

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Background

It can be argued that the basic aim of TEFL programmes is to improve learners ' awareness and performance of English language skills. Awareness and performance of these skills, namely, listening, speaking, reading and writing would enable learners to use English for various purposes.

Writing skill is a major skill but it has been given little attention in the mid-sixties. Writing for EFL learners is a complex skill that is learnt rather than acquired .Hayes and flower(1981:55), in their analysis of the complexity of the writing process and its impact on the cognitive level, state, Writing is no longer considered a linear evaluation of successive drafts, but recursive articulated development that triggers the process of understanding and creates meaning"

Thus writing is not an easy task for both EFL learners and even native speaker.EFL learners find it more difficult to write in a language which is not their mother tongue and they do not fully master. Mohdy(2003:70-71)state that arranging words, phrases and sentences in the right order to create a unified text is a considerable problem for the students. most of our students leave their answer books blank in writing tests, and those who try to write, their text will be loaded with many mistakes.inshort, the learner must know what to write and be able to organize his ideas coherently and logically by the use of correct structure,appropriate vocabulary and proper punctuation.To write effectively and appropriately,EFL sudanese university students are required to be able to relate and organize thoughts in unified and coherent

Texts. Thus the effectiveness of the text lies in both coherence and cohesion.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Receiving incoherent papers (articles and essays) from students continues to be very frustrating not to be able to understand why students are unable to produce coherent text or to see why their papers are incoherent. Many written text books do not provide useful methods to the teaching and learning of this concept.

Many writing instructors encounter the problem of coherence in their students' essays since for one reason or another many of these essays lack coherence.

In the Sudanese context the written English of the university students is not cohesive and is incoherent. This is rather strange and is unacceptable.

This study will investigate the abilities of producing coherent and unified texts of the Sudanese EFL university students who are preparing to graduate with a A.B degree in English. These students are exposed to a variety of courses in writing skills, in addition to other linguistic courses.

Thus, it is still important to investigate this area because the system of teaching English had been changed from what had been followed in the past. The syllabus had also been changed. The researcher wants to investigate the problem of coherence and cohesion at University of Holy Quran and Islamic Sciences. The reason for this is to show if this university has the same problems or not.

1.3 Research Objectives

1. The Study gives a theoretical framework of Coherence and Cohesion studies.
2. The Study aims to explain the concept of Coherence and Cohesion.
3. The study aims at investigating the weakness in using cohesive devices by University students who are specialized in English at University of the holy Quran and Islamic sciences.
4. The study aims to investigate lack of coherence in the written texts of this university students.

5.The study aims to look into the problems that university students encounter in using cohesive devices.

5.The Study explain to what extent Students of EFL able to apply Coherence and Cohesion in writing.

5 .also the research aims to suggest some strategies to overcome these problems.

1.4 Research Questions

In tackling the research problem, the research specifically is going to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent do weakness of the written work of university students be attribute to the lack of awareness of coherence and cohesion?
2. How appropriately do university students use the cohesive devices?
3. To what extent do students achieve Coherence and cohesion in their text?
4. To what extent does the use of the cohesive devices correlate to the coherence of the students written texts?

1.5 Hypotheses of the Research:

In order to answer the study questions the research proposes the following hypotheses:

1. There is a weakness in Sudanese university students 'written work due to their ignorance of coherence and cohesion.
2. University students do not use cohesive devices appropriately.
3. There is no significant difference in the Students achievement as cohnerning Coherence and Cohesion.
4. There is a significant correlation between the students use of Cohesive devices and Coherence of their written text.

1.6 Significance of the Research

1. The significance of this research stems from the fact that writing is a major language skill for achieving fluency in English.
2. The target groups are university students who are specialized in English and will graduate with a B.A degree and might prepare for their M.A study. They should be good at using such devices of writing.
3. The study will investigate coherence and cohesion in university student's and their abilities to produce an Coherence and Cohesion texts. This can help in syllabus design.

1.7 Methodology of study

The methodology of this study is a descriptive and an analytical study. the researcher will use spss program for the statistical analysis of data, then there will be a textual analysis. The materials of this study will be originally written answers for the test which were used by Sudanese researcher in university of the Holy Quran and Islamic Sciences. The subjects of the study will be the third year English students who are majoring in English there is one group :students of English at university of the holy Quran and Islamic Sciences,faculty of Education(third year).

1.8 Limits of the Study

This study exclusively focuses on Cohesion and Coherence. it will be conducted at the University pf the Holy Quran and Islamic Sciences.3d year students oF Department English 2014-2015.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter some of the literature related to the subject of the study is reviewed. First the concepts 'coherence' and 'cohesion' are discussed with reference to the definitions made by some researchers. Next different approaches to the study of the concepts 'coherence' and cohesion are presented and explained. Finally, previous studies on coherence and cohesion are reviewed.

2.2. Coherence

The root of the word coherence is the verb 'cohere' which means "literary" to stick together" or to agree or be consistent. According to Van Dijk (1972:93) "coherence is not a well defined notion". The vagueness in its definition may be related to the fact that coherence is an interpretive process created by the reader while he is reading the text.

In writing, coherence is the relationship of ideas and abilities of those ideas to function together in order to convey the meaning.

McLinn (1988:15) explain that coherence is "The functioning of the text as a unified whole".

Mathews (1990) defined coherence as the logical relation of sentences forming a text. According to him a student may, for example, produce a composition in which all the sentences are grammatically correct, but which lack coherence.

Moreover, coherence underlies semantic relations which enable the reader to understand the text.

Other theorists indicated that coherence can also be seen as an interaction between the writer and the reader.

Some linguists ,Halliday and Hasan (1976:11) maintained that that discourse sentences cohere as far as their meaning is concerned.

According to what Morgan and Sellner assumed, the reader background knowledge of cooking author's purpose in addition to their ability to reason and the assumption that the text is coherent.

In this respect coherence in writing can be stated as all the ideas in paragraph follow smoothly from one sentence to another. with coherence, the reader has an easy time understanding the ideas that the writer wishes to express.in other words,coherence is:

*making connection between ideas

*making meaningful connection between sentences.

*Patterning information

2.2.1.Local coherence versus Global coherence

The term "coherence" is studied under two general categories: local coherence and global coherence. Local coherence is defined "pair wise relations between sentences of a textual sequence" (VanDijk , 1978). Thus local coherence is achieved through establishing relations between sentences at the surface level.

On the other hand, global coherence is defined in terms of operations on whole sets of sentences,e.g.for the discourse as a whole (Van Dijk , 1978).

2.2.2. Approaches to Coherence

This section will deal with two main approaches to coherence, the process-oriented approach and product-oriented approach. These two approaches reflect various views on how coherence is achieved.

2.2.2.1. The process-oriented Approach to coherence

Since the 1970s there has been a heated debate among researchers on the above approaches in coherence .The two approaches, that is coherence as a process and coherence as a product .The former centres on what is unfolded as the reader interacts with the text ,where as the latter is explained in terms of features identifiable in the textual product it self.

The researches of the process-oriented approach challenged coherence (Carrel 1982 ; Tierney and Moenthal, 1983 , Morgan and Sellner,1980).These researches affirmed that coherence is not a feature that is embedded in a text, but instead it is a process of "coherence-making" on the part of the reader and writer and dependent on the notion of shared background knowledge.

Van Dijk (1972) argued that readers have certain expectations about the overall structure or "macro-structure" of text,depending on the genres.Carrell (1984 :162) and speber and Wilson (1986), advocated that coherence is dependent on relevance.

It is noteworthy that process-oriented approaches to coherence are subject to a lot of short comings.They suffer from retrospective recording (going over what has happened before) this can be subjective: what we will see will be determined by what we expect to see

2.2.2.2 Product-oriented approach to coherence

The majority of studies in the three decades before the 1990s,concentrated on discourse at the sentence level.the researcher followed the general interest shown by theoretical linguists in sentence grammar .Gradually some linguists shifted their emphasis from the analysis of sentence structure to the analysis of the process by which people use language.

Many quantitative studies using product-oriented approaches have not dealt with intersectional aspects of text structure. Rather, they have focused on errors in general, for example: greenall (1980) and shaughnessy (1977) have concentrated, within the transformation-generative paradigm, on syntactic features such as the sentence, T-units and clause length and so have other researchers (e.g. hunt, 1965, 1970, Moller 1969; O hare 1973, cited in Hubbard 1989: 52).

The importance of cohesion and coherence to writing quality has preoccupied researchers for some time; they have considered the use of cohesion in different genres of composition writing at different school grades. Smith and frawey (1983 in Ramaswamy, 2004) compared the use of conjunctions in the writing of four American English genres; fiction, religion, journalism and science. They found that the functions of conjunctions are not limited to "inter-clausal functions" and that the functions may be made clearer "through their differential distribution over genre". (p.19). That is, they are manifested in different modes of texts. They further claimed that different modes of texts connect differently. They discovered a prevalence of certain types of conjunctions over others in some genres, but no difference in use of coordination and subordination. They found that the cohesive use of the hypothetical if is less frequently present in journalism and science, where its frequency is more or less the same, than in religious discourse (Ramaswamy : 19).

They suggested that the types of conjunctions used in the genres they analyzed are of vital importance because "the semantics of such signals give us an excellent insight into the argument and narrative structure of each type of text". The use of "as" and "because" in the narrative texts of their data corpus here does not indicate a certain text structure and rhetorical component, a text generating or a text analysis scheme. This means that the semantics of the kinds of conjunctives used through light on the narrative structure of each type of text.

Zamel (1984) conducted a study on "conjuncts" which she defined as "those connectives more specifically referred to in grammar as coordinating conjunction and conjunctive adverbs or transitions"

(1984:110). Meaning or intent can be obscured, she argued, when these conjunctions are either absent or when their use is semantically or syntactically inappropriate. Indeed, conjunctions signal relationships within and between sentences and between longer units of discourse. She affirmed that, cohesive ties, when correctly used, make obvious the writers' "line of thought. They are essential for preserving meaning. She also approved that transition markers, can have more than one function in English: some linking devices in a list do serve similar semantic functions, but carry different grammatical weight. For example a word like since can be used as transition marker signaling both time and cause as in the following two sentences:

*since we arrived in Pretoria last Monday, it has been raining. (since signals time).

*Since he did not care for the poor, he lost election (Since since signals cause).

The above examples illustrate the importance of knowledge of the different roles and semantic of conjunctions in different context.

Beene (1985) had a view that coherence in students' written text is achieved through content organization, focus, functionality of connectives, topic development and appropriateness of grammatical structures. He also underlined the point that cohesive links in his study were inappropriately, and at times redundantly, used.

Using Halliday, and Hasan's model in his study in his study of cohesion and coherence, Khalil (1989 in Atteh, 2006) investigated the relationship between cohesion and coherence in 20 compositions in Arab EFL students' college writing. The relationship of cohesion and coherence was also tested by the use of multiple correlation statistics. A weak correlation was found ($r = 0.18$) between the number of cohesive ties and the coherence score of the text. This study occurs with an earlier one such as Carrell (1980:486) that a text may be cohesive but not coherent and that cohesion is just one of the many components contributing to coherence.

2.3 Cohesion

The notion of cohesion is the semantic relationships that exist within the text and which qualifies it as a text. It includes five categories: conjunctions, reference, lexical, ellipsis and substitution (Halliday and Hasan 1976:4)

Accordingly, cohesion is the network of lexical and grammatical relation that organizes and creates a text. This relation is considered to be a surface relation which connects words or expressions that we see or hear. In another attempt to clarify the notion of cohesion, Widdowson (1987:26) stated,

"The notion of cohesion, then refers to the way sentences and parts of sentences combine so as to ensure that there is a prepositional development"

Moreover, Mathews et al (1990) defined cohesion as "the overt relation of one sentence to another through the use of reference devices. There may be no use of cohesive ties in a text but it may be still coherent. It seems that cohesion is a controversial concept in writing. There is a dispute on the role cohesion plays in textual coherence.

Generally, there are two types of cohesion: sentence cohesion and discourse cohesion. Where the former category is concerned, Crystal (1997) points out that cohesion is a property of words that constitute a unit, within a sentence or individually into which no other word can be inserted. This can be illustrated by the case of superlative form "the most important" where no word is permitted between "the" and "most" or between "most" and "important" without violating the well-formedness of the phrase. Another kind of cohesion that takes place within the sentence is reported by Halliday and Hasan (1976:7-8). They point out that in a sentence such as:

*If you happened to meet the admiral, don't tell him his ship's gone down.

2.3.1. Cohesive Devices

According to some linguists, eg.Brostoff (1981 in Younis 1999:27) cohesion is one of the important features of discourse that account for texts readability. According to Zamel(1983:22):

"cohesive devices are crucial in writing for they turn separate clauses,sentences, and paragraphs into connected prose,signaling the relationships between ideas, and making obvious the thread of meaning the writer is trying to communicate"

In their study of cohesion in English Halliday and Hasan(1976) defined cohesion as what occurs when the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another.

Kuehner and Reque(1987) in Younis 1999: 27)) believed that when a piece of writing is coherent, its ideas move in a smooth, uninterrupted line from beginning to end. Accordingly, coherent text must proceed logically and smoothly through sensible ordering of the items or ideas in the paragraph and linking the sentences with transitional devices so that they follow smoothly from one idea to the next, uniting the paragraph into one coherent whole.

According to Halliday and Hasan(1976:30) cohesive relation is set up only if the same word or a word related to it has occurred previously. Realizing the function of cohesive in constructing discourse, they assert that:

"by its role providing texture cohesion helps to create text". Identifying features that combine to make up textual components, Halliday and Hasan identified five types of cohesion:

Reference cohesion, substitution cohesion, ellipses, lexical cohesion and conjunctive cohesion.

2.3. 1.1 Reference cohesion

Reference cohesion constitute "terms" in English language which, "instead of being interpreted semantically in their own right, make reference to something else for their interpretation".(Halliday and Hasan,1976:31).

According to Halliday(1985:35) reference has three types:

a-a particular or circumstantial element introduced at one place in the text can be taken as a reference point for something that follows. It is an exphoric relation, that is pointing outwards. It is possible to have anaphoric relation in which such items pointing backwards to the preceding text. Let us consider the example below:

*you cannot see the headmaster now. He is interviewing a teacher.

He in the above example is a reference cohesion tie because it shares the same referent as, and refers back to, the headmaster.

*The woman took up a cup of tea after she woke up.

She here is a reference cohesive tie, sharing the same referent as the woman.

b- the second type is demonstrative like, this, that, there, those, here. They may be either exphoric or anaphoric.

c- the third type is comparative reference which setup a relation of contrast. Any expression such as, the same, another, similar and related adverbs such as likewise, equally presume some standard of reference in the preceding text. However, comparative reference can be used cataphorically.

2.3 .1.2 Ellipsis and Substitution

The term ellipsis refers to the absence of a word, phrase or a clause which is understood. Ellipsis contributes to the semantic structure of the discourse by setting up lexicogrammatical relationship.

A relationship in wording rather than directly in meaning. On the other hand substitution serves as a place holding device, showing where something has been omitted and what its grammatical function would be. However, it is worth mentioning that here are some grammatical environments in which only ellipsis is possible, some in which only substitution is possible such as *I prefer the other (one) which allow for either. In the case of ellipsis cohesion, there are three types, depending on the syntactic category of the presupposed element.

2.3.1.2.1 Nominal ellipsis

Nominal ellipsis occurs when a noun or noun phrase is presupposed, as shown below:

These are my two doges.I used to have four.

The word dog has been omitted and can easily be understood or recovered from the context.

2.3.1.2.2 Verbal ellipsis

Verbal ellipses occurs where a verb or verb phrase is presupposed, as in:

Teacher:Have you done the homework?

John:yes, I have.

John's answer is elliptical in the sense that done the homework is un

2.3.1.2.3.Clausal Ellipsis

Clausal ellipsis occurs when both a noun or noun phrase and a verb or at least part of a verb phrase, is omitted. It is mostly seen in dialogue in yes/no questions , as in the example below:

Mary:Are you going to buy new dress for My birthday?

Mother:yes

Here the mother is affirming the entire clause you are going to buy a new dress for my birthday.

The whole clause may often be omitted, as in:

Henry: what grade did you get for French?

Paul:B

Since the whole clause has been omitted, paul's answer constitutes a clausal ellipsis and not nominal or verbal ellipses.

2.3.1.3 Conjunctive Cohesion

Halliday(1985) defines this typ of cohesion as a clause or clause complex, or some longer stretch of text, may be related to what follows it by one or other of a specific set of semantic relations.

Conjunctive cohesion has own intrinsic meaning. As Halliday and hasan(1976:226) point out "conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings,they are not primarily devices for reading out into the preceding(or following)text, but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the dis course'

Furthermore, words such as hence and so indicate that there is preceding segment of text presenting a cause or reason, and a following segment a result. In other words the relation between the two segments will be one of reason-result.

2.3.1.4 Lexical Cohesion

According to Halliday(1985) lexical cohesion comes about through the selection of items that are related in some way to those that have gone before. This as Halliday states ,may take the form of word repetition; or choice of a word related in some way to previous one- either semantically in case of relation of synonymous sense, or collocation ally when the relation is based on a particular association known as co-occurrence tendency. Nevertheless, cohesive devices do their job within intesential,intrasential relation, as well as between paragraphs as paragraphs connectors not sentence connector, Hoey (1985) and Bander (1985).

Lexical cohesion is the final type of cohesion dealt with in (Halliday and Hasan,1976). Unlike references, ellipsis, substitution and conjunction, lexical cohesion is not associated with any special syntactic class of elements. It is the

re fore the most open –ended and least adequately defined of the five kinds. In lexical patterning, successive sentences can be expected to exhibit some relationships through their vocabulary.

For example:

1-Through repetition of a word or a phrase.

2-Synonymy :words of almost the same meaning.eg .commonly, popularly. eg. Accordingly I took leave , and turned to the ascent of the peak. The climb is perfectly easy.

3-Antonym(the relation of semantic contrast, eg . High , low).

4-Hyponymy(the semantic relation between a more general expression and related specific relations)

5-Collocation (words which tend to occur with one another in certain contexts,eg.education,class room,class and so on.

2.4.1 The writer and the reader

Traxle and Gernsbacher (199:2015-237)argue that writers often fail to convey their intended messages. One way to achieve successful communication in the written discourse for the writers is to form mental representations of the ideas the writer wants to convey the text as it is written and of their readers as they will build the text.

According to Rosenblatt, the writer constantly transacts with the environment which the reader is apart of. Moreover, the writer has two roles in the text production.

2.4.2 Schema theory

According to all researchers,a text becomes meaningful when a reader interacts with the text. In the interactive approach to reading, coherence is reader-centered. A Text is coherent if there is a successful interaction between the information presented in the text and the reader's Schema to or stored knowledge concerning the text structure and the information presented.Celce-Murcia and Olishine (2000 : 126) define Schemata as:

"Frames of re-reference that readers possess,

Structures of the world and reality in the reader's
Minds, which enable them to develop Scenarios to be
Projected into events predicted as part of the interpretation
Process"

If the reader's Schema matches the text, the text is found to be meaningful, and so is coherent.

2.5. Review of Previous Studies

It has been shown that cohesion plays a role in discourse coherence. Some studies showed empirically that students' awareness of English cohesive devices often correlates with discourse coherence. IN this section, the discussion will be posed upon the studies that were concerned with coherence and cohesion in the writings of EFL learners.

Lautamatti. (1978: 60) conducted a study on some Observations on Coherence and Cohesion in Simplified Text". He analyzed several simplified texts, He found that simplification affects the nature of the textual coherence and cohesion also found that this simplification lead to the inconsistent variance in conjunction and the decrease of modality markers. He came out with the conclusion that, the complexity of the texts' devices led the reader to a more serious processing of information.

Pritchard (1980:40) IN her research 'A study of cohesion Devices in the Good and poor Compositions of Eleventh Graders". She investigated cohesive devices as an index of writing quality in connection with good and poor compositions written by eleventh graders. Her study showed that poor writing was characterized by proportionately more cohesive devices of all types i.e. writing problems were caused by overuse and unsuccessful use of cohesive devices.

Tierney (1981) Conducted another study on Cohesion and textual Coherence'. They examined whether the cohesive ties, which were used to measure and evaluate text cohesion, have an effect on the quality of the produced piece of writing or not. results of this comparison showed that there was no relation between the coherence ranking and the cohesive patterning.

Ching (1983) in his study 'Reading Development and Cohesion' used Halliday and Hasan's (1976) taxonomy, examined three kinds of cohesion, co-reference (anaphoric reference), conjoining (and so) and coextensions (exical cohesion). The results indicated that older students were more successful than young students in identifying the missing cohesive devices, also they produced a wider range of word choices.

Leinonen (1984) in Ramasawmy (2004) undertook analysis of 38 Finish teenagers EL2 composition of around 150 words each in length. She found these writers to be parsimonious in their use of conjunctive type of markers, a type elsewhere referred to as logical connectors. To a lesser degree they tended also to under exploit the ellipsis and substitution types.

Conner, u(1984) conducted a study entitled 'A study of Cohesion and Coherence in English as a second language students' Writing'. She examined coherence and cohesion in ESL learners writing as compared with the writing of native English speakers. Her study showed that to be cohesive, an ESL article does not need to be coherent. Furthermore, cohesion density is not found to be a discriminating Factor between native speakers and ESL writers.

Harnett (1986) in his study "static and Dynamic written by writer- who is defined by him as some one who enters college without traditional skills needed for success in customary introductory course in English composition. He concluded that his subjects seemed to be aware of the power and importance of cohesive devices.

Hubbard (1989) in His study 'Reference cohesion, Conjunctive cohesion and Rational coherence in students' Academic writings' reported his study of cohesion errors in the academic writing of EL2 students in south Africa.

Atieh (2006) claimed in his PhD study about the Manifestation of cohesion and coherence in the written English of Senior Palestinian University students'. The study investigated the difficulties relevant to cohesion and coherence in English writing by adopting a description approach both quantitative and qualitatively in the analysis of 30 essay written by 30 English Major seniors studying at ALQuds University in Palestine. The study showed the results that there was serious weakness in

students ability to produce cohesive and coherent texts is concerned with the general theoretical frame work of the study specifically it will comprise the research problem, the research questions, the hypotheses, the objectives and the methodology of the study.

Chapter Three

Methodology

The focal objective of this chapter is to describe the research methodology which is employed in this study. First, the chapter describes the population on which the empirical part of the study has been applied. Second, it provides description of the measuring tools (one Tool had been used (test) . Third, it states the procedures for collecting the data of study.

3.1. Population

This case study examines aspects of coherence and cohesion through quantitative and qualitative analysis of two test. The Two tests include written essay and an objective test . This test was answered by Sudanese university students of English language at one of the universities, namely, University of the Holly Quran and Islamic sciences. The students were as the third year level.

The sample of the study was composed of thirty students; all of them were female. Table (3.1) shows the distribution of these subjects.

Table(3.1) The distribution of the subjects

| University | Population | | Selected samples | |
|-------------|------------|--------|------------------|--------|
| | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Holly quran | 0 | 30 | 0 | 30 |

3.2 Research Tools

The researcher conducted Two Test one general expository writing test and a semi close-type objective test. These two tests was used by palestinian researcher Atieh(2006), who conducted this tests at ALQuds university on the West Bank in Palestine. The researcher made some minor changes in these tests before using it in order to make it more suitable to cope with the situation of the students in sudan. These changes did not affect the content of the tests. The use of this test led to more valid and more reliable results to examine the correlation between tools at the cognitive and performance levels. The students were asked to answer four objective questions related to cohesion and coherence. The aim offered. The first question was to examine the subjects cognitive abilities to connect sentences within a paragraph by filling in the blank spaces with appropriate connectors, connectors to be used were offered. The second question had the same aim, but here the subject were to choose ten appropriate connectors from a given list. The third question on aimed at checking the subjects' ability to reorder ten jumbled sentences in a logical coherent manner by using ten appropriate connectors and then to write them in a form of paragraph. The fourth question aimed at examining the subjects' ability to match ten sentences from column A' with ten sentences from column 'B' by using appropriate connectors. Thus the overall aim of this test was to check the subjects cognitive ability to deal with in the context of cohesion and coherence as one textual genre. In other words, it is not true here that certain questions are related to coherence alone and others are related to cohesion separately.

3.2.1. Test Validity

Validity refers to the factor that data collection tool measures what it is supposed to measure (Best & Kahan ,1986) .For instance,Halliday and Hasan's cohesion taxonomy was utilized by many researchers(Conner,1984;McCullly,1985,peyton,staton,Richardson&Wolf rom,1990;Tierney and Mosenthal,1983).

The validity of the tests was assigned special attention(The tests were carefully designed in a way that their focal objective was to test the subjects ability in writing cohesive and coherent text).it designed by Ph.Manal mokhtar.

In this study the test include test of the subjects cohesive and Coherent writing efficiency.and also aimed at testing their cohesive and Coherent thinking .The validity of the test was measured by using 'items factoranalysis which showed the internal consistency of the text items and indicated that they all combined in measuring the students'writing performance with reference to cohesion and coherence.

3.2.2. Test Reliability

FOR the test the researcher gave it to apiloting group of students,then the researcher scored it and the reliability was tested by calculating the internal consistency of the test by using Cronbach Alpha.The result was(0.76).This result showed that the test was reasonably reliable.

3.3. Procedures

As for the procedures adopted, the tests were given to the students in july 2015 at University of The holy Quran and Islamic sciences. The students were aware of the purpose of the tests . The tests tried to test the students ability to produce a coherent test there are also some objective question which provided the students with different options to choose the correct answer.The time given to the test was reasonably sufficient for the students to write the essay or to answer the objective questions.

After collecting the students answers the researcher scored the scripts according to the measures in the following section.

3.3.1.The Scoring of The test

In this section the researcher will explore the ways she used in scoring the test.

3.3.1.1.Cohesion Measure

In this section, attention was directed towards surface structure devices that composers employ in order to establish relationships between ideas in sentences. In other words, the researcher was investigating the cohesive devices within the texts. here, the researcher made a distinction between what renders a text coherent, and what renders it cohesive. That is a coherent text is considered as being both coherent and cohesive; whereas a cohesive text is not necessarily coherent. The students may use many cohesive devices in their written work which add nothing to the coherence of the text. This is because they either overuse these devices or they use them in the wrong way.

Using the scoring code the researcher scored the text to the five cohesive categories. The five cohesive categories were: lexical cohesion, conjunctives, Reference, substitution and ellipsis. These categories were initiated by Halliday & Hasan? (1976) taxonomy to examine the number and type of cohesive devices in the texts. Then the researcher counted and classified all the cohesive devices used within each text according to these five categories.

The scores provided within this scoring code ranged from 0 to five and the researcher chose the score that best described the level of each cohesive category within the paragraph being scored. The sum of the scores was to be divided by five in order for the whole text to be out of thirty. The other thirty scores were to be assigned to coherence. The test was assigned sixty scores, for each paragraph, five for cohesion and five for coherence.

3.4.2.Coherence Measure

To score coherence within the texts, a global scoring code was developed in this study. This code was developed in the light of Bamberg's (1984) guidelines for analyzing essays written for the National Assessment of Educational progress in her quest to provide an answer to her question, what makes a text coherent? (McLinn, 1988:65-66).

The code was divided into five categories: focus, which means that the text lacks a topical statement which can be a general statement that directs the reader's attention to the way the content may unfold. Topical statements are sought by the reader as they usually assist him visualize a certain pattern that the text may unfold. This is applicable to texts of complex functions and structures; e.g. purpose-method and cause-effect method. The second category is development, which refers to the ability of the students to compose well developed texts. The third category is relevance. that means whether the materials the students bring to the text add something or nothing. In other words are they relevant or not?

The fourth category is organization; content organization is concerned with whether paragraphs hang together in a way that sequence of paragraphs must be perceived as establishing a thought pattern that agrees with the academic writing conventions.

Content organization closely relates to the outline or plan which the writers set up prior to the actual writing of the texts. This is a very important requirement for writing coherent texts. If the writer fails to develop his texts according to such an outline, the text then is described as lacking content organization. This is because the writer will include chunks of information which do not link with each other as one organized unity.

The fifth category is continuity; this refers to grouping into paragraphs so that each paragraph deals with one topic. Each one of these categories was assigned five scores ranged from 0 to 5 and the

sum was to be divided by five in order for the whole text to be out of thirty.

Having finished now the description of the research methodology, it is time to proceed to chapter four for the data analysis and discussion.

Chapter Four

Data Analysis,Results & Discussion

The aim of this chapter is to analyze and discuss the results of the data of cohesion and coherence tests applied to texts of general expository nature and to texts of guided semi-closed nature. There were four questions which were asked at the beginning of this study. three hypotheses were derived from them. were built to collect data. used statistical tests: Analysis of Variance Test, one way t.test was used to compute the students achievement in the two tests. In addition to correlation test which was used to show the realation between coherence and cohesion in the students written texts In other words, the analysis of the data in this chapter will be implemented in accordance with the hypotheses stated in chapter one. The subjects on whom the tests were applied were 30 students. All of them were females. These students were third year students from one Sudanese universities.

4.1. Analysis of the results

In the present study, there were three hypotheses which corresponded to the study questions. The researcher will analyse them one by one in an effort to solve the study problem and answer its questions.

4.1.1. The first hypothesis

The first hypothesis which the study raised is as follows

There is weakness in Sudanese students' written work due to their ignorance of coherence and cohesion.

To test this hypothesis the researcher used (one way t.test) test as in tables(4.4),(4.5),(4.6),(4.7) to show the mean score of the students in the

Table(4.1)**Students' achievement in coherence Test (the pass score is 50%)**

| Level | Student Number | Mean | Standard Deviation (std-d) | Test value | T-test(T) | Degree of Freedom (DF) | Significance (sig) |
|-----------|----------------|---------|----------------------------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--------------------|
| Coherence | 30 | 19.8966 | 8.92566 | 0 | 12.004 | 28 | ,000 |

Source:Filed study 2015

Table(4.2)**Students' achievement in cohesion Test (the pass score is 50%)**

| Level | Student Number | Mean | Standard Deviation | Test value | T.test (T) | DF | Sig |
|----------|----------------|---------|--------------------|------------|------------|----|------|
| cohesion | 30 | 15.0345 | 5.55159 | 0 | 14.584 | 28 | ,000 |

Source:Filed study 2015

Table (4.3)**The analysis of the first test**

| Level | Student Number | Mean | Std-D | Test value | T | DF | Sig |
|----------|----------------|--------|---------|------------|----------|----|------|
| The test | 30 | 6.6333 | 2.78522 | 30 | -45.657- | 95 | .000 |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| out of 100 | | | | | | | |
|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Source:filed study2015

The mean score of the test is (6.6333) out of 60%.The mean also is below the average.This mean is significant,because it is below 3%. Accordingly this is an indication of weakness of the students' written texts.The students were not well acquainted with of rules of cohesion and coherence.The students'failure in this level can be explained more as in table(4.6) which tests the second test the objective one.

Table (4.4)

The analysis of the objective test

| Level | Student Number | Mean | Std-d | Test value | T | Df | Sig |
|--------------------------|----------------|-------|-------|------------|--------|----|------|
| Objective test out of 40 | 30 | 4.082 | 2.675 | 20 | 47,24- | 95 | .000 |

Source:filed study 2008

The objective test was a semi-closed test.It measured the students cognitive ability in knowing coherence and cohesion.Although the answers were given,the output of students was weak.The mean score was(4.082) out of 20(20% here is the pass score)which is very low.it also reveals a serious weakness.This indicates that if the students were aware of the rules of coherence and cohesion,their performance would have been better.The answers were ready,all was wanted just to organize them.Their failure in achieving organization of these answers reflected their inefficiency in this field of knowledge which led to bad results.

When we take the sum of the two tests out of 100,the weakness becomes very clear.Table(4.7) indicates this weakness.

Table (4.5)

The analysis of the two tests together

| Level | Student Number | Mean | Std-D | Test value | T | Df | Sig |
|----------------------|----------------|-------|-------|------------|---------|----|------|
| The two tests of 100 | 30 | 15.26 | 5,236 | 50 | -20.034 | 95 | .000 |

Source:filed study 2008

The mean score of the test out of 100(15.26) that is also weak as stated in tables(4.4),(4.5),(4.6),(4.7),(4.8) this affirms the weakness of the students.

Table (4.6) comparison between the achievement of the students

| Test value | T | Df | Significance | Test value | T | Df | Significance |
|------------|--------|----|--------------|------------|-------|----|--------------|
| 15 | -8.95 | 95 | .000 | 9 | -2.66 | 95 | .000 |
| 15 | -16.52 | 95 | .000 | 9 | -8.32 | 95 | .000 |
| 15 | -13.20 | 95 | .000 | 18 | -5.52 | 95 | .000 |
| 15 | -14.36 | 95 | .000 | 12 | -6.49 | 95 | .000 |
| 40 | -16.70 | 95 | .000 | 30 | -7.19 | 95 | .000 |

Source:Filed study 2008

According to tables(4.4)(4.5),(4.6),(4.7),(4.8) and (4.9) there is a clear weakness in the achievement of the students in written texts, the mean

score in the three cases is below the average. Moreover, table (4.10) states the maximum and minimum scores of the students in coherence and cohesion tests.

Table (4.7)

Maximum & Minimum scores of cohesion-coherence test

| Level | Maximum score | Minimum score |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Coherence | 41.00 | 8.00 |
| Cohesion | 31.00 | 7.00 |
| Total of the test out of 50% | 71.00 | 15.00 |

Source: Filed study 2015

4.1.2 The Second hypothesis

This hypothesis is stated as follow:

To test this hypothesis, the researcher used Duncan test as in table (4.8) which reveals the general mean score of the use of cohesive devices.

Table (4.8)

Mean of maximum and Minimum score of cohesion Categories

| Category | Number of students | Maximum | Minimum | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|--------------|--------------------|---------|---------|------|--------------------|
| Reference | 30 | 33.00 | 2.00 | 10.4 | 7.17 |
| Lexical | 30 | 23.00 | 4.00 | 9.18 | 4.14 |
| Conjunction | 30 | 25.00 | 1.00 | 8.08 | 4.00 |
| Ellipsis | 30 | 3.00 | .00 | 0.23 | 0.57 |
| Substitution | 30 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 0.33 | 0.51 |
| Sum | 30 | 66.00 | 10.00 | 2.28 | 11.46 |

Source: Filed study 2015

According to table (4.10) there is variation in the mean of the five categories of cohesion. The analysis showed that, the students use of

substitution and ellipsis was very weak. The students may not be well acquainted of these two categories.

Then table(4.11) indicates the frequencies of the cohesive devices.

Table (4.9)

Frequency of cohesive devices in the student's written text

| Category | Frequency |
|--------------|-----------|
| Reference | 1020 |
| Conjunction | 918 |
| Lexical | 808 |
| Substitution | 33 |
| Ellipsis | 23 |
| Total | 2802 |

Table(4.10) reveals the percentage of the students' use of cohesive devices according to their frequencies in their written texts. From the the students' use of reference is the most. Whereas their use of substitution and ellipsis is least. see appendix(G) for the frequency of cohesive devices in the written texts of the students.

Table (4.10)

Percentage of cohesive devices

| Category | Percentage |
|--------------|------------|
| References | 36.40% |
| Conjunction | 32.76% |
| Lexical | 28.83% |
| Substitution | 1.17% |
| Ellipsis | 0.82% |

Source: Filed study 2015

The table of the percentage, the reference is the highest and ellipsis is the lowest percentage.

Tables(4.10) &(4.11),show that there is overuse of some categories and lack of use of others which mean that the use of these categories by students was not right.The percentage of references is the highest one.while there is clear neglect of ellipsis and substitution which will lead to bad texts.Moreover,the textual analysis in section two of this chapter will reveal more clarification with support of examples of the written texts of the students.In her study,Prichard (1980) investigated cohesive devices in written work by eleven graders.she found that their writing was characterized by overuse and unsuccessful use of cohesive devices.Furthermore,witte and Faigly (1981) examined essays to explore the relationship between writing quality and coherence of written English texts.They found that lexical cohesive features of synonym,Hyponym, and collocation were important elements in writing quality.In the present study although the percentage of lexical cohesion which is (28.83%),it can be considered,there was wrong use of synonym and collocation which led to poor texts,more illustration will be set on 4.2.1.3.of this chapter.Magableh(1992) revealed in his study on the part of cohesion,that cohesion within the paragraphs was poorly accomplished through the use of cohesive ties more than any other devices.There was the same problem for the subjects of the present study, there was over use of 'and',and wrong use of references.The wrong use of references will be discussed in detail in 4.2.1.1.In the light of this discussion the hypothesis that:University students do not use cohesive devices appropriately,is confirmed and accepted.

4.1.3. The third hypothesis

This hypothesis states the following

There is a significance correlation between the students'use of cohesive devices and the coherence of their written texts.

To test this hypothesis the researcher used correlation coefficient Tests to show the use of the cohesive devices and the coherence of the texts of the students as stated in tables (4.11) &(4.12).

Table(4.11)**Correlation between coherence & Cohesion in the students****Written texts**

| Coherence | Mean | | |
|-----------|------|--------------------|----------------|
| .716(**) | | Person correlation | Sig.(2-tailed) |
| .000 | | | |
| 30 | 30 | N | |

Table (4.12)**Correlation between coherence & cohesion**

| | | Objective test |
|-----------|----------------------|----------------|
| Coherence | Person correlation | .181 |
| | Sig.(2-tailed) | .72 |
| | N | 30 |
| Cohesion | Pearson correlation | .395(**) |
| | Sig.(2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 30 |
| Total of | Pearson coorrelation | .295(**) |
| | Sig.(2-tailed) | .003 |
| | N | 30 |

Source: filed study 2008

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level(2-tailed).

Moreover, table (4.13) shows that the influence of the students' use of the cohesive devices and the coherence of their written texts.

The analysis of the results displayed by tables(4.11),(4.12) revealed that influence of the students' use of the cohesive devices and the coherence of their written texts was significant. Accordingly what had been stated by conner(1984) in her study which examined coherence and cohesion in ESL Learners writing as compared with the writing of native speakers. she concluded that to be cohesive, an ESL article does not need to be coherent. The results of Conner's study contradicts the results of the present study. Khalil (1989 Atieh 2006) investigated the relationship between cohesion and coherence in 20 compositions of Arab EFL students, college writing. The relationship of cohesion and coherence was also tested by the use of multiple correlation statistics.

Controlling for the number T-units used in each composition. weak correlation was found($r= 0.18$) between the number of cohesive ties and the coherence score of the text. In the present study according to the analysis the correlation between coherence and cohesion is significant.

As a result the hypothesis, there is a correlation between the students' use of cohesive devices and the coherence of their written texts is confirmed.

Chapter Five

Summary,Conclusions,Recommendations and Suggestions for Further Studies

This chapter is comprised of a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for further studies.

5.1. Summary of the Study

The present study attempted to investigate a very intricate and crucial aspect of learning English as a foreign language, that is the writing skill. special attention has been given to the two major rhetorical requirements of writing. These are coherence and cohesion. The researcher tackled this topic through applying both descriptive and analytical methods.

The study is comprised of five chapters. The subject of this study were university students at level three. These students were, from three Sudanese universities, namely, University students at level three. These students were, from one Sudanese universities, namely University of the Holly Quran and Islamic Sciences. To investigate the problem of the study the researcher raised four questions. These questions were as follows:

1. To what extent can weakness of the written work of university students be attributed to the lack of awareness of coherence and cohesion?
2. How appropriately do university students use the cohesive devices?

3.To what extent do university students of the study differ in achieving coherence and cohesion in their texts?

4.To what extent does the use of the cohesive devices correlate to the coherence of the students' written texts?

Based on these questions.Four hypotheses were put.These Hypotheses were as follows:

1.There is weakness in Sudanese university students' written work due to their ignorance of coherence and cohesion.

2.Sudanese university students of English language do not use cohesive devices correctly.

3.There is no significant difference in the achievement of the sample students of the three universities of the study.

4.There is a significant correlation between the students' use of cohesive devices and the coherence of their written texts.

To test the truth of these hypotheses,the researcher used one test .The test was a written essay in order to test the writing abilities of the students.also test was an objective test in order to test the students cognitive abilities in achieving coherence and cohesion in their written texts.The test was originally designed and validated by the Palestinian researcher Atieh, (2006:88). The tests reliability was also confirmed by the original designer and researcher.

The analysis of the data of this study focused on two main levels of textual analysis: coherence and cohesion.At the cohesion level, the analysis of students' written texts tackled five rhetorical categories: reference,conjunction,lexical,ellipsis and substitution.Moreover,the analysis on the coherence level focused also on five categories: topic development,topic relevance, topic continuity,topic focus and topic organization. The five categories of each level discussed in chapter four should be emphasized as one systematized integrity.

The results presented in chapter (4) which described the students' performance at the cognitive level and the writing level have revealed a

very serious deficiency in the linguistic level of the student. The students did not achieve the pass mark in the two tests of the study. In the first test, the written test, the students' written texts were loose and is incoherent. The analysis also revealed the students' weakness in using cohesive devices. In the second test which is an objective test, they were not able to arrange the sentences in away to be coherent and cohesive.

5.2 Conclusions of the Study

As related to the first hypothesis, which states that, there is weakness in Sudanese students' written work due to their ignorance of coherence and cohesion. The results showed that this hypothesis is true according to the scores of the students in both the written and the objective tests. So the first hypothesis was confirmed and was accepted.

The second hypothesis states, university students do not use cohesive devices appropriately. According to the results obtained from the students' written texts, their use of cohesive devices was not appropriate. In addition, the percentage of the categories of cohesive devices varied greatly. Thus the second hypothesis was confirmed.

As for the third hypothesis, states, there is no significant difference in the achievement of the students of the university of the study.

The results obtained from the analysis of the written texts of the students of these university, indicated that the students face the same problems. Thus the hypothesis was confirmed.

The fourth hypothesis states that, There is a significant correlation between texts revealed that to be coherent a text needs to be cohesive. As a result, the fourth hypothesis was confirmed and was accepted

Accordingly, the main findings of this study were :

1. The weakness of the Sudanese university students' written work can be attributed to their ignorance of coherence and cohesion.
2. Sudanese university students do not use cohesive devices correctly.

3. There is no significant difference in the sample students' achievement of the university of the study.

4. There is a significant correlation between the students' use of cohesive devices and the coherence of their written texts.

To sum up, having analyzed the texts written by the sample subjects, the researcher noticed that the most dominant linguistic, rhetorical and stylistic features within these texts were that, students tend to write many general statements that do not reveal specific information. Moreover the students did not use a lot of cohesive devices within the same sentence and between pairs of sentences. Furthermore they shifted from one idea to another in an illogical way. and tended to produce chunks of information which do not link with each other as one organized whole.

5.3. Recommendations

In the light of the finding of the study, the researcher has made the following recommendations:

1. The analysis of the results showed that, the Sudanese university EFL learners were incompetent in writing. Their overall scores were below the pass level. This low achievement in writing seems to be due to lack of practice. students rarely practice writing by themselves, they do not write unless they are asked to. Therefore, more attention should be given to the practice of writing to make it an easy task for the learners. More practice in the skill of writing helps the students to master it.

2. The students' awareness of the importance of writing should be increased regarding writing composition as a means of expressing their feelings and thoughts. students have learnt the basic of writing through the different levels of learning English. Thus they are required to care more for writing and to develop their writing abilities by themselves. The students should know that writing is one of the most important means used to assess their proficiency in English language.

3. School teacher and university instructors should dedicate part of the time allotted for English language classes for training their students in the skill of writing. They are also required to raise the students interest in writing. They are also required to raise the students interest in writing and to encourage them to write about the topics they prefer.

4. Instructors always need to revise and evaluate the students written work and to comment on it. As a result, students can feel the importance of their written work. Then the comments can guide them to improve their writing.

5. Emphasis should be laid on coherence and cohesion when teaching writing. Students' attention should be drawn to the importance of these elements in making writing comprehensible.

6. English syllabus designers should give a considerable attention to coherence and cohesion in the syllabus.

7. There should be a continuous assessment of the students' written work which can be presented many times to undergo a process of editing.

5.4. Suggestions for Further studies

The study attempted to investigate coherence and cohesion in the Sudanese EFL learners' written works. Thus further researchers and more investigations should be made in this area. The researcher suggests that, this kind of study should be applied on post graduate students. Nearly all the previous studies had been done at the undergraduate level. Moreover, the researcher suggests that, these aspects should be investigated in the written texts of those who study English for academic purposes (EAP) and special Purposes (ESP). Then a comparison should be made with those who are majoring in English. All the previous studies concentrated on the students who are majoring in English, so it is better if some studies will be done on those who are not majoring.

References

Atieh,H.(2006) ,The Manifestation of Cohesion and Coherence in the Written English of Senior University Students: A textual Analytic Study.Unpublished phD Thesis,Sudan University of science and Technology.sudan.

Beene,L. (1985) ,Text linguistics and composition:Research and practical Connection.New Mexico,U.S.ERIC Data base.Document No.ED27863.

Carell,p.L.(1982).cohesion is not coherence.TESOL Quarterly,16,479-488.

Conner,U.(1984) , A study of cohesion and Coherence in English as a second language students' writing,International Journal of Human Communication,17,301-316.

Crothers,E.J.(1978), Inference and coherence Discourse process,51-71

Giabir.D.M.(1995), Foreign Learners' Cohesive Devices:Analysis and Evaluation of Foreign Learners' Knowledge of cohesive Devices.Unpublished M.A.Dissertation.University of Khartoum.

Flower and Hayes. Acognitive Theory of Writing.1981.

Hal.(2000) ,Rules and Conventions of Academic writing.london.Queen Margaret University college press.

Halliday,M.A.K and Hasan(1976) ,Cohesion in English.Longman.

Halliday,M.K(1985).An Introduction to Functional Grammar.Edward ARNOLD.London.

Hoey,Michael (1991a) ,"Another perspective on coherence and cohesive Harmony".In: Eija Ventola (ed).Functional and systemic Linguistics.Berlin: de Gruyter,385-414.

Hubbard,E.H (1989), Reference cohesion,conjunctive cohesion and relational coherence in student academic writing.

Unpublished phD.Thesis:Unisia, Pretoria.

Lautamatti. (1978), some Observations on cohesion and coherence in simplified Texts. (Eric Document Reproduction service No.ED,275191

Mathews (1973), Practice.plan and Write Guided composition for students of English.Book Two:American Book company.

McLinn,Janet Betty (1988),coherence and cohesion in the Writing of Eighth Grade students. Doctoral Dissertation, University of New Orleans.

Morgan.and sellner,M.(1980).discourse and linguistic theory.IN :

Spiro,R.J.et-al.(eds) (1980),Theoretical issues in reading comprehension. New York:Erlbaum: 165-200.

Raimes,A.(1983),Techniques in Teaching Writing .New York.OU.P.

Ramasawmy,Narainsamy(2004),Conjunctive cohesion And Relational coherence in students' Compositions. Unpublished M.A

Thesis.University of south Africa.

Scinto,L.F.(1977),Textual competence: A preliminary Analysis of orally Generated Texts.linguistics:An International Review,Vol.194.pp5-34.

Shaughnessy,M.p.(1977), Error and expectations. Aguide for the Teacher of Basic Writing. New York.Oxford University press.

Smith,Frank.(1982), Psycholinguistics and reading,ed.Frank smith. New York.Holt,Rinehart and Winston.

Van Dijk,TA.(1972), some aspects of text grammer. The Hague: Mouton.

Widdowson,H.G.(1978), Teaching language As Curriculum.Oxford University press.Oxford.

Younis,M.(1999), Awareness of paragraph Writing Among Sudanese University students Acase study of preliminary Medical students University of Kartoum post Arabicization.Khartoum.

Zamel,V.(1981), Writing: The process of Discovering meaning. TESOL Quarterly 16.

