Discourse Connectors and Cohesion in Writing

Seyed Ali Rezvani Kalajahi

Department of English Language, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia
Email: ali.rezvani85@gmail.com

Ain Nadzimah Abdullah (Corresponding author)

Department of English Language, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia
Email: ain@putra.upm.edu.my

Abstract

The aim of this study was to find out the relationship between use of discourse connectors and cohesion of writing1 in the writing samples of Malaysian school students. Thirty samples from each educational level (Form 4; Form 5; College; N=30) were chosen randomly from the Malaysian Corpus of Students' Argumentative Writing. To assess the quality of the essays, two experienced raters, who were PhD holders in ELT, were asked to use ESL Composition Profile (Jacob's et al., 1981). Although the rubric checks for five components, including content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics, in order to address to the purpose of the study only "Organization" marks were taken in to account since it is an only component which measures cohesion of an essay. The reliability test result showed that inter-rater reliability was very high (was 0.90). The analyses indicated that there was a very weak negative correlation, but insignificant, between writing quality and the frequency of the use of the DCs in the writing of Malaysian ESL students. The findings of the study will also be discussed in detail.

Keywords: quality of writing, cohesion in writing, cohesion and ESL writing, discourse connectors, Malaysian school students, correlational analysis,

1. Introduction

Generally, writing in second/foreign language is demanding and difficult for non-native speakers, especially when it comes to the learners of English. They would need to familiarize themselves with different elements of writing that might help them to write effectively as writing of none native writers of English should be coherent and cohesive for readers.

A written text requires the writer not only to be able to construct sentences accurately but also to be able to use cohesive devices appropriately to build a coherent text. One of the most important devices is discourse connectors (DCs). Discourse markers, adverbial connectors, and coordinating conjunctions form discourse connectors (DCs) (Rezvani Kalajahi, Neufeld, Abdullah, 2015). They are words and expressions that can be accommodated within the text in order to join one sentence to another sentence or one paragraph to another paragraph.

By using appropriate DCs, a reader/listener is able to follow easily the direction of the text/speech and understand a writer's/speakers points of view, arguments, examples. Cohesion is a text/speech feature upon which a good writing heavily relies on, but it is not limited to DCs because they are only one of the cohesive devices proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) that help the text or writing to be coherent.

Coherence is often described "[...] which makes a discourse more than the sum of the interpretations of the individual utterances" (Sanders & Spooren, 1999, p. 235). Lee (2002) points out that coherence in a written text refers to the linking of ideas to make it meaningful to readers. The skilled writer applies various devices such as reference, substitution and ellipsis, conjunctions [DCs] to construct coherent texts (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Kehler, 2004). The use of explicit linking words or linking phrases [DCs] is one way of signaling coherence relations. "A text may however be coherent without explicit marking of coherence relations, but such relations often are marked linguistically", as Knott and Dale (1994) and Sanders and Spooren (1999, p. 2005) point out.

Therefore, L2 writers must learn to use DCs appropriately in which readers are able to follow the ideas expressed in the text more easily. They can properly signal the relations of their utterances to those which precede and follow. Therefore, DCs constitute an important component of communicative competence, which L2 learners must acquire if they want to communicate effectively. This implies that the nonnative speakers competent in using DCs of the L2 will be more

---

1 *"Cohesion of writing" and "quality of writing" terms have been used interchangeably throughout this study.*

successful in interaction than those who are not (Rahimi, 2011).

Some researches in different contexts have attempted to portray the role of DCs in cohesion of writing. While Tapper (2005), Lahuerta Martínez (2002), Jalififar (2008) and Johnson (1992) found that DCs bring cohesion into writing, these studies (Patanasorn, 2010; Jalilifar, 2008; Fei, 2006; Tapper, 2005; Lahuerta Martínez, 2002; Witte and Faigley, 1981; Hartnett, 1980) failed to confirm DCs role in cohesion of writing. To date, no research exists on the study of DCs in the writing of Malaysian ESL students and there is no published evidence in this context to find out the role of DCs in cohesion of writing in learners' writing. To address this issue, this study intends to examine the relationship between the use of DCs frequency and the cohesion in writing. To achieve the purpose of this study, the following research question is addressed.

Is there any relationship between the use of DCs frequency and cohesion of the essays in different educational levels?

2. Methodology

2.1 Samples

A total number of 90 randomly sampled writing were chosen from the Malaysian Corpus of Students' Argumentative Writing (MCSAW, Version 2) developed by Rezvani Kalajahi & Mukundan (2014). There are over 1500 essays written by Malaysian students across three educational levels, namely, Form 4, Form 5 and First year College students. The nature of the study was correlational and despite the fact that the minimum acceptable sample size for correlational analysis depends on the type of research, previous research generally recommend a minimum sample size of 30 for each level group (Waters, 2013; Ouyang, 2012; Jacobs, 2003) as they hold having 30 sample size or more may increase the validity of the research. Therefore, writing samples were randomly selected from the writing of Form 4 (n=30), Form 5 (n=30), and the college level (n=30). To select the samples randomly and properly, Research Randomizer online application (Version 4) was used (Urbaniak, 2013).

2.2 Instrument

On the one hand, to assess the quality of the writing samples some other research studies have made use of Jacob's et al. (1981) analytical scoring tool extensively (Ting, 2003; Meisuo, 2000; Sasaki, & Hirose, 1999; Perkins, 1983). This study similarly adopted the ESL Composition Profile (Jacobs, Zinkgraf, Wormuth, Hartfiel, & Hughey, 1981). This profile divides writing into five components with various percentages, i.e. content (30%), organization (20%), vocabulary (20%), language use (25%) and mechanics (5%). Each component has a set of criteria ranging from "excellent to very good" to "very poor" with a specified range of scores.

Jacob's et al Composition Profile was selected because it is "one of the most widely used analytical scales for ESL writing" (Reid, 1993: 235). It is also "perhaps the only analytic rating scheme for assessing adult second language writing which has been widely tested, documented, and used in published studies" (Wong, 1992:107). Further, this tool is highly quantitative and looks at writing more as product than process. The writings compiled for building the corpus was the production of the students and they were not trained how to write for this particular type of writing.

On the other hand, to determine the relationship between the frequency of use of DCs and the cohesion of the compositions in different proficiency levels, the "organization" marks were solely considered because it is the only part that checks for the cohesion of an essay. Moreover, DCs are the major linguistic means that account for the textual cohesion. They are, interestingly enough, among the main components of the rubric that are checked for the text "organization".

In order to reduce the danger of subjectivity in assessing the quality of the compositions and to increase the reliability of the results, the selected 30 essays from each level were rated by two ESL professional writing instructors following the Jacob's et al. (1981) analytical scoring tool. The raters were holding PhD degrees in English language teaching with a work experience of more than 5 years each. Finally, in order to ensure scoring consistency between the raters, the grading results were checked for inter-rater reliability using Chronbach's Alpha formula.

The inter-rater reliability was checked with Cohen Kappa statistics as our data were categorical in nature. Cohen's (1960) K (Kappa) is the most popular coefficient of rater agreement. Kappa has a range from 0-100, with higher values indicating better reliability. By convention, a Kapa > 0.70 is considered as an acceptable inter-rater reliability. Landis and Koch (1977) provide a guideline to interpret Kappa values and the interpretation is displayed in Table 1.

Table 1. Cohn's Kappa Value Scales and Interpretations

Kappa Values	Description
<0	No inter-rater reliability
0.0-0.19	Poor inter-rater reliability
0.20-0.39	Fair inter-rater reliability
0.40-0.59	Moderate inter-rater reliability
0.60-0.79	Substantial inter-rater reliability
0.80-1.00	Outstanding inter-rater reliability

Using ESL composition profile scheme, two independent raters assessed all the 90 essays. Both of the raters gave numerical scores, 4, 3, 2, and 1 to the organization of the essays and each score represented very good organization, good organization, average organization and poor organization.

Table 2 shows the inter-rater reliability results for two raters.

Table 2. Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.903	2

As can be seen from the table, the reliability of the two raters in the assessment, calculated on the Cronbach's Alpha reliability was 0.90, which was highly acceptable. The findings reveal that two different raters were highly consistent in scoring and rating of the organizations of the essays.

Finally, Rezvani Kalajahi, Nadzimah Abdullah, Mukundan, and Tannacito (2012) taxonomy of DCs were used to identify the number of DCs utilized in the selected samples were counted manually and entered into SPSS along with the marks assigned to the "organization" part of the essays. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients test was then performed to find out the correlation between the frequency of DCs employed by the learners and the writing quality of their compositions.

3. Results and Discussion

To be able to establish any pedagogical applications from the results of a study, the researcher found it essential to investigate the relationship between the Malaysian students' use of DCs and their writing quality. The quality of the essays was assessed through the use of analytical scale of Jacobs et al. (1981) mainly because it provides a general quality score based on an overall impression of the writing, taking both syntactic and organization quality into account. Since the usage of the DCs is related to the successful text organization, analytical assessment of the students' essays was considered to be a suitable rating method.

Tapper (2005) states that the potential existence of a correlation between various kinds of cohesive ties, especially DCs and writing quality has been studied extensively since the publication of Halliday and Hasan's (1976), Cohesion in English. Generally, no established correlation has yet been reported for the writings of native speakers of English (Tapper, 2005; Mosenthal & Tierney 1984; Hultman & Westman 1977), but literature has witnessed a lot of research attempts to find such a relationship in the writing of none native speakers of English in an ESL/EFL setting.

To this end, a total number of 90 randomly sampled pieces of writing, 30 writing samples from each educational level, was chosen and rated by two raters. Utilizing the Jacobs et al.'s Scale, the raters first rated the quality of the writings. Next, they counted the frequency counts of different instances of DCs in each writing (see Appendix 1). Then the researchers managed to run Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient test to see how the quality of writing was correlated with the use of the DCs. Table 3 shows the overall correlation of the writings across the sampled writings and Table 4 exhibits the correlation between the use of DCs and the quality of the writing for each separate educational level.

Table 3. Overall Correlation between writing quality and the frequency of DCs use

		Frequency of DCs
	Pearson Correlation	-.02
Writing Quality	Sig. (2-tailed)	.84
	N	90

p<.001

As can be seen, there was a very weak negative but insignificant correlation between writing quality and the frequency of the use of DCs *r*(90) = -.02, p < .001. This correlation indicates that the frequent and extensive use of DCs in the writing of Malaysian ESL students not only did not contribute to the quality of the writing under any circumstances but it might also work otherwise. In other words, it is highly likely that frequent and extensive use of the DCs would damage the cohesion in writing, in other words it may reduce the quality of writing.

Table 4. Correlations between writing quality and the frequency use of DCs in three educational levels

	Level		Frequency of DCs
Form 4	Writing Quality	Pearson Correlation	.07
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.73
		N	30
Form 5	Writing Quality	Pearson Correlation	-.060
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.77
		N	30
College	Writing Quality	Pearson Correlation	-.23
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.23
		N	30

The above table shows that there is a very weak positive but insignificant correlation between the use of DCs by Form 4 students and the quality of their writing *r*(30) =.07, p < .001. On the other hand, the correlation was negatively weak and insignificant for Form 5 students *r*(30) = -.060, p < .001 as well as College students *r*(30) = -.23, p < .001. More specifically, the findings indicate that frequent use of DCs was not found to be an indicator of good writing quality for Malaysian ESL students.

This research was the first attempt to explore the correlation between frequency of DCs and quality of the essays in an ESL context. Findings of the study did not reveal any significant correlation between these two variables. The findings seem to be in line with the findings of Alarcon and Morales's (2011) study which investigated undergraduate Filipino students and demonstrated that mere use of DCs was not significantly correlated with the quality of the students' essay. The Pearson correlation *r* was - 0.054 which was not significant at .05 level of significance. The findings were also partially consistent with other research which found no strong correlation between the quality of the essays of the Arab students and the number of DCs (Modhish, 2012). Likewise, Rahimi's (2011) research on Iranian ELT students at degree level indicated that the use of DCs in argumentative and expository essays does not significantly predict the quality of the essays. It should also be noted that the findings in the literature as to the relationship between writing quality and DCs use are mixed. For instance, Johnson (1992) found no differences in the amount of cohesion between "good" and "weak" compositions written in Malay by native speakers or in English by Malay speakers. Although majority of the essays were highly rated in terms of organization and containing frequent use of DCs, it is crystal clear that cohesion does not solely depend on the use of DCs. That is, a larger number of DCs use in the writing is not associated with the higher quality of the writing of Malaysian ESL students. It is likely that students' writing with more DCs would appear more cohesive to the writer, DCs are, yet, by no means the only evidence of a well-organized and cohesive text.

Negative and insignificant correlation in Malaysian learners may imply that these ESL students tended to incorporate more DCs in their writing simply because they felt pretty sure of the 'how' of the use of the connectors. It might also imply that they preferred not to take the risk of attempting to use some of the unfamiliar ones. We might also suppose that that DCs are not being appropriately and thoroughly addressed in the teaching materials they were formally exposed to. In other words, it might be the case that the teaching materials and methods might focus more on the accuracy of the use of language and pay scant attention to the language components that enable students to communicate effectively and appropriately in English.

However, findings of the present study go against the studies which report a high and sometimes significant degree of correlation between the use of DCs and overall writing quality (Patanasorn, 2010; Jalilifar, 2008; Fei, 2006; Tapper, 2005; Lahuerta Martínez, 2002; Witte and Faigley, 1981; Hartnett, 1980). To illustrate, Fei (2006) found a highly significant correlation between the frequency of DCs and the quality of writing in the compositions of Chinese EFL learners with different proficiency levels. Patanasorn (2010) also discovered a significant correlation between the frequency of DCs used in the Thai EFL learners and the quality of writing. In fact, higher quality essays contained remarkably more DCs than weaker ones (p<.05).

It might be interesting to indicate that there exist some other studies with findings incongruent with the findings of

the present study. For instance, Tapper (2005) found that there was a moderate correlation between the number of DCs and the quality of writing in the compositions of Swedish EFL learners. Additionally, Lahuerta Martínez (2002) computed correlation between the scores of a set quantitatively marked essays and the frequency of DCs in the essays by means of Pearson correlation test. He found that there was a statistically significant relationship between the scores of the compositions and the number of DCs present in the same compositions. The correlation had a value of 0.646. Therefore, he concluded that the larger the number of DCs used, the higher the score of the composition would be. Finally, Jalififar (2008) investigated the Iranian junior, senior and MA students' essays, majoring in TEFL, and found that there was a direct and positive relationship between the quality of the compositions and the number of well-functioned discourse markers. The results also revealed statistically significant differences between the use of discourse markers and composition quality in the groups. All these researchers clearly stated that the greater the number of DCs and the greater variation of DCs the subjects used in their essays, the better the overall quality of their essay would be.

Comparing the findings of the present study with those of the above-mentioned studies, one can argue that the text quality cannot be merely a function of the use of DCs. In fact, there seem to be other elements (e.g., lexical reiteration, collocation pattern, reference, etc.) that add to the coherence and quality of the texts. Furthermore, this relationship can be influenced by the type of the text and whether or not the writer is a native speaker. For instance, Jalilifar (2008) found a significant relationship between the use of DCs and writing quality in descriptive texts by postgraduate and graduate EFL students, while Johnson (1992) found no such a relationship in the expository writings of native speakers of English in his study. He believes that Malay students' use of DCs to create coherent texts in English might, under the influence of their cultural-linguistic background, be radically different from that of the English native speakers. These findings imply that function of the DCs in enhancing the quality of writing is still unestablished. As a result, the phenomenon needs more empirical research with diversified methods in different contexts to be explained.

4. Conclusion

There was a very weak negative insignificant correlation between writing quality and the frequency of the use of the DCs in the writing of Malaysian ESL students. The lack of relationship between writing quality and DC use can imply that DCs has not been used effectively and appropriately by the Malaysian ESL students. Therefore, it is suggested that not only do teacher need to work on the quantity of DCs, but also they need to pay attention to their quality. In other words, teachers should focus on the proper use of DCs in the students' writing. Students' awareness can also be raised on the appropriate use of individual categories of DCs and they can be taught to understand how effective uses of DCs create a coherent text. Moreover, teachers can highlight that DCs are not only textual devices which can bring or add cohesion to a text. However, in addition to DCs, there are other elements that can make a text more cohesive such as the use of reference, ellipsis, substitution as pointed out by Halliday and Hasan (1976).

A future study investigating the effect of explicit and systematic teaching of DCs on the performance of the students writing would be very interesting. Teaching explicitly and systematically via corpus can provide us with both linguistics data to test our intuitions against empirical evidence and some useful materials to teach the authentic use of DCs. To this end, computer learner corpus analysis which identifies systematic interlanguage patterns, distribution and occurrence of DCs in the native and learner data can offer important pedagogical insights for the future studies.

References

Alarcon, J. B., & Morales, K. N. S. (2011). Grammatical cohesion in students' argumentative essay. *Journal of English and Literature*, *2*(5), 114-127.

Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and psychological measurement*, *20*(1), 37-46.

Halliday, M., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hultman, T.G., & Westman. M. (1977). Gymnasistsvenska. Lund: Liber Läromedel.

Jacobs, R. M. (2003). Educational Research: Correlational Studies. Retrieved June 05 2012 from www83.homepage.villanova.edu/ richard.../correlation.ppt.

Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F. and Hughey, F. B. (1981). *Testing ESL composition: a practical approach.* Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.

Fei D. (2006). The Effect of the Use of Adverbial Connectors in Chinese EFL Learners English

Writing Quality. 27 June 2008. Available online: <http://www.celea.org.cn/teic/65/65-105.pdf>

Johnson, P. (1992). Cohesion and coherence in compositions in Malay and English. *RELC journal, 23*(2), 1-17.

Jalilifar, A. (2009). Discourse Markers in Composition Writings: The case of Iranian learners of English as a foreign language. *English Language Teaching, 1*(2), 114-122.

Lahuerta Martínez, A. C. (2004). The use of Discourse Markers in EFL learners' Writing. *Revista alicantina de estudios ingleses, 15,* 123-132.

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 159-174.

Kehler, A. (2004). Discourse coherence. In L. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), The handbook of pragmatics (pp. 241–265). Malden: Blackwell.

Knott, A., & Dale, R. (1994). Using linguistic phenomena to motivate a set of coherence relations. *Discourse processes, 18*(1), 35-62.

Meisuo, Z. (2000). Cohesive features in the expository writing of undergraduates in two Chinese universities. *RELC journal, 31*(1), 61-95.

Modhish, A. S. (2012). Use of Discourse Markers in the Composition Writings of Arab EFL Learners. *English Language Teaching, 5*(5), p56.

Mosenthal, J. H., & Tierney, R. J. . (1984). Commentary: Cohesion: Problems with Talking about Text. *Reading Research Quarterly, 19*(2), 240-244.

Ouyang, R. (2012). Basic Concepts of Quantitative Research. Retrieved October 20 2012 from http://ksumail.kennesaw.edu/~rouyang/ED-research/methods.htm.

Patanasorn, A.T. (2010). The Use of Linking Adverbials in the Argumentative Essays of Thai EFL Learners. *KKU Res J, 15* (78), 751-767.

Perkins, K. (1983). On the use of composition scoring techniques, objective measures, and objective tests to evaluate ESL writing ability. *TESOL quarterly*,*17*(4), 651-671.

Rahimi, M. (2011). Discourse Markers in Argumentative and Expository Writing of Iranian EFL Learners. *World Journal of English Language, 1*(2), p68.

Reid, M. J. (1993). *Teaching ESL writing.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Rezvani Kalajahi, S. A., Abdullah, A. N., Mukundan, J., & Tannacito, D. J. (2012). Discourse Connectors: An Overview of the History, Definition and Classification of the Term. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 19*(11), 1659-1673.

Rezvani Kalajahi, S.A. & Mukundan, J. (2014). Malaysian Corpus of Students' Argumentative Writing(MCSAW).Australia, Australian International Academic Center.

Rezvani Kalajahi., S.A., Neufeld, S., Abdullah, A.N. (2015). The Discourse Connector List: A Multi-Genre Cross-Cultural Corpus Model. International Journal of Corpus Linguistics. *In Press*

Sanders, T., & Spooren, W. (1999). Communicative intentions and coherence relations. In W. Bublitz, M. Lenz, & E. Ventola (Eds.), Coherence in spoken and written discourse (pp. 235–350). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sasaki, M., & Hirose, K. (1999). Development of an analytic rating scale for Japanese L1 writing. *Language Testing, 16*(4), 457-478.

Tapper, M. (2005). Connectives in advanced Swedish EFL learners' written English–preliminary results. *The Department of English: Working Papers in English Linguistics, 5*, 116-144.

Ting, F. (2003). An investigation of cohesive errors in the writing of PRC tertiary EFL students. *Retrieved December, 15,* 2012. from http://etds.lib.ncku.edu.tw/etdservice/view_metadata?etdun=U0026-2405201018572400.

Urbaniak, G. C., & Plous, S. (2013). Research Randomizer (Version 4.0) [Computer software]. Retrieved on June 22, 2013, from http://www.randomizer.org/

Waters, J. (2013). Correlational Research Guidelines, Conducting Correlational Research. Retrieved from http://www.capilanou.ca/psychology/student-resources/research-guidelines/Correlational-Research-Guidelines/.

Witte, S., & Faigley, L. (1981) Coherence, cohesion and writing quality. *College Composition and Communication, 22*,189-204. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/356693.

Wong, R. (1992). *Strategies for the construction of meaning: Chinese students in Singapore writing in English and Chinese.* Ph.D. thesis. University of Toronto.

Appendix 1

Two Raters Scores and DCs Frequencies in the Selected Writing

	Levels	Rater 1	Rater 2	Mean	DCs F.
1	Form 4	20	20	20	11
2	Form 4	15	15	15	19
3	Form 4	20	20	20	41
4	Form 4	20	20	20	11
5	Form 4	15	20	18	14
6	Form 4	20	20	20	20
7	Form 4	15	15	15	21
8	Form 4	20	20	20	18
9	Form 4	20	20	20	18
10	Form 4	15	15	15	22
11	Form 4	20	20	20	16
12	Form 4	20	20	20	10
13	Form 4	20	20	20	13
14	Form 4	20	20	20	26
15	Form 4	20	20	20	12
16	Form 4	20	15	18	11
17	Form 4	20	20	20	26
18	Form 4	20	20	20	11
19	Form 4	15	15	15	14

20	Form 4	20	20	20	13
21	Form 4	20	20	20	12
22	Form 4	20	20	20	32
23	Form 4	20	20	20	13
24	Form 4	20	20	20	11
25	Form 4	20	20	20	14
26	Form 4	15	15	15	9
27	Form 4	15	15	15	12
28	Form 4	20	20	20	11
29	Form 4	20	20	20	18
30	Form 4	20	20	20	14
31	Form 5	20	20	20	27
32	Form 5	15	15	15	23
33	Form 5	15	15	15	35
34	Form 5	20	20	20	7
35	Form 5	15	15	15	18
36	Form 5	15	15	15	19
37	Form 5	15	15	15	21
38	Form 5	15	15	15	12
39	Form 5	20	15	18	22
40	Form 5	20	20	20	17
41	Form 5	15	15	15	16
42	Form 5	20	20	20	13
43	Form 5	20	20	20	15
44	Form 5	20	20	20	12
45	Form 5	15	15	15	8
46	Form 5	15	15	15	7
47	Form 5	20	20	20	9
48	Form 5	15	15	15	9
49	Form 5	20	20	20	26
50	Form 5	20	20	20	7
51	Form 5	15	15	15	10
52	Form 5	20	15	18	13
53	Form 5	15	15	15	10
54	Form 5	15	15	15	12
55	Form 5	20	20	20	11
56	Form 5	15	15	15	7
57	Form 5	20	20	20	9
58	Form 5	15	15	15	8
59	Form 5	20	20	20	8
60	Form 5	15	15	15	14
61	College	15	15	15	11
62	College	15	15	15	16
63	College	20	20	20	16
64	College	15	15	15	11
65	College	15	20	18	12
66	College	15	15	15	14
67	College	15	15	15	16
68	College	20	20	20	10
69	College	20	20	20	18
70	College	15	20	18	9
71	College	15	15	15	10
72	College	20	20	20	7
73	College	15	15	15	14
74	College	15	15	15	26
75	College	15	20	18	25
76	College	20	20	20	17
77	College	20	20	20	16
78	College	15	15	15	18
79	College	15	15	15	29
80	College	20	20	20	12
81	College	15	15	15	13
82	College	15	15	15	12
83	College	15	20	18	19
84	College	15	15	15	14
85	College	15	15	15	18
86	College	20	20	20	10
87	College	20	20	20	18
88	College	15	15	15	27
89	College	20	20	20	12
90	College	15	15	15	13