| number  | Title                                     | Page No |
|---------|---|---------|
|         | Dedication                                | I       |
|         | Acknowledgement                           | II      |
|         | Abstract in English                       | IV      |
|         | Abstract in Arabic                        | V       |
|         | List of tables                            | VI      |
|         | List of graphs                            | XII     |
|         | Chapter one Introduction                  | 1       |
| 1-1     | Overview                                  | 1       |
| 1-2     | Context of The Problem                    | 3       |
| 1-3     | The Statement of the Research Problem     | 3       |
| 1-4     | The Study Questions                       | 4       |
| 1-5     | The Hypotheses of the Study               | 4       |
| 1-6     | Objectives of the Stud                    | 4       |
| 1-7     | Significance of the Study                 | 4       |
| 1-8     | Limits of the Study:-                     | 5       |
| 1-9     | The Study Methodology                     | 5       |
| 1-10    | Definition of Terms                       | 5       |
| 1-11    | the Structure of the Study                | 6       |
|         | <b>Chapter two Literature Review</b>      | 7       |
| 2-1     | Conceptual framework                      | 7       |
| 2-1-1   | History o f discourse analysis            | 7       |
| 2-1-2   | Definition of discourse analysis          | 7       |
| 2-1-3   | text and discourse                        | 8       |
| 2-1-4   | the concept of texture and textuality     | 10      |
| 2-1-5   | spoken discourse versus written discourse | 12      |
| 2-1-6   | Grammar within and beyond sentence level  | 14      |
| 2-1-7   | Cohesion                                  | 15      |
| 2-1-8   | Types of grammatical cohesion             | 17      |
| 2-1-8-1 | Reference                                 | 17      |

| 2-1-8-2  | Ellipsis                                  | 20 |
|----------|---|----|
| 2-1-8-9  | Substitutions                             | 22 |
| 2-1-8-10 | - conjunctions                            | 23 |
| 2-2      | Review of previous and related studies    | 25 |
|          | summary of the chapter                    | 27 |
|          | <b>Chapter three Research Methodology</b> | 28 |
| 3-1      | The study methodology                     | 28 |
| 3-2-1    | Sampling techniques                       | 28 |
| 3-2-1    | The study population                      | 30 |
| 3-2-1    | Sampling of population                    | 30 |
| 3-2-2    | The student's written work                | 30 |
| 3-2-3    | Teachers questionnaire                    | 31 |
| 3-3      | Data collection procedure                 | 32 |
| 3-4      | Data analysis procedure                   | 33 |
| 3-5      | Validity of the tool                      | 34 |
| 3-6      | Reliability of the tool                   | 34 |
| 3-7      | Summary of the chapter                    | 38 |
|          | Chapter four                              | 39 |
|          | Data Analysis, Results and Discussion     |    |
| 4-1      | Analysis of teacher questionnaire         | 39 |
| 4-2      | analysis of student written work          | 46 |
| 4-2-1    | Learners use of demonstrative             | 46 |
| 4-2-2    | Learners use of pronoun                   | 47 |

| 4-2-3 | Learner's use of additive cohesive devices  | 48 |
|-------|---|----|
| 4-2-4 | 4-2-4 Learner's use of adversative cohesive | 50 |
| 4-2-5 | earner's use of temporal cohesive           | 52 |
| 4-2-6 | Learner's use of ellipse                    | 53 |
| 4-2-7 | Learner's use of                            | 53 |
| 4-3   | Test of hypotheses                          | 53 |
| 4-4   | General comment .                           | 54 |
|       | Chapter five                                | 55 |
|       | Summer, conclusion, Recommendations         |    |
| 5-1   | 5-1 Summary of the study                    | 55 |
| 5-2   | 5-2 conclusion                              | 56 |
| 5-3   | The main finding of this study are 5-3      | 57 |
| 5-4   | Recommendations                             | 57 |
| 5-5   | Suggestion for further study                | 58 |
|       | BIBLIOGRAPHY                                | 59 |
|       | Appendices                                  | 61 |
|       | Appendix one                                | 61 |
|       | Appendix two                                | 65 |
|       |   |    |
|       |   |    |
|       |   |    |
|       |   |    |
|       |   |    |
|       |   |    |
|       |   |    |
|       |   |    |
|       |   |    |
|       |   |    |
|       |   |    |
|       |   |    |

## **Dedication**

I dedicate this work to  $\,$  my dear mother , to the soul of  $\,$  my father , to  $\,$  my brothers , sisters and  $\,$  my sincere friends .

## Acknowledgement

The researcher would like to express his sincere gratitude to his supervisor Dr: Abdalla Yassin Abdalla for his patience, help and his good guidance. My thanks are extended to the head of English department Sudan University of Science and Technology Dr Ayman Hamdalneel and Institute of Languages Department of English at Ahfad University for Women for their support.

Also t thank the staff of library, Collage of Languages Sudan University of Science and Technology

### **Abstract**

This study aims to investigate linguistic cohesion in student written discourse. The researcher used descriptive analytical method quantitatively and qualitatively in it s design. The researcher used two instruments to collect the data of , which were students written work and questionnaire for teachers in two Sudanese Universities. The sample of the study consisted of 60 students written work and 50 teachers at Sudanese universities . both subject were study and teach English language third year .

The data were analyzed by using the statistical program (SPSS) then were textual analysis of the subjects the teachers questionnaire and students written work.

The analysis of the data showed that there were weaknesses in using some grammatical devices in student students written discourse, that due to their ignorance of grammatical cohesion moreover students at Sudanese universities are not able to produce well coherent text.

At the end of the study the researcher presented some recommendations . these recommendations focused on paying more attention to the use of grammatical cohesion in designing syllabuses and in teaching language, moreover students at Sudanese universities should receive more practice in using grammatical devices.

### **Abstract Arabic version**

#### مستخلص البحث

هدفت الدراسة لبحث الترابط اللغوي في النصوص المكتوبة لطلاب اللغة الانجلزيه بالجامعات السودانيه لقد تبنا الباحث المنهج التحليلي الوصفي كماً وكيفاً لجمع بيانات الدراسة استخدم الباحث استبيان و اختبار لنصوص المكتوبة وقد اثبتا صدقهما وثباتهما في الفصل الثالث من الرسالة

تكونت عينة الدراسة من ستين طالباً و خمسين محاضراً بالجامعات السودانية .

لتحليل بيانات الدراسة استخدم الباحث برنامج التحليل الاحصائي ( SPSS)

اظهر تحليل البيانات ان هناك ضعفاً في استخدام أدوات الربط اللغوي حيث ان استخدامها لم يكن كافيا وصحيحا.

فى الختام أوصى الباحث على ضوء النتائج المتحصل عليها بالاهتمام بمشكلة الترابط اللغوي عند تصميم المناهج وتدريسها كما أوصى باعطا الدارسين مزيدً من التطبيق والتدريب.

# VII

# Lists of the tables

| Table 2-2 Demonstrative reference the questionnaire                    |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Table 2-3 comparative reference  |  |  |  |  |
| Table 3-1 shows the numbers of teachers and their responses            |  |  |  |  |
| Table 3-1 shows chi- square, df, sig and median of scales of the       |  |  |  |  |
| teachers questionnaire   |  |  |  |  |
| Table .4-1 EFL students in Sudanese universities are weak in           |  |  |  |  |
| producing well coherent written discourse                              |  |  |  |  |
| Table 4-2 EFL students in Sudanese universities don't use sufficient   |  |  |  |  |
| grammatical devices in their written discourse                         |  |  |  |  |
| Table 4-3 EFL students in Sudanese universities don't usually use      |  |  |  |  |
| demonstrative as reference in their written discourse                  |  |  |  |  |
| Table 4-4 EFL students in Sudanese universities face some problems in  |  |  |  |  |
| using pronouns to refer to other nouns or noun phrases in their        |  |  |  |  |
| written work   |  |  |  |  |
| Table 4-5 Conjunctions as cohesive devices are not used appropriately  |  |  |  |  |
| in EFL students written discourse in Sudanese universities             |  |  |  |  |
| Table 4- 6 Additive cohesive devices (e g and ,for instance) are not   |  |  |  |  |
| used appropriately in EFL students written discourse in Sudanese       |  |  |  |  |
| universities   |  |  |  |  |
| Table 4-6 There are some weaknesses in using adversative cohesive( e g |  |  |  |  |
| however ,but ect devices in EFL students in Sudanese universities      |  |  |  |  |
| written discourse  |  |  |  |  |

| Table 4- 7Causal cohesive devices (e g because) are not appropriately      |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| used by EFL students in Sudanese universities in their written discourse   |  |  |  |  |
| Table 4-8Temporal cohesive (e g first to sum up) are rarely used           |  |  |  |  |
| correctly by the EFL students in Sudanese universities in their written    |  |  |  |  |
| discourse  |  |  |  |  |
| Table 4- 9EFL students in Sudanese universities are unable to use ellipsis |  |  |  |  |
| (nominal, verbal or clausal) in their written discourse.                   |  |  |  |  |
| Table 4=10 EFL students in Sudanese universities are unable to use         |  |  |  |  |
| substitution (nominal, verbal or clausal) in their written discourse       |  |  |  |  |
| Table 4-11 EFL students in Sudanese universities don't receive enough      |  |  |  |  |
| practice on grammatical cohesion   |  |  |  |  |
| Table 4-12The weaknesses of using grammatical devices in EFL students in   |  |  |  |  |
| Sudanese universities are due to ineffective teaching methods              |  |  |  |  |
| Table 4-12The weaknesses of using grammatical devices in EFL students in   |  |  |  |  |
| Sudanese universities are due to ineffective teaching methods              |  |  |  |  |
| Table 4- 13The syllabuses in EFL Sudanese universities don't cover all the |  |  |  |  |
| uses of grammatical cohesion in written discourse                          |  |  |  |  |
| Table 4-14Using grammatical devices is a real problems to EFL students     |  |  |  |  |
| in Sudanese universities which teachers usually come across                |  |  |  |  |
| Table 4-14 3: shows students use of demonstrative                          |  |  |  |  |
| Table 4-15 shows students uses of pronoun as reference                     |  |  |  |  |
| Table 4-2-3 Learner's use of additive cohesive devices                     |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

# List of graphs

| Graph 4-1 | shows the student use of         |
|-----------|----------------------------------|
|           | demonstrative                    |
| Graph 4-2 | shows students uses of pronoun   |
|           | as reference                     |
| Graph 4-3 | show the use of additive devices |
| Graph 4-4 | Learner's use of adversative     |
|           | cohesive                         |
| Graph 4-5 | Learner's use of temporal        |
|           | cohesive                         |

# Chapter one

Introduction

# Chapter Two