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ABSTRACT

Cohesion is the Semantic relation between the elements which are used in the text and it could be regarded as a part of the system of language.

Doing this study about Cohesive Devices is a little bit challenging as this study presents a comparative analysis of cohesive devices in two different texts which are written by two different writers; First: an English learner Text (Erbil named 2014 Arab Tourism Capital) Written by Barzan Muhammad/Rudaw, and Second: a native speakers Text (Welcome to Erbil, Tourism Boom Town) Written by Harvey Morris.

We are analyzed both texts according to five types of cohesion which are introduced by Halliday and Hasan (1976). The study shows some significant differences and similarities in terms of employing the types of cohesion.
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1- INTRODUCTION

Many studies have been conducted for several decades in order to explore the use of cohesive devices in both English learner writing and native speaker writing. Paltridge (2006: 2) states that discourse analysis deals with the knowledge of the language and it is concerned with the usage of word, expression and sentence across a text. Therefore, the study of cohesive elements in discourse analysis would be important to investigate texts. According to Larson (1998), cohesion is used...
during the discourse and it binds the parts of a sentence together in order to create a text. This means that cohesion is one of the basic features of textuality which allows the text to be communicative. This study presents a comparative analysis of cohesive devices in two different texts which are written by two different writers; an English learner and a native speaker. In addition, Halliday and Hasan (1976) divided cohesion into two types as lexical and grammatical. Also, grammatical cohesion divided into four categories: conjunction, reference, ellipsis and substitution. The aim of this study is to determine how the cohesive devices are used in the writing by an English learner compared with a native speaker.

2- RESEARCH BACKGROUND ON COHESION AND COHESIVE DEVICES

2-1 Cohesion
According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), cohesion is the semantic relation between the elements which are used in the text and it could be regarded as a part of the system of language. These elements would be a certain group of potential devices which are used in a language and they are responsible for connecting one part to another part of sentences in a text. Also, Paltridge (2006: 130) considers that cohesive devices can be found in any language and they join the expressions together in the text. Thus, the devices play an important role in writing and they would be used more in some genres and less in others. Similarly, Baker (1992:180) shares the same opinion with Halliday and Hasan’s and states that cohesion is a group of lexical, grammatical and other relations which join words and expressions among sentences within a text. This illustrates that the relationships among the sentences are crucial to produce a meaningful text.

Regarding the style of writing and use of cohesive devices in both learner’s and native speaker’s texts, Connor (1984) insists that it would be easy to find differences in using cohesive devices between learner’s and the native speaker’s writing. This illustrates that cohesive devices might not equally use by the English learner and native speaker. On the other hand, Gass and Selinker (2001) state that regular errors could be occurred in English learner’s writing. Those errors could be caused due to lack of knowledge of using cohesive devices. Obviously, Halliday and Hasan (1976) argue that a text is created by merging words and sentences, and cohesive devices lead to make a texture. These features play an important role to combine parts of texts together.

2-2 Types of Cohesion
This part of the study discusses the five categories of cohesion according to Halliday and Hasan’s study.

2-2-1 Lexical Cohesion
The first type is lexical cohesion, Hoey (1991: 26) agrees that cohesion results from the relation of lexical items rather than the grammatical. Also, Halliday and Hasan (1994: 274) state that cohesive devices could be achieved by the selection of vocabulary and there are various semantic relationships among lexical items. However, Baker (1992: 202) defines the lexical cohesion as a linguistic device which plays a role to create unity within the text. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 286) categorise lexical cohesion into two sub-classes: reiteration and collocation. Reiteration
refers to the repetition of the lexical items. It has direct and indirect types. Direct repetition is the use of same lexical items throughout the text, for example, visit: visits.

However, the indirect repetition consists of synonym, antonym, hyponym and meronym. Synonymy means using words which have the same meaning such as issue: problem. Antonym is another kind of indirect repetition, which indicates the opposite meaning of the word, for example, big: small. Hyponym means using subordinate, for instance, fruit: apple. Meronym is using part of a concept which refers to a whole, for example, keyboard: computer. Another kind of lexical cohesion is collocation, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 286) state that collocation is different from reiteration because it is a pair of words. Therefore, it could refer to sharing the same lexical background and retain semantic relationship between words, for instance, king ... crown, bee... honey and door... window. Another linguist, Tanskanen (2006) believe that collocation might be employed mainly in the writing by the English learner, but it might not always carry the cohesive sense. There is another kind of lexical cohesion which is the general nouns; “a small set of nouns having generalised reference within the major noun classes” such as thing, person, place, plant and idea (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 274). Besides that Bloor and Bloor (2004) assert that general nouns are commonly used in the English language and they constitute a significant type of lexical cohesion.

2-2-2 Conjunction

Another type of cohesion is conjunction, which is used to join two ideas together in the writing. Beason and Lester (2009) state that the English learner or native speaker should employ numerous conjunction devices to combine the ideas together and retain the relationships between expressions in text. Moreover, using conjunction devices in one language is different from in another language. Likewise, Baker (1992: 190) states that conjunction contrasts reference, ellipsis and substitution, because the receiver would not be directed to feel the omitting or missing the words. This means that these devices are not used to replace the omitted part, but they only give new information. In addition, Paltridge (2006: 139) argues that the conjunction elements combine two similar or different thoughts within the text. Moreover, the conjunctions are divided into four categories: additive, adversative, causal and temporal. Firstly, additive conjunction expresses an additional or further information, for instance, and, or, also, in addition, furthermore, and besides. Adversative conjunctions are used as a contrast, for example, but, yet, however, instead and nevertheless. The causal device is another type of conjunction and it illustrates the result, reason and purpose, such as because, therefore, so and consequently. Finally, temporal indicates time or sequence, for instance, next, after, finally and at last.

2-2-3 Reference

Reference is also discussed by a number of linguists and they have different thoughts and definitions in terms of using references in the texts. Baker (1992: 181) defines reference as a semantic relationship between a word and its reference to the element. In addition, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 33) divide reference into two parts: exophoric and endophoric. The exphoric one is a situational reference which depends on the knowledge of the world, because the item refers to something in the immediate environment. For example, tree which refers to an object. However, endophoric is a textual reference that refers to things surrounding the text and it has two types: anaphoric which refers to preceding text and cataphoric which refers to following text. Reference involves three different categories which are demonstrative, comparative and pronominal.
Demonstrative is used to refer to something, it has two types: definite article such as the and demonstrative pronouns such as this, these, that and those. According to Hinkel (2001), using the demonstrative devices in the writing are important, because they only indicate a particular noun or expression in the text, not the whole part. The comparative devices are the elements used to compare two different ideas, for instance, another, different and worse. Finally, pronominal is the pronoun which replaces proper names or the doer, for example, he, it, she, and they.

2-2-4 Ellipsis

Baker (1992: 187) introduces ellipsis as an omission of an item and substitute by nothing. This means omitting some parts of a sentence which are unnecessary to be repeated and still understood by the reader. The last two types of grammatical cohesion, which are ellipsis and substitution, are very similar to each other. Similarly, Halliday and Hasan (1976) explain that ellipsis is omitting some words and being replaced by non-words. For example:

- Ali went to London at Christmas, but Sara went to Birmingham.
  The elliptical item is ‘at Christmas’ in the second sentence.

2-2-5 Substitution

Substitution is the final type of cohesion, which means replacement of an item or a part of a sentence by another in the text. It is a relation between words rather than the meaning. Thus, Paltridge (2006: 142) highlights the difference between substitution and reference in terms of relations. Substitution deals with grammar and linguistic form; while the reference deals with the semantics and meaning. Therefore, substitution consists of three types: nominal, verbal and clausal. Nominal talks about the items which are used instead of repeating nouns, for example, one, any and some. However, verbal is using a verb rather than a noun, for instance, do. Finally, clausal substitution is replacing words with a clausal conjunction item without repeating the whole part, for example, so and the same. Following the examples above:

- Tim lost his wallet. He will buy another one. (Nominal substitute)
- Do you go to school? Yes, I do. (Verbal substitute)
- Alison teaches general English at the school. Tim teaches the same. (Causal substitution)

3- METHODOLOGY

3-1 Secondary Data

In this research, two literary texts have been used, English Learner’s and Native Speaker’s Texts. Both texts have shared the same genre and introduced the same topic which is entitled ‘Erbil City as the Capital of Arab Tourism’. The two texts are written by different journalists and they are available on the internet. The first material, which is about 680 words, has been written by a native journalist (Harvey Morris) and it was published in The Guardian newspaper. The second one, that consists of 660 words, has been written by an English learner journalist (Barzan Muhammad) and it was published in a local newspaper in Rudaw. These two texts contain many cohesive devices. The comparison between the usages of these cohesive devices in two texts has been helpful in identifying the main type of cohesion which was usually used by the learner when writing. The
most suitable methods in the analysis of the data depend on the previous works of scholars and researchers. In this study, the collected data will be analysed and some tables will be provided to show the differences and similarities in using cohesive devices in two texts. Then the findings will be discussed and summarized in the conclusion.

3-2 Research Questions and Hypotheses

The study conducted the following questions and they have been answered during the analysis of two texts:

1- How do the English learner and native speaker use cohesive devices in their writing?

2- How do cohesive devices influence learner’s writing?

This investigation has presupposed that English learner employs more cohesive devices that of the English speaker.

4- ANALYSIS

4-1 Lexical Cohesion

First of all, the two texts are analysed to explore the use of lexical cohesion. Table (1) shows the types of lexical cohesive devices which are used in both texts. It is found that they include a number of lexical items and they are commonly used in both texts compared with other types of cohesion. The lexical items divided into two main parts: reiteration and collocation. Reiteration refers to direct repetition and indirect repetition.

According to McGee (2009), the repetition is often used by the native speaker rather than the learner. Reiteration represents the direct repetition and it is frequently employed by the learner. The English learner retains to repeat the same item and uses a wide range of them in the text without replacing them by pronouns or substitution, for instance, governor, contest and Kurd. In contrast, native speaker used less repetition and replace them by synonyms like tourism, autonomous and Arab.

Synonym is one of the indirect types of repetition of lexical cohesion and it demonstrates the vocabulary knowledge of the writer. Crystal (1995) states that synonymy refers to the same meaning of two signals. The majority of the synonyms are used by the native speaker in order to avoid repetition and create a good quality in writing. For example, visitor: tourist and modern: new. However, the learner has attended to employ few synonyms, for instance, necessary: need and told: said.

In addition, antonym is another type of indirect repetition. It is the opposite of synonym and usually appears as a pair of words. They have commonly been used in both texts in order to make a comparison between two different things. The native speaker tends to use a lot of them in the writing, such as peace: war and build: destroy. Equally, the learner employed several antonyms like north: south and old: new.

Hyponym means using subordinate or sub-class of a noun in order to maintain the unity between the cohesive devices. In both texts, there are few instances of hyponyms and they are used to avoid repetition. The native speaker has employed more hyponyms, for instance, mountain:
resort and community: country. On the other hand, the learner used a limited number of hyponyms to retain the unity of cohesion elements, for example, concert: festival.

Finally, meronym is another type of indirect repetition and it is an expression which represents a part of something that refers to its whole object. The native speaker attempted to use fewer of them to maintain the relationship between the signals, such as Kurd: Kurdistan and Saddam Hussein: Baghdad Regime. These two examples demonstrate that the Kurd is a part of the Kurdistan. Moreover, it would be clear that the learner text has used some meronyms compared with the native speaker, such as winter: season and hall: hotel. The learner focused on using appropriate meronyms in the text.

**Table 1: Shows lexical cohesions which are used in the both texts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical Cohesion</th>
<th>English Learner</th>
<th>Native Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>Erbil, Kurd, governor, contest</td>
<td>Arab, autonomous, citadel, Tourism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Synonym          | necessary: need  
told: said  
situation: condition | visitor: tourist  
new: modern  
territory: region |
| Antonym          | north: south  
old: new | peace: war  
built: destroy |
| Hyponym          | concert: festival | mountain: resort  
community: country |
| Meronym          | winter: season  
hall: hotel | Kurd: Kurdistan  
Saddam Husain: Baghdad regime |

**4-2 Conjunction**

Halliday and Hasan (1976) state that the conjunction as cohesive devises refer to connect two different ideas together. Their function is not only to maintain the semantic relation, but also to join the relation of what follows with the preceding. Therefore, the texts are analysed according to four types of conjunctions which are additive, adversative, causal and temporal as they can be seen in the table (2).

Additive conjunctions mean adding or combing two expressions, ideas and information. The native speaker and the learner have equally used a lot of additives in their texts like additionally, and, for example and also. However, adversative demonstrates opposite opinions and a combination of two different ideas. In both texts, the adversative was used less than the rest of three types of conjunction. Furthermore, the learner used adversative conjunctions in the text as much as the native speaker used. The learner has employed some of them like but and however. Also, the native speaker attempted to use a few of them, such as nevertheless and on the other hand. In the other parts of the texts, there were some causal conjunctions used in order to express the reasons. In both texts, the learner used five causal conjunctions, but the native speaker used only two of them. The causal elements which were used in the texts are in order to, for and therefore. The last subcategory of conjunction is temporal, which means indicating the time and arranging sequence. The native
speaker has employed temporal conjunctions twice as much as the learner. Both texts involved some of temporal conjunctions, such as during, now and while.

Table 2: Illustrates the numbers of conjunction cohesion that are used in the both texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjunction Cohesion</th>
<th>English Learner</th>
<th>Native Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additives</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4-3 Reference

Reference is another type of cohesion which has frequently been used in both texts. According to Baker (1992: 181) reference directs the reader to search for its original meaning and explanation in the text. As it was mentioned before, it is divided into three sub-categories which are demonstrative, comparative and pronominal. Also, Morley (1985: 76) states that the reference is a relationship between an expression and its substitution in the text. The table (3) illustrates the number of the uses of reference in both texts. Moreover, they are used either as anaphoric or cataphoric reference within the text. The first type of reference is demonstrative, which refers to something in the text. It can be divided into two sub-categories: definite article and pronoun. In the native speaker’s text, the demonstrative article ‘the’ is used as an anaphoric reference, for instance, Shiite and Sunni neighbors to the south. The native speaker used more definite articles than the learner. Conversely, the learner used a number of pronouns as much as the native speaker. In addition, comparative references like wider, another and younger are employed in the texts. They are used two times by the native speaker, whereas only once by the learner. This means that the learner and native speaker tended to use less number of comparative references among the other sub-categories of reference. Finally, the pronominal reference has been used to refer to something or someone in the text, such as it, she and them. An obvious difference could be seen in using pronominal references in the texts, because the learner has significantly used a higher number of them, while the native speaker has used a few of them.

Table 3: Demonstrates the amount of reference cohesions which are used in the both texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>English Learner</th>
<th>Native Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td>D. Definite Article: 18 D. Pronouns: 5</td>
<td>D. Definite Article: 21 D. Pronouns: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronominal</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4-4 Ellipsis

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), ellipsis demonstrates the omission of a part and the replacement by zero substitution. There was only one case of ellipsis in both texts, as it can be seen in the table (4). The native speaker used ellipsis in this example: English is now the second language of choice rather than Arabic. The word ‘language’ was replaced by zero substitution, the writer did not want to repeat the word, but the sentence is still understood. However, the learner has never used any ellipsis in the text.

Table 4: Indicates the usage of ellipsis cohesion by both the writers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ellipsis</th>
<th>English Learner</th>
<th>Native Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4-5 Substitution

Substitution is the final type of cohesion and it is divided into three types, the table (5) shows types of substitution; nominal, verbal and causal. In addition, it is different from ellipsis because the omitted word could be substituted by one of the three categories, whereas ellipses is only replaced by zero. Both texts are analysed in detail, but could not find any example of substitution that used by the learner or the native speaker.

Table 5: Shows the numbers of substitution in the both texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substitution</th>
<th>English Learner</th>
<th>Native Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5- DISCUSSION

The texts have been analysed according to five types of cohesion which are introduced by Halliday and Hasan (1976). The research showed some significant differences and similarities in terms of employing the types of cohesion. Initially, the lexical cohesion is intensively used in both texts than other types of cohesion. The repetition is mostly used among the other categories of lexical cohesion. Fowler and Ramsey (1992) state that the repetition in English language could only be used for rhetorical emphasis or power, and it should be replaced by using different alternative forms for each individual word in the text. The English learner has used a large number of indirect repetitions because of the lack of information on using synonyms. However, the native speaker used numerous synonyms in order to avoid the repetition in the text. Nevertheless, antonyms have equally been employed in both texts and it could be regarded as a useful technique to show the
skills of the writer. Finally, hyponym and meronym have merely been used by the learner, but the native speaker tended to employ them to strengthen the relationship between the lexical cohesive.

In addition, the conjunction is another type of cohesion which has commonly been used to combine new ideas within the text. The four subcategories of conjunction have been employed in both texts. The additive was the dominant conjunction, and the learner attempted to provide numerous examples of the use of additive conjunctions in order to build the semantic relation between the sentences. Similarly, the native speaker used them to connect additional ideas. However, the instances of adversative conjunction appeared less than the other subcategories because there were limited arguments and opposite ideas in the text. Moreover, Müller (2005) says that the native speakers use more causal conjunctions than the learners. In contrast, in the investigated texts, the learner used causal signals twice as much as the native speaker, because the learner wanted to give more explanations. The final type of conjunction is temporal, and the native speaker used more temporal items than learner in order to indicate the sequence or time. The use of temporal elements by the native speaker indicates that the native has a wider background knowledge of vocabulary.

Furthermore, reference is another type of cohesion, which contributed to this study. The demonstrative definite articles have been used more than other types of reference in the texts. The native speaker tended to use more demonstrative definite articles than the learner, because the native speaker concentrated on comprehension aspects of the text in order to make it more understandable. Meanwhile, the learner used more demonstrative pronouns than the native speaker in order to make the text more coherent. Also, Baker (1992) states that using demonstrative pronouns in writing helps the readers to understand the text and find the right direction. Moreover, comparative references are used less than other types and the reason behind this goes back to the genre of the texts which influence the use of cohesion elements. The final one is pronominal which is a replacement of someone’s position or refer to the doer. The English learner used pronominal references twice as much as the native speaker, because the writer attempted to replace proper nouns and names of place by pronominal devices so as to avoid repetition. However, the native tended to be more objective and more academic. Therefore, Crystal (1995) states that using reference is important to identify the quality of the writing.

The last two other types of cohesion, ellipsis and substitution, are rarely used in both texts. These two elements are very important in the skill of writing, because they show the ability and experience of the writer. In the most conducted works, it has been shown that the English learner could not use them in an appropriate way. Like the conducted works, this study found that the learner and the native speaker used rarely the two types of cohesion, as it can be seen that there is only one example of ellipsis, which used by the native speaker.

6- CONCLUSION

To sum up, the study has been analysed by applying the five types of cohesion of Halliday and Hasan (1976) to the both texts. In this analysis, it found that both texts employed a number of lexical, reference and conjunction elements, but ellipsis only used once and substitution neither used by the English learner nor native speaker. Also, the learner used a large number of cohesive devices, especially direct repetition. However, all the types of conjunction used in the learner’s text, but the causal elements employed more than the other subcategories. In terms of the reference, the
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learner widely used demonstrative pronouns and pronominal references in his text. These results illustrated that the cohesion plays a crucial role in discourse analysis and it has an impact on the English learner’s writing. Moreover, English learners should use cohesion devices in their writing in order to produce more meaningful sentences and texts. This technique will be useful to create a good piece of writing leading to a more understandable text by the reader.
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A- Native Speaker’s Text

Welcome to Erbil, Tourism Boom Town

By: Harvey Morris

4/5/2013  1:51 PM

ERBIL, Iraq — Erbil is preparing to greet visitors as the Arab Capital of Tourism in 2014, a singular honor for a non-Arab city. It won out over Beirut, Sharjah and the Saudi resort of Taif.

Erbil, the capital of Iraqi Kurdistan, already plays host to tourists from the Arab world, not least Iraqi Arabs, who come north to escape the heat, and the violence, elsewhere in the country.

Erbil has boomed in the decade since the 2003 U.S. invasion of Iraq ended the regime of President Saddam Hussein. Resorts and upscale housing developments have sprawled out across the once-empty plain between the city and mountains to the north. Erbil now boasts half a dozen world-class hotels, with prices to match, as well as luxury car showrooms, designer stores and Western-style fast food outlets.

To win the Tourism Capital designation from the Arab Council of Tourism, the authorities in the Kurdish autonomous zone promised to host a range of activities, from winter ice-skating to an international marathon and a beauty contest, to entertain an anticipated three million visitors in 2014.

With the help of international experts, the authorities are restoring the ancient walled citadel that dominates the center of the city and has revealed evidence of human occupation dating back 8,000 years. Still, it might seem an odd place to plan a holiday.

Shiite and Sunni neighbors to the south are on the brink of what could be a new civil war, a resurgent Al Qaeda is operating in neighboring Kirkuk Province, and armed fighters of Turkey’s Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) are preparing to move into the Iraqi Kurdistan mountains as part of a peace deal with Ankara. On Kurdistan’s northwestern border, refugees are spilling across to seek sanctuary from the conflict in Syria.

The autonomous region nevertheless enjoys a high degree of calm and security, thanks to its own peshmerga army that mans the frontiers of the territory, and which in recent weeks deployed southward to secure areas of Sunni-Shiite tension.
Erbil is now home to a growing expatriate community of investment consultants, oil executives and language trainers – for younger Kurds, English is now the second language of choice rather than Arabic (ellipsis: language).

The city itself, despite its rapid Dubai-ization, has limited appeal. Standing on a featureless and somewhat dusty plain, it has more in common with the hot flatlands to the south than with the snow-capped landscape more typically associated with Kurdistan.

Little over 16 kilometers, or 10 miles to the north, however, the road along which Kurds once retreated to escape the forces of Saddam Hussein winds steeply to an escarpment and then on to the mountains.

Heading toward the Zagros range that marks the border with Iran, it is a spring landscape of green hills, wild grasses and poppies, and traditional hill resorts such as the town of Shaqlawa that are rapidly expanding to meet a growing tourist boom.

Further along the road, built for the British between 1928-32 by Archibald Hamilton, a New Zealand engineer, leads through a dramatic gorge to the waterfall of Gali Ali Beg. An Austrian-built cable car is among the modern attractions.

The Kurds were once Iraq’s most despised community. As non-Arabs prone to rebellion, they faced periodic onslaughts by the previous Baghdad regime, including the Anfal campaign that followed the end of the Iran-Iraq war.

Kurds were driven from their homes and tens of thousands were killed as villages were destroyed and chemical weapons were used against them.

Now the autonomous region is an island of stability in a sea of troubles, and its politicians are increasingly important players in the turmoil afflicting the surrounding region.

Therefore, Erbil’s designation as Arab Capital of Tourism will, the authorities hope (ellipsis: Arab Capital of Tourism), be a further opportunity to promote Kurdistan’s culture and newfound influence to a wider world.

Source: http://rendezvous.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/05/04/welcome-to-erbil-tourism-boom-town/?_r=0

B- English Learner’s Text

Erbil named 2014 Arab Tourism Capital

By: Barzan Muhammad, Rudaw
Erbil, Kurdistan Region—Erbil has been appointed the 2014 tourism capital by the Arab Council of Tourism.

During the council’s conference in Cairo last month, four cities -- Beirut, Taif, Sharjah and Erbil -- competed to win the title of tourism capital for the year 2014.

“During the conference, we presented a 10-minute documentary about Erbil which is why we won the contest,” said Tahir Abdulla, Erbil deputy governor.

He added that they plan to play the documentary on Al Arabiya to advertise and attract tourists. The film was produced by Afshar Production Company and cost 600 million dinars.

According to Abdulla, the security situation in Erbil was another reason why it won the contest.

The Arab Council of Tourism has several conditions necessary to win the tourism capital title. For example, Erbil had to present 40 different activities that it will host throughout the year.

Abdulla said, “From the beginning of next year, we will start planning the activities according to the seasons. For example, we plan to have ice skating in the winter.”

Erbil already has several activities that take place annually, such as celebrating the Kurdish New Year (Newroz), the anniversary of Erbil’s liberation, an international marathon and a beauty queen contest. Abdulla said that we will plan more activities such as horse racing and sky diving.

Several days will also be designated to introduce Kurdish traditions and culture. “During those days, we will offer tourists traditional Kurdish food and present Kurdish traditions,” Abdulla said.

Additionally, 12 theaters are currently being built at the Family Mall for an international film festival Erbil will host in 2014.

Abdulla expects that the city will need at least $200 million in order to meet the demands of the Arab Council of Tourism. “We have a huge responsibility in order to maintain the title,” he said.

Erbil has several tourist resorts. Abdulla said that they will encourage the private sector to renovate these places and the government will provide water, electricity and quality roads for them.

He added that the private sector has applied to build $1 billion worth of hotels. “By the year 2014, Erbil will have seven world class hotels and several more hotels and motels will be built,” Abdulla said.

According to a statistic from the Erbil governorate, the city currently has around 150 hotels. But it needs more as a projected 3 million tourists will come to Erbil by 2014.
Abdulla also said that they will renovate the old neighborhoods and markets around Erbil’s citadel by 2014, and build a huge concert hall in the downtown.

Mawlawi Jabar, the director of the tourism department, told Rudaw, “The number of tourists coming to Erbil is increasing year by year. The number may reach 4 million by 2014 and this will help Kurdistan’s economy.”

Erbil is also preparing for a big dance contest and wants to record its name in the Guinness Book of World Records.

Hamza Hamid, the media director in the governor’s office, told Rudaw, “We are preparing for a dance contest where thousands of people from different nations will participate. The contest will be around the Erbil Citadel.”

Hamid said, “The goal of the contest is to introduce Erbil as the tourism capital. The contest will be held during Newroz 2013. The contest will be filmed live from a helicopter.”

While Erbil is the capital of Iraqi Kurdistan, the fact that it has been appointed as the tourism capital for Arab countries is an achievement officials are proud of.

However, Abubakr Ali, an author, said, “This has two sides. On the one hand, it means Erbil and the Kurdistan Region are still part of Iraq as it is Iraq that is a member of the Arab League. On the other hand, we have to take the positive side and use this opportunity to introduce Kurdish culture to the outside world.”

Source: http://www.krg.org/a/d.aspx?l=12&a=45887

C- The Colours Which are Used to Indicate the Types of Cohesion in Analysing Both Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Cohesion</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical Cohesion</td>
<td>Repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synonym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antonym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyponym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>Additive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adversative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Ellipsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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