The following highlights the stylistic errors identified in the written compositions of Jordanian EFL students:

[T3-H] Actually when I read a book, which becomes apart from my life, then becomes apart from my personality.

As observed in the given examples, *“actually”* was misused stylistically. *“Actually”* is a conjunction device that is more likely to be used in the informal form of language (spoken) compared to the formal form of language (written), and it is, however, rather stylistically ineffective to be used in formal writing.

[T5-H] **Also**, it keeps the person more focus and successfully.

The given instance in the earlier section of this study show that “also” was misused stylistically by the students in their written compositions. That is, some students used the conjunction *“also”* as a cohesive in the sentence’s medial position, which appeared stylistically odd. This endorses that *“furthermore”* and *“moreover”* would rather be an appropriate option for *“also”* at the sentence initial position, as indicated in T5-H, (Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, 2013).

Students use some cohesive devices more overtly in spoken language than in written communication. According to the findings, Jordanian EFL students do not always use certain cohesive devices as conjunctions; instead, they use them as phrases in some situations. For example, He gave me something “other than that” precious gift. As a result, it may be revealed that the oral style or register of this cohesive device was misused by Jordanian EFL students.

[T22-L] **And** we use technology in all our life like hospital, shop, mall, market, school, army.

[T26-L] **And**, i think this is my personal opinion that the internet is very important for reading books.

In the earlier discussed examples, *“and”* was misused in terms of style and register due to the fact that *“and”* should not be used at the sentence’s initial position rather than the sentence’s medial position, as indicated by T22-L and T26-L, (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (4th ed.), 2003).

The findings may indicate that the participant overgeneralized certain Arabic language rules, supposing that the discourse marker “and” in English worked exactly like its Arabic counterpart. Wright (1975: pp. 209-291) defines discourse markers as connective or conditional particles, arguing that “Wa” connects sentences through simple coordination, expressing either subsequence or causality. Hamza (2006) investigated the use of “Wa; and” and concluded that its application in Arabic differs from its English equivalent, serving roles that go beyond the sentence level because it is a necessary component of meaningful Arabic speech. Significantly, significant research on Arabic writing connectives (Abbas et al., 2016) has revealed the ubiquity of additive connectives, such as “Wa; and,” as evidenced by student usage and the current study's findings.

Mechanical Misuse of Conjunctions

Jordanian EFL students used cohesive devices in their writing mechanics with just slight variations. The use of cohesive devices needs proper punctuation that expresses the learner's preferred writing style. They sometimes attribute different interpretations to the phrases used. Furthermore, language patterns are commonly related with the use of specific punctuation marks. This misuse is associated with a lack of awareness and diversity among students and authors (Alayaydeh, E'layan, et al., 2026b; Al-Hussein et al., 2026; Altarawneh et al., 2026a). The examples provided show inappropriate punctuation for coherent devices in texts written by Jordanian EFL students (T2-L, T29-L, T18-H, and T3-H).

[T2-L] In addition {#} to that technology (internet) changed the way that we look at books, this bad thing, also {#} there are advantages and disadvantages of technology (internet).

[T29-L] In conclusion {#} books and technology should complete each other, no one of them should dominate the other to have a good generation.

[T18-H] on the other hand {#} there are some drawbacks to internet. People are becoming more and more over dependent on internet.

[T3-H] So {#} it depends, some people still believe(trust) in books which have most honest information, and they still found their needs in reading these book, while the other prefer to surf net since it's saving time, money and effort.

For instance, the use of a comma in formal writing either before or after a conjunction is found to be significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the Jordanian EFL students appeared not to have full awareness and knowledge concerning the proper use of these conjunctions in association with the use of punctuation, as shown in T1-L, T12-L, and T13- L in the next section.

[T1-L] In addition, I always interested in learning about the state of reading today, that's giving many information to readers on digital devices{#} than we do in physical books, also we do not spend much time to get the materials that we need in our project{#} or even in any subject else.

[T12-L] Nowadays technology is spreading very fast in our daily life. It is a double-edged weapon. The new invention of all technological devices has changed the way that we deal with books.

[T13-L] The internet has many benefits {#}one of this benefits of internet medium of communication. There are many facilities on the internet helps as to communicate with other people from different countries around the world.

In excerpts, the students showed using commas in certain positions in the sentence where they were not supposed to be. This helped produce grammatically and structurally incorrect sentences. For instance, the use of a comma after conjunction devices such as "no doubt," "yet," "nowadays," "hence," and "so" appears to be one of these commonly realised cases among students.

[T11-L] Despite that, **if** you want to download the book, **then** it will cost you extra fees.

This instance also indicates that the student is aiming to use "if" as a conditional. Yet, it is obvious that the student is unaware of the punctuation of "if" clause. In fact, a comma (,) had to be used in place of "then" in this example, and including "then" would make the sentence grammatically unacceptable.

Positional Misuse of Conjunctions

Taking into account the positional characteristics of conjunction devices, they were used at the sentence's initial, medial, and final positions after coordinating devices such as "and," "or," and "but" after subjects, adverbial phrases, or linking verbs. It was revealed that some Jordanian EFL students did not show any appropriate use of cohesive devices. The following are some examples indicating such usage.

[T3-H] **Especialy** when I touch the book's pages. In fact, I feel happy and proud, so give me a book and I will still alive.

[T11-L] **Specially**, internet changed everything not only the way that we look to any different material, even if it had negative impact but it does help us to find answer of everything.

These examples indicate some positional misuses with regard to some conjunctions, such as "especialy" in the earlier discussed sentence. As stated by researchers, the use of "especialy" should be used after a subject. Furthermore, when used as conjunctions / cohesive devices, "especialy" should not be used before the subject. The appropriate form of use should be "students especialy can use" as indicated in T3-H and T11-L (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (4th ed.), 2003).

[T13-H] **But** we realize that using internet became a part of our life and we can't give up on it.

[T15-L] It's easy to carry and faster we search anytime, we can send message any time anywhere. **But** it effects our eyes due the brightens of the screen.

[T12-L] **But** we are not forced to follow all the development.

Although the previous example indicates certain contrast in the use of "but," it is realised that it cannot be utilised in the sentence's initial position as a conjunction or cohesive device. Hence, the use of "but" in the earlier given examples is wrong because "but" is not applicable at the sentence initial position in formal English (the written form of language) as indicated in T13-H, T15-L, and T12-L. This proposes that "However" and "Nevertheless" could be appropriate cohesive devices instead of "but". Another issue with the use of "but" in the earlier given examples is that it preceded a comma. In formal register, this conjunction or cohesive device typically precedes a comma.

Unnecessary Addition of Conjunctions

The usage of two cohesive devices (conjunctions) from the same sub-category within a single phrase is unusual, especially when they express identical meanings and perform the same purpose in the same way. The following samples show the repeated usage of various underlined cohesive devices in written text. The underlined cohesive devices or conjunctions are from the same sub-category of cohesive devices and have almost identical implications; nonetheless, using these devices together in a same phrase is both unnecessary and incorrect, as indicated in T17-L and T13-L in the following section.

[T17-L] **On other hand**, as a disadvantage, educators may consider this information overload, **Moreover**, with all the information available to students, he may find it difficult to choose which information is most important to his topic.

[T13-L] **In conclusion**, I believe that the internet helps people in the communication, information and entertainment. **However**, the internet also has much negative side. **Therefore**, use their internet for positive things so that are get a lot of benefits.

Omission of Conjunctions

Not like other types of errors that included unnecessary use of cohesive devices or conjunctions, certain uses of cohesive devices seem to be significant and necessary, as indicated in the following instances.

[T7-L] There are many ways technology has changed the way we read and learn. Technology is constantly improving itself. Before there was printing, people use to tell stories orally. Then the printing press invented mass-produced books. Now books have kept up with technology and are in screen format the invention of computers, tablets, and smartphone has changed the way we read and learn. There are new forms of communication, research is performed mostly online. Also, classroom is getting rid of chalkboards and paper, text books are interactive.

[T8-L] Nowadays, things have changed, internet made everything much easier, you don't have to spend time and money to get what you want, one click will give you a very large amount of information.

Upon examination of the offered examples, it is clear that each example contains two unique ideas or meanings; thus, there is a lack of an associative cohesive device that connects the concepts. The use of contrastive cohesive devices such as "in contrast," "however," and "while" conveys the concept of contrast while ensuring a coherent and understandable narrative. Using a cohesive device of contrast in the designated blank indicated by the symbol { } results in a coherent, united, and meaningful written language, as seen in T7-H (Al Mughrabi, 2017).

The student or writer most likely believed he was addressing fundamentally different opposing ideas, but he may have lacked the necessary writing abilities to convey them effectively and accurately. He may not have had sufficient expertise or understanding of the use of cohesive devices to connect concepts and

effectively communicate meaning to the audience. Thus, communicating an idea without acknowledging the use of cohesive devices in written language jeopardizes its unity and coherence. The contrastive sub-category of cohesive devices, which includes *"on the one hand," "on the other hand,"* and *"in contrast,"* improves the logical connections between sentences in written text by effectively contrasting and opposing ideas, allowing the audience to better understand the flow of thoughts.

[T20-H] In reality, technology has developed and spread throughout the world. It becomes important and irreplaceable in our lives. In general, there are many kinds of technology that changed life for the better, such as medical technologies, transports, arts and music, entertainments and media, artificial intelligence, and science. For science, it plays a crucial role, especially, to learners who use the internet in their reading and doing their homework.

As a matter of fact, Jordanian EFL students did not show any use of cohesive in written text such as *"for example"* or *"for instance"* to reveal that they are trying to provide instances after the first sentences to enrich their ideas and thoughts, as indicated in T7-L.

[T7-L] In my opinion, technology have advantages and disadvantages. The advantages of it has improved communication technology tools, easy access to information at any time and everywhere. Social network for marketing and business. {#} The disadvantages are most of people do not use internet in proper way to success their goals.

[T7-L] Nowadays, things have changed, internet made everything much easier, {#} you don't have to spend time and money to get what you want, one click will give you a very large amount of information. Next, internet is the greatest thing for communication. {#} You can connect with others easily through video call and messenger too. You can exchange your emotional everyday on internet.

Each example in the preceding section has several instances in which multiple phrases repeat the same expression or concept. As a result, each sentence exists independently of the others. This is because the text would lack a large number of additive cohesive devices. The use of additive conjunctions would improve the text's logical consistency and structure. They would also improve the written material and increase its readability.

The writer may have used cohesive devices such as *"to begin with," "also,"* and *"then"* to help readers understand the links within the text. The use of *"moreover"* implies that the student should have used other additive cohesive devices previously, which were omitted. Similarly, further examples show a variety of applications of cohesive devices within the same category, such as *"another advantage would be,"* which can be used at the beginning of the sentence in the second example.

[T14-L] {#} Technology has been used in various places such as houses, offices and official institutions in the countryside, the city and desert. and it is natural for people to deal with them regardless of their level of civilization or less.

This is the final case in which "and" is used to complete the textual discourse. As a result, no firm conclusions should be reached about the use of cohesive devices like *"in conclusion," "to conclude,"* or *"to sum up"* to indicate the completion of a written work or assignment. The use of these coherent elements would draw readers' attention and connect them to the main idea or theme of the book, assisting them in comprehending how the authors ended their arguments. The use of such cohesive elements would undoubtedly improve the coherence and cohesiveness of the written content.

Redundancy in the Use of Conjunctions

The following examples highlight a common error made by EFL writers when using conjunctions such as *"although"* and *"but."* The use of cohesive devices such as *"although"* provides a sense similar to *"despite the fact that."* It is frequently used at sentence's initial position to indicate a level of awareness or understanding that differs from the information delivered in the following sentence. As a result, EFL learners frequently attempt to use these two coherent methods simultaneously, influenced by their original language. The following example demonstrates the writers' incorrect use of the cohesive

techniques "although" and "but" to convey two contradictory elements. The use of "but" deviates significantly from the active grammatical structure of language, as shown in T33-L and T22-H.

[T33-L] As soon as the technology start to grow bigger the people started to forget about the books, because all the books become electronic. **Although** books are still usable **but** people start to forget about them. To sum up, technology brought many destruction rather than good things for users **although** many advantages around, **But** everything depend on the users.

[T22-H] Firstly, technology can be considered as a bad influence on people **due to the** wide variety of information it provides that can be confusing and not precisely accurate or true to the readers.

For example, the use of "due to" in the above example indicates the meaning of "because of." This is because "due to" is used to represent "caused by" or "attributed to" in the first place, in which it has a different meaning from "because". "Due to" is an adjective that modifies a noun phrase, whereas "because of" is an adverbial phrase that modifies a verb or an entire sentence. Thus, using "due to" to change a phrase in these cases is grammatically incorrect. Second, two occurrences of cohesive devices in two consecutive phrases are inappropriate from a register standpoint, which the writer failed to notice.

[T4-H] Indeed, reading book also on your laptop screen is more comfortable and less costless even you can carry it anywhere or place. Also, easy to store and copy/pose but on other hand, loss royalty, delight of paper book, it depends on electronic, made pair and effort to the eyes, etc.

[T5-H] Also, using technology also inspire our life from ancient time to the recent days, one of the good things that which find out the technology is the easier things.

Furthermore, students demonstrated good use of certain cohesive devices, which they used to convey new information that reinforced previously taught concepts. The term "also" can be used in both spoken and written language; nevertheless, wrong usage may make a written document appear odd. The inappropriate usage of "also" may give the language a sense of formality and intricacy, as shown in T4-H, and T5-H. While the writer was cautious in giving fresh data that supported his previous argument, he appeared to be unaware of more cohesive ways that achieve identical goals and improve writing quality. They may have used alternate cohesive devices like "moreover," "in addition," and "furthermore," which fulfill the same function.

Results

Improper usage of conjunctions is a common concern among EFL students. It appears to be a characteristic linked with EFL students' writing, while it may also be found in advanced authors (Crewe, 1990). Ong (2011) demonstrates that inappropriate usage of cohesive devices is a common language issue among ESL/EFL students. Despite previous work not identifying misspelled conjunctions or their syntactic underuse, this study found that most selected writing samples had syntactic misuse or underuse of conjunctions (Altarawneh et al., 2026b). Conjunctions may be misspelled. Omitting "s" from "besides" may be a spelling error, but replacing "for example" with "for an example" shows conjunction knowledge. Writing teachers seem to overlook instructional methods and conjunctions. Students frequently view editing and editing separately when writing.

Writing students and instructors benefit from this conclusion because it explains conjunctions and their thorough investigation. Despite their lack of syntactic and semantic awareness of cohesive devices, Jordanian EFL students showed acceptable comprehension of conjunction register and stylistic features. Register and style affect conjunction frequency (Biber, 1988). Switching between formal and informal terms like "actually," "moreover," and "anyway," which are prevalent in spoken language, can misuse a register or style. French and Asian authors share these traits (Field and Yip, 1992: 26).

The inappropriate use of conjunctions can be attributed to a moderate neglect of style and register in school. The distinction between formal and informal language styles can be discussed, but not with sufficient emphasis (Alkhotaba, 2010; Rababah and Melhm, 2015; Obeiah and Bataineh, 2016). One key

cause is the need for a thorough understanding of conjunction usage in glossaries, writing materials, and dictionaries. Therefore, it is essential to prioritize the role and placement of conjunctions, emphasizing the examination of their use in real-life contexts. Writers must revisit the accessibility of conjunction placement by analyzing actual instructional materials (Granger & Tyson, 1996). Examining redundant additions, omissions, and repetitions of conjunctions revealed that writers use them without the necessity to convey a point. EFL students can recognize conjunctions as syntactic elements. They appear to continue using conjunction devices to connect sentences rather than to govern concepts and phrases.

Cohesion became a goal in and of itself, rather than a means to an end. Furthermore, authors require inspection and assistance while educating and learning to write. Also, some students may lack the necessary knowledge about the application of conjunctions, resulting in their inappropriate use. It is critical to sufficiently focus on the use of cohesive devices in order to effectively explain the proper function of conjunctions. The incorrect usage of conjunctions may result in poor writing quality. Conjunctions are important and should be used with caution (Milton & Tsang, 1993).

Discussion

Examining conjunctions demonstrated that writers accidentally drop linked coherent devices, making it difficult to distinguish between opposing perspectives. This could happen for numerous reasons. Writers may not know how to employ cohesive devices and cannot distinguish between opposing ideas. This may be shown by “contrastive-concessive” categorization frequency. This is underused or misused. Writing instructional materials may also be a problem owing to teachers and students not paying attention to conjunction use. Thus, effective instructional materials, tactics, techniques, and contexts can help students employ conjunction (Alayaydehet et al., 2026a). This is assumed because learners repeatedly utilized the same conjunction without considering different coherent strategies. Inappropriate conjunction use may also be linked to a lack of knowledge in textbook and teaching materials. However, further studies should corroborate the present study's conclusions. The findings of this study accord with those of Ong, J. (2011), Asassfeh, et al. (2013), Kalajahi, (2014), Mohamed, Darweesh, & Kadhim (2016), Al Mughrabi, F. M. (2017), Macora, (2020), and Alkhotaba (2022). Thus, many interconnected causes cause Jordanian EFL students to misuse conjunctions. An investigation of Jordanian students' conjunction use showed that these devices create semantic linkages between concepts and combine ideas inter-sententially to construct compound sentences. Error study showed that Jordanian EFL students find conjunctions difficult to use in argumentative writing for several reasons.

The main cause of conjunction misuse may be textbook recommendations. Students' written products reflect such misperceptions since conjunctions are categorized by function, (Darweesh, & Kadhim, 2016). Jordanian EFL students also misuse conjunctions due to native language interference. In contrast to prior studies, the new study has excellent instructional implications for EFL teachers, learners, and researchers, notably in Jordan and body awareness (Alamouh et al., 2026; Abu Dalou et al., 2026). In addition, Jordanian EFL students' written compositions show many conjunction errors due to transferring meaning from Arabic to English (Karazoun and Abdelmajid, 2016). Jordanian EFL students' frequent use of conjunctions in argumentative writing has complicated the text. Not all Jordanian students in this study are included. The need for textuality in argumentative writing made text complex. Crewe (1990) offered three ways teachers and students can prevent conjunction complication. These approaches may help EFL Jordanian students avoid conjunction usage (Althnaibat et al., 2025). These approaches include a reductionist approach, an expansionist approach and a deductionist approach.

Conclusion

Jordanian EFL students may utilize comparable conjunctions differently. As shown in their erroneous usage of conjunction in reverse, learners may have trouble utilizing conjunctions correctly. As indicated before in this research, EFL writers (low-level and high-level competence) may perform differently when using conjunctions in argumentative writing when encountering the same challenges. EFL writing teachers should adapt their methods and materials to address this issue. Focusing on the authentic causes of conjunction usage helps decision makers and curriculum designers create a useful pedagogical design and minimize textual errors. In general, Jordanian EFL students need conjunction practice. The final goal of this study was to analyze conjunction errors in student writing. Jordanian EFL students utilize conjunctions differently and similarly. Qualitative research analysis showed that Jordanian EFL students struggled to use coherent devices or conjunctions without errors in their writing.

References

- Abbas, J. M., Yasin, M. S. M., & Ismail, K. (2016). Arabic language influence on the Iraqi EFL tertiary learners' use of grammatical cohesive devices in their argumentative essays. *International Editorial and Advisory Board*, 4(1), 28–35.
- Al-Khotaba, E. H. (2010). The use of lexical repetition and patterning in written compositions of Jordanian students majoring in English language and literature at Mu'tah University: A case study (*Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation*). Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- Al Khotaba, E. (2022). Cohesive connectivity in Arabic-English translated texts by English as foreign language students. *British Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(1), 22–27.
- Al-Khresheh, M. (2010). Interlingual interference in the English language word order structure of Jordanian EFL learners. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 16(1), 106–113.
- Al Mughrabi, F. M. (2017). Arab learners of English and the use of discourse markers in writing. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(4), 715–721.
- Al Natsheh, M. (2007). Cohesion in 10th grade students essay at public and private schools in Al Karak Directorate (*Unpublished master's thesis*). Mu'tah University, Jordan.
- 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.
- Asassfeh, S., Alshboul, S., & Alshaboul, Y. (2013). Distribution and appropriateness of use of logical connectors in the academic writing of Jordanian English-major undergraduates. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, 13(3), 15–19.
- Bataineh, R. F., & Zghoul, L. H. (2006). Jordanian TEFL graduate students' use of critical thinking skills (as measured by the Cornell Critical Thinking Test, Level Z). *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(1), 33–50.
- Bex, T. (1996). Variety in written English—*texts in society: Societies in text*. Routledge.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., Finegan, E., & Quirk, R. (1999). Longman grammar of spoken and written English (Vol. 2). Longman.
- Cook, G. (1995). Discourse and literature: The interplay of form and mind. Oxford University Press. <https://archive.org/details/discourseliterat0000cook>
- Corder, S. P. (1974). Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), *Error analysis* (pp. 158–171). Longman.
- Crewe, W. J. (1990). The illogic of logical connectives. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 316–325.
- Darweesh, A. D., & Kadhim, S. A. H. (2016). Iraqi EFL learners' problems in using conjunctions as cohesive devices. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(11), 169–180.
- De Beaugrande, R. A., & Dressler, W. U. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics* (Vol. 1). Longman.
- El-Freihat, S. M. (2021). Challenges facing students in writing theses at the Jordanian universities. *Kıbrıslı Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 16(6), 3266–3277.
- Ellis, R. (1994). The study of second language acquisition. Oxford University Press.

- Field, Y., & Oi, Y. L. M. (1992). A comparison of internal conjunctive cohesion in the English essay writing of Cantonese speakers and native speakers of English. *RELC Journal*, 23(1), 15–28.
- Gay, L., & Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (7th ed.). Pearson International Edition.
- Granger, S., & Tyson, S. (1996). Connector usage in the English essay writing of native and non-native EFL speakers of English. *World Englishes*, 15(1), 17–27.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
- Hamza, M. (2006). Discourse markers in written Arabic. Teachers' *College Researchers Journal*, 1(1), 232–243.
- Hung, D. M., & Thu, V. T. A. (2014). Vietnamese learners' attention and use of cohesive devices in English essay writing at Dong Thap University. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 2(2), 1–14.
- Jacobs, H. L. (1981). *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach*. Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Kalajahi, S. A. R. (2014). *A corpus-based study of Malaysian ESL students' use of discourse connectors in upper and post-secondary argumentative writing* (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Putra Malaysia).
- Karazoun, A., & Abdelmajid, G. (2016). A linguistic analysis on errors committed by Jordanian EFL undergraduate students: A case of news headlines in Jordanian newspapers. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 170–189.
- Liu, C., & Chen, M. (2022). A genre-based approach in the secondary school English writing class: Voices from student-teachers in the teaching practicum. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 992360.
- Macora, Y. D. (2020). The problems of discourse markers and coherence in the graduate's theses of Sintuwu Maroso University. *Sintuwu Maroso: Journal of English Teaching*, 2(1), 11–18.
- Malta, P., & Sousa, R. D. (2016). Process oriented approaches in enterprise architecture for business-IT alignment. *Procedia Computer Science*, 100, 888–893.
- Meisuo, Z. (2000). Cohesive features in the expository writing of undergraduates in two Chinese universities. *RELC Journal*, 31(1), 61–95.
- Milton, J. C., & Tsang, E. S. C. (1993). A corpus-based study of logical connectors in EFL students' writing: Directions for future research. In *Studies in lexis. Proceedings of a seminar on lexis organized by the Language Centre of the HKUST, Hong Kong* (Language Centre, HKUST, Hong Kong, 1993).
- Mohamed, N. (2016). Use of conjunctions in argumentative essay by ESL undergraduates. *E-Academia Journal*, 5(1), 16–22.
- Mustafa, A., Arbab, A. N., & El Sayed, A. A. (2022). Difficulties in academic writing in English as a second/foreign language from the perspective of undergraduate students in higher education institutions in Oman. *Arab World English Journal*, 13(3), 41–53.
- Obeiah, S. F., & Bataineh, R. F. (2016). The effect of portfolio-based assessment on Jordanian EFL learners' writing performance. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 9(1), 32–46.

- Ong, J. (2011). Investigating the use of cohesive devices by Chinese EFL learners. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 11(3), 42–65.
- Pearson, W. S., & Abdollahzadeh, E. (2023). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A systematic review. *Lingua*, 293, 103561.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). A comprehensive grammar of the English language. Longman.
- Ranalli, J., Feng, H. H., & Chukharev-Hudilainen, E. (2018). Exploring the potential of process-tracing technologies to support assessment for learning of L2 writing. *Assessing Writing*, 36, 77–89.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2013). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833835>
- Silva, T. (1990). Second language composition instruction: Development, issues, and directions in ESL. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 11–23). Cambridge University Press.
- Tardy, C. M. (2025). *Teaching second language academic writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zamel, V. (1982). Teaching composition in the ESL classroom: What we can learn from research in the teaching of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10(1), 67–76.
- Zewitra, Z., Bakhti, K. Y., & Ramadhan, M. S. (2023). EFL learners' tendency in using conjunctions in writings: Evidence from English Diploma-III students. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 6(4), 705–713.
- Zhang, X. (2018). Diluting minority students' marginalization in the mainstream college English writing classroom through functional linguistic praxis: A case report from China. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 27(6), 465–475.
- Al Maagbeh, M. M. F., Altarawneh, M. M., E'layan, M. K., Al Dalaien, A. A., Alayaydeh, H. A. S., Al-Tarawneh, D. I., Baniamer, A., Alhendi, N., Altarawneh, S. M. D., & Alhusban, O. A. K. K. (2026b). The role of artificial intelligence technologies in protecting the environment and enhancing its sustainability. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 7(3). <https://doi.org/10.58256/7dcy5w77>
- Alayaydeh, H. A. S., E'layan, M. K., Altarawneh, S. M. D., Al-Hobabseh, W. I., Alkhatatneh, A. A. S., & others. (2026b). Project management of major construction projects in Jordan between contractual standardization and dispute reality: An empirical assessment of FIDIC contracts. *Journal of Intelligent Decision Making and Information Science*, 3(4s), Article 1152. <https://doi.org/10.59543/jidmis.v3.1152>
- Alayaydeh, H. A. S., E'layan, M. K., et al. (2026a). FIDIC contracts, risk allocation, and sustainability in international construction: Comparative lessons from mega projects. *Journal of Intelligent Decision Making and Information Science*, 3(1), Article 1145. <https://doi.org/10.59543/jidmis.v3.1145>
- Althnaibat, O. H. A., Alayaydeh, H. A. S., Abu Hazeem, M. S., Al Atiyat, M. M., Al Tarawneh, R. Y., & Abueid, A. Q. M. (2025a). The digital historian: Between civic responsibility and ethical obligation: A comparative study. *Journal of Human Security*, 21(2), 181–187. <https://doi.org/10.12924/johs2025.210227>
- Al-Hussein, S. M. S., Hmaidan, R. M., Azzeh, S. B. N., Bashabsheh, Z. M. F., Alsubehat, E. A. S., Heif, M. K., Altarawneh, S. M. D., E'layan, M. K., Aladaseen, M. A., & Alayaydeh, H. A. S. (2026). Civil liability for environmental damages arising from the use of artificial intelligence technologies in fertilizers and pesticides: An analytical comparative study. *Natural Resources for Human Health*, 6(5s), 27–45. <https://nrfhh.com>

Altarawneh, D., Meeush, S., Tarawneh, S. Y. S., Saraireh, R. M. Y., Aljaafari, M., E'layan, M. K., Alabdallat, F. M., & Alayaydeh, H. A. S. (2026). The impact of engineering management on the establishment of strict product liability and the legal defenses available against AI-based smart products. *Social Science Forum*, 10(8), 1047–1070. <https://doi.org/10.10118/SSFJ/2610861>

Altarawneh, D., Meeush, S., Alabdallat, F. M., Saleh, N. A. H., Maagbeh, M. M. F. A., E'layan, M. K., & Alayaydeh, H. A. S. (2026). Civil protection of intellectual property rights against infringements arising from the deployment of artificial intelligence systems: A comparative legal analysis. *Social Science Forum*, 10(8), 891–909. <https://doi.org/10.10118/SSFJ/2610849>

Alamoush, S. J. A., Abu Ghazleh, A. M., Altarahweh, S. M. D., Aldasaeen, M. A., Alayadeh, H. A. S., Ramadin, M. A. M., & Elyan, M. K. (2026). *Towards AI-powered electronic arbitration for investment dispute resolution: A comparative analytical study*. *Družboslovne Razprave*. Retrieved from <https://druzboslovne-razprave.org>

Abu Dalou, M. W. M., Al-qaisi, A. H., Al Maagbeh, M. M. F., Elfawair, O. T. A., Ramadin, M. A. M., Alqaisi, S. A. A., Altarawneh, S. M. D., E'layan, M. K., & Alayaydeh, H. A. S. (2026). The impact of constitutional amendments on entrenching the right to public health. *Natural Resources for Human Health*, 6(5s), 46–59. <https://nrfhh.com>