Chapter One

Introduction

1-1 Background

Cohesion refers to the relation of meaning that exists within a text. It is a part system of language which has potential for meaning enhancement in texts.

Halliday & Hassan (1976) noticed that cohesion occurs when the interpretation of some element in discourse is dependent on that of another .Cohesion means unity in writing as well as in speech, we use certain words and expression to establish connection a mong ideas in a sentence and paragraph. these cohesive devices add unity to our work if we don't use them often enough, our essay will be a collection of disjointed sentence ,the sentence may be grammatically correct ,but if we fail to establish the connection between them a great deal of meaning will be lost .

EFL students may have trouble understanding a text that seems to have easy words and concepts because they fail to identify the cohesive ties .conversely the teacher may fail to understand the ideas or arguments that EFL student trying to express because the student has not yet learned how to tie English sentence together clearly and naturally with appropriate cohesive devices.

For that reasons mentioned the researcher become aware that it was   necessary to conduct a study that what was the reason that there were still so many student form English department could not perform good writing particularly in using cohesive devices. the researcher was triggered to investigate whether the students knowledge was stated well within the student mind by asking them to locate the cohesive with in written essay test. The student of English department must be able to have a good writing skills in order to teach writing when they have graduated .

The researcher investigates the writing problems in a research entitled '' investigation of cohesive devices in Sudanese EFL students ' written work'' case study on the third year student of English department college of languages ''where this research conducted in university of Sudan of science &technology.

1-2 Statement of the problem

The problem which the present study attempts to investigate is that Sudan university students particularly English language students where have a serious problem in dealing with writing most of them confused on how to make a good essay where cohesive devices are used as indicator of good writing and fundamental to great cohesive unified text ,they are weak in writing generally and in a achieving cohesion devices such as`

-References

-Substitution

-Ellipsis ...ect

1-3 Research questions

This study tries to answer for the following questions:

1- What problems do students face in using cohesive devices to achive cohesion?

2-To what extent are `students' aware of cohesive devices in their written work?

3-what are the common errors in the usage of written cohesive device?

1-4 Research hypotheses

1-there are many difficulties that face Sudan University Students in using cohesive device in their writing .

 2-the English language student in Sudan University of Science &Technology overuse certain types of cohesive devices in their writing ,while missing others .

3-the low English proficiency of the students caused no coohesive   writing.

1-5 Methodology of the study

The study will use a descriptive , analytical method to adopt a test as a tool in collecting data ,the data will be analyzed to identify the difficulties that Sudan university students level three in department of English language college of language encounter in using cohesive.

1-6 Significance of the study

The study is considered significance for the following reasons:

The study expected to provide useful information to the writing lectures and student of English language department . In small scope the result of this study was expected to be a tiger for the students to improve their writing skills quality, and the department would get useful information as feedback to improve it quality of education.

1-6 Objectives of the study

This research was aims to find out

1- The knowledge of cohesive devices of Sudan University of Science and Technology students in English writing ,with a perspective that each of them is able to write an essay but not sufficiently well.

2- Common errors in usage of written cohesive devices among the student.

3- Presenting some recommendation and suggestion for further research.

1-7 Limits of study

In order to keep this study on its focus it is necessary to have some limits. this research only investigate the cohesive devices in the writing of student of Sudan University of Science & technology college of language level three on their academic year 2016-2017.

Chapter Two

Literature Review and Previous Studies

2-0 Introduction

In this chapter some of the literature related to the subject of the study is reviewed, first discourse analysis and its features are discussed with reference to the definitions made by some researchers. Next, concept of cohesion and non-structural and structural cohesive devices are presented and explained; finally the previous studies on cohesion and coherence are reviewed.

2.1 Discourse Analysis

2-1-1. Definition of discourse

Since its introduction to modern science the term 'discourse' has taken various, sometimes very broad, meanings. In order to specify which of the numerous senses is analyzed in the following dissertation it has to be defined. Originally the word 'discourse' comes from Latin '*discursus*' which denoted 'conversation, speech'. Thus understood, however, discourse refers to too wide an area of human life, therefore only discourse from the vantage point of linguistics, and especially applied linguistics, is explained here.

There is no agreement among linguists as to the use of the term discourse in that some use it in reference to texts, while others claim it denotes speech which is for instance illustrated by the following definition: "Discourse: a continuous stretch of (especially spoken) language

larger than a sentence, often constituting a coherent unit such as a sermon, argument, joke, or narrative" (Crystal 1992) On the other hand Dakowska, being aware of differences between kinds of discourses indicates the unity of communicative intentions as a vital element of each of them. Consequently she suggests using terms 'text' and 'discourse' almost interchangeably betokening the former refers to the linguistic product, while the latter implies the entire dynamics of the processes (Dakowska 2001) According to Cook (1990) novels, as well as short conversations or groans might be equally rightfully named discourses.

Seven criteria which have to be fulfilled to qualify either a written or a spoken text as a discourse have been suggested by Beaugrande (1981). These include:

- **Cohesion** - grammatical relationship between parts of a sentence essential for its interpretation;
- **Coherence** - the order of statements relates one another by sense.
- **Intentionality** - the message has to be conveyed deliberately and consciously;
- **Acceptability** - indicates that the communicative product needs to be satisfactory in that the audience approves it;
- **Informativeness** - some new information has to be included in the discourse;
- **Situationality** - circumstances in which the remark is made are important;

- **Intertextuality** - reference to the world outside the text or the interpreters' schemata;

Nowadays, however, not all of the above mentioned criteria are perceived as equally important in discourse studies, therefore some of them are valid only in certain methods of the research (Beaugrande 1981, cited in Renkema 2004)

- ## 2.1.2 Features of discourse.

Since it is not easy to unambiguously clarify what a discourse is it seems reasonable to describe features which are mutual to all its kinds. To do it thoroughly Saussurean concepts of langue and parole are of use. Ferdinand de Saussure divided the broad meaning of language into langue, which is understood as a system that enables people to speak as they do, and parole - a particular set of produced statements. Following this division discourse relates more to parole, for it always occurs in time and is internally characterized by successively developing expressions in which the meaning of the latter is influenced by the former, while langue is abstract. To list some additional traits: discourse is always produced by somebody whose identity, as well as the identity of the interpreter, is significant for the proper understanding of the message. On the other hand langue is impersonal that is to say more universal, due to society. Furthermore, discourse always happens in either physical, or linguistic context and within a meaningful fixed time, whereas langue does not refer to anything. Consequently,

only discourse may convey messages thanks to langue which is its framework (1).

2.1.3 Types of discourse

Not only is discourse difficult to define, but it is also not easy to make a clear cut division of discourse as such. Therefore, depending on the form linguists distinguish various kinds of communicative products. A type of discourse might be characterized as a class of either written or spoken text, which is frequently casually specified, recognition of which aids its perception, and consequently production of potential response (Cook 1990:156). One of such divisions, known as the Organon model, distinguishes three types of discourse depending of the aspect of language emphasized in the text. If the relation to the context is prevailing, it conveys some knowledge.

thus it is an informative type of discourse. When the stress is on a symptom aspect the fulfilled function is expression, as a result the discourse type is narrative. Last but not least in this division is argumentative discourse which is characterized by the accent on the signal aspect.

This distinction due to its suitability for written communicative products more than for spoken ones faced constructive criticism whose accurate observation portrayed that there are more functions performed. Consequently there ought to be more types of discourse, not to mention the fact that these often mix and overlap. Thorough examination of the matter was conducted, thus

leading to the emergence of a new, more detailed classification of kinds of spoken texts.

The analysis of oral communicative products was the domain of Steger, who examined features of various situations and in his categorization divided discourse into six types: presentation, message, report, public debate, conversation and interview. The criteria of this division include such factors as presence, or absence of interaction, number of speakers and their relation to each other (their rights, or as Steger names it 'rank'), flexibility of topic along with selection and attitude of interlocutors towards the subject matter.

However, it is worth mentioning that oral discourse might alter its character, for instance in the case of presenting a lecture when students start asking questions the type changes to interview, or even a conversation. Using this classification it is possible to anticipate the role of partakers as well as goals of particular acts of communication.

The above mentioned typologies do not exhaust the possible division of discourse types, yet, nowadays endeavor to create a classification that would embrace all potential kinds is being made. Also, a shift of interest in this field might be noticed, presently resulting in focus on similarities and differences between written and spoken communication (Renkema 2004).

2.1.4 Written and spoken discourse

Apart from obvious differences between speech and writing like the fact that writing includes some medium which keeps record of the conveyed message while speech involves only air, there are certain dissimilarities that are less apparent. Speech develops in time in that the speaker says with speed that is suitable for him, even if it may not be appropriate for the listener and though a request for repetition is possible, it is difficult to imagine a conversation in which every sentence is to be rephrased. Moreover, talking might be spontaneous which results in mistakes, repetition, sometimes less coherent sentences where even grunts, stutters or pauses might be meaningful. The speaker usually knows the listener, or listeners, or he is at least aware of the fact that he is being listened to, which enables him to adjust the register. As interlocutors are most often in face-to-face encounters (unless using a phone) they take advantage of extralinguistic signals as grimaces, gesticulation, expressions such as 'here', 'now', or 'this' are used. Employment of nonsense vocabulary, slang and contracted forms (we're, you've) is another feature of oral discourse. Among other significant features of speech there are rhythm, intonation, speed of uttering and, what is more important, inability to conceal mistakes made while speaking (Crystal 1995, Dakowska 2001)

In contrast, writing develops in space in that it needs a means to carry the information. The author of the text does not often know who is going to read the text, as a

result he cannot adjust to readers' specific expectations. The writer is frequently able to consider the content of his work for almost unlimited period of time which makes it more coherent, having complex syntax. What is more, the reader might not instantly respond to the text, ask for clarification, hence neat message organization, division to paragraphs, layout are of vital importance to make comprehension easier. Additionally, owing to the lack of context expressions such as 'now' or 'here' are omitted, since they would be ambiguous as texts might be read at different times and places. One other feature typical of writing, but never of oral discourse, is the organization of tables, formulas, or charts which can be portrayed only in written form (Crystal 1995).

Naturally, this division into two ways of producing discourse is quite straightforward, yet, it is possible to combine the two like, for example, in the case of a lesson, when a teacher explains something writing on the blackboard, or when a speaker prepares detailed notes to be read out during his speech. Moreover, some of the foregoing features are not so explicit in the event of sophisticated, formal speech or a friendly letter.

- Discourse expressed formally and informally.

The difference in construction and reception of language was the basis of its conventional distinction into speaking and writing. Nevertheless, when the structure of discourse is taken into consideration more essential division into formal and informal communicative products gains

importance. Formal discourse is more strict in that it requires the use of passive voice, lack of contracted forms together with impersonality, complex sentence structure and, in the case of the English language, vocabulary derived from Latin. That is why formal spoken language has many features very similar to written texts, particularly absence of vernacular vocabulary and slang, as well as the employment of rhetorical devices to make literary-like impact on the listener.

Informal discourse, on the other hand, makes use of active voice mainly, with personal pronouns and verbs which show feelings such as 'I think', 'we believe'. In addition, contractions are frequent in informal discourse, no matter if it is written or spoken. Consequently it may be said that informal communicative products are casual and loose, while formal ones are more solemn and governed by strict rules as they are meant to be used in official and serious circumstances.

The relation of the producer of the message and its receiver, the amount of addressees and factors such as public or private occasion are the most important features influencing selecting either formal or informal language. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to assume that the contemporary learner, who may easily travel and use his linguistic skills outside class, will encounter mainly informal discourse, which due to its flexibility and unpredictability might be the most difficult to comprehend. Accordingly, it seems rational to teach all

varieties of language relying on authentic oral and written texts (Cook 1990).

2.1.5 Discourse analysis –its origins and development

Discourse analysis is a primarily linguistic study examining the use of language by its native population whose major concern is investigating language functions along with its forms, produced both orally and in writing. Moreover, identification of linguistic qualities of various genres, vital for their recognition and interpretation, together with cultural and social aspects which support its comprehension, is the domain of discourse analysis. To put it in another way, the branch of applied linguistics dealing with the examination of discourse attempts to find patterns in communicative products as well as and their correlation with the circumstances in which they occur, which are not explainable at the grammatical level (Carter 1993).

2.1.6 Starting point of discourse analysis

The first modern linguist who commenced the study of relation of sentences and coined the name 'discourse analysis', which afterwards denoted a branch of applied linguistics, was Zellig Harris (Cook 1990). Originally, however, it was not to be treated as a separate branch of

study - Harris proposed extension of grammatical examination which reminded syntactic investigations . The emergence of this study is a result of not only linguistic research, but also of researchers engaged in other fields of inquiry, particularly sociology, psychology, anthropology and psychotherapy (Trappes-Lomax 2004:133). In 1960s and 1970s other scholars, that is philosophers of language or those dealing with pragmatics enormously influenced the development of this study as well. Among other contributors to this field the Prague School of Linguists, whose focusing on organization of information in communicative products indicated the connection of grammar and discourse, along with text grammarians are worth mentioning (McCarthy 1991).

A significant contribution to the evolution of **discourse analysis** has been made by British and American scholars. In Britain the examination of discourse turned towards the study of the social functions of language. Research conveyed at the University of Birmingham fruited in creating a thorough account of communication in various situations such as debates, interviews, doctor-patient relations, paying close attention to the intonation of people participating in talks as well as manners particular to circumstances. Analysis of the factors essential for succession of decently made communication products on the grounds of structural-linguistic criteria was another concern of British scholars. Americans, on the other hand, focused on examining small communities of

people and their discourse in genuine circumstances. Apart from that, they concentrated on conversation analysis inspecting narratives in addition to talks and the behavior of speakers as well as patterns repeating in given situations. Division and specification of types of discourse along with social limitations of politeness and thorough description of face saving acts in speech is also American scholars' contribution (McCarthy 1991).

2.2 Cohesion

2.2 .1 Concept of cohesion

Cohesion in this study is defined as the linguistic features which help to make sequence of sentence a text i.e. to give it texture. Haliday & Hassan (1976).

Cohesion devices are words or phrases that act signals to the reader in order to help him or her make connections with what has already been stated. as Haliday &Hassan(1976).

Cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is depended on that of another .in the sense that it cannot be effective decoded except by recourse to it .when this happen, a relation of cohesion is setup , the two element the presupposing and presupposed, are there by at least potentially intergraded into a text.

In cohesion, the relation between the presupposing and pre supposed is called a tie. Such relationships include within sentence and interdependency.

However, the notion of cohesion is not just A syntactic but also a semantic one; it is semantic relation between an element that is crucial to interpretation of it. Haliday& and Hassan (1976:8).

2.2.2 Cohesion in sentence structure

The concept cohesion is a sentence one. Haliday and Hassan (1976).   A semantic relation is expressed between one element in a text.   They claim that the relation between two cohesive element s found in a text is not determined by the grammatical structure. However grammatical structure "determines the way in which cohesion is expressed Haliday &Hassan (1976).

In this respect the sentence ,as the highest structural unit in the grammar ,serves to be a significance unit for cohesion .A text functions as a single meaningful unit when each individual sentence has its cohesive relations with other sentences has within a text .

Cohesive relations are both within a sentence and between sentences. in terms of grammatical structure of sentences .the use of pronouns to refer to other nouns in order to avoid direct repetition is one of the examples of cohesive references .this types of cohesion is always expressed when one entity is referred to one more items

in a sentence the entity may be named again at the second mention, or it may be referred to by a pronoun .cohesion is realized more obviously a cross sentence boundaries since it produces a more striking effect As (Hoey 1991) mention On the hand two sentence may be understood as being in contrast with each ,or on other hand a whole group of sentences or clauses may be interpreted as exemplify what has been earlier.

 Cohesion is away in which dependent choices in different point of a text correspond with or presuppose one another forming networks of sequential relations. Markes (1984).

Scholars assume that a sentence is structured grammatically .this grammatical condition presupposed that all the individual parts of the sentence are linked together and thus they contribute to construction of a text .cohesive relations established by various ties across sentence of a text help readers to perceive the meaning of individual sentence s presented as a single entity. Textual meaning, what makes it possible for reader to understand textual meaning is continuity of semantic relationships that is described as necessary element in the interpretation   of text. Halliday&Hassen (1976).

2.2.3 Cohesion in written discourse

Cohesion is one of the central concepts in discourse analysis that has been developed to discover substitutable items in any stretch of written or spoken language that is felt as complete in itself. (Hoey1983).

Discourse analysis refers to studies of the sentence in its linguistics context (simensen 2007). What is important for discourse analysis is that "reader interpret particular meaning and contexts in the light of their own existing knowledge and social association.(Hillier 2004).

Halliday and Hassen introduces the main idea of cohesion saying that we need t o establish relationships between sentences and clause in order to construct discourse. (1994)).the number of grammatical items in a sentence determines by its length .,however theses grammatical items of characteristic feature of discourse structure, but they do not determine whether a text co is coherent or not ,what help to interpret cohesion in written discourse is to study of semantic resources used for linking across .what can observed within sentence are structures which define the relations a among the parts Halliday and Hassan (1976) .In terms of cohesion what can be observed across sentences in written discourse are not structures but links that have particular features that are to be interpreted on the part of the a reader.

2.2.4 Types of cohesion

There two broad division of cohesion identified by Haliday& Hassan (1976) grammatical and lexical.

Reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction are the various types of grammatical cohesion. Lexical cohesion is realized through repetition of lexical items synonyms, super ordinates and general words.

The Table 2-1 (based on Halliday and Hassan 1976) presents the division of the types of cohesion that will be described further in this chapter.

Table 2.1: Types of cohesion:

Cohesion				
Lexical		**Grammatical**		
Repetition	Reiteration	Exophoric {situatioal}		Reference
Synonyms		Endophoric		
Super ordinate		Cataphoric {To following text}	Anaphoric {To preceding text }	
General word		Substitution		
Collocation		Ellipsis		
		Conjunction		

2.2.4.1 Grammatical cohesion

Linguistic structure the highest Grammatical cohesion refer to the Structural unite in the grammatical elements occur and the way they are related within as a sentence cohesive relationships with other sentence to create a certain linguistic environment, and the meaning of each

sentence depends on it .various linguistic environment and, the meaning of function as a single meaningful unite or not.

Table 2 (based on Haliday and Hassan 1976) illustrates the types of grammatical cohesion that will be discussed further in this chapter.

Table.2-2 Types of Grammatical cohesion

Grammatical cohesion				
Conjunction	Ellipsis	Substitution	Reference	
Additive	Nominal	Nominal	Personal	
And ,and also, nor, or, else, furthermore, by the way ,in other words, likewise, one the other hand ,thus		One/ones, the same ,so	Possessive	Existential
			My/mine, your/yours Our/ours, his, her/hers, its, Their/theirs, one s	I, you, we, he, she, it One, they.
Adversative	Verbal	Verbal	Demonstrative	
Yet, though, only ,but, however, at least, in fact, rather, on the contrary, I mean ,in any case		Do, be, have, do the same ,likewise, do So, be so, do it ,/that, be it/that	This /that ,these/those, there/here	
Causal	Clausal	Clausal	Definite article	

So, then ,therefore ,because ,otherwise		So, not	The
Temporal			Cooperatives
Then, next ,before that, first...then ,at ,first,once ect , formerly..finally			Same, identical similar, such different ,other ,else

2.2.4.1.1 Reference

The principle of reference is based on the exploration of lexico grammatical environment-al a text to look elsewhere to get a future picture and to make complete sense of a word or structure Haliday &and Hassan (1976).

Referential cohesion plays a special role in creating cohesive ties a single sentence is taken out of context. Nuwan (1993) .

This study of grammatical cohesion in student essay necessary requires the retrieval of the information necessary for interaction form the given context this refer to exospheric reference ,an exospheric in relation play no part in textual cohesion .

Haliday &and Hassan (1976) distinguished between the two kind of of reference endophoric relations: anaphoric and cataphoric. Anaphoric reference points listeners or reader backward to what is previously mentioned on the

contrary .cataphoric reference looks forwards in the text in order to identify the elements the reference refer to:

1- Look at the sun .it is going down quickly.

(It refer back to the sun)

2- Its going down quickly, the sun

(it refer forward to the sun)

Halliday and Hassan (1976) identity three sub types of referential cohesion   personal, demonstrative various types of referential cohesion enable speakers and writers to make multiple references to things and people with in a text.

Personal reference items are expressed through the category of person.   Reference is used to identify individuals and things or objects that are named at some other point in the text.

The demonstrative reference is essentially a form of verbal pointing. It is expressed thought determiners and adverbs. this types of reference is achieved by means of location on a scale of proximity what is understood by proximity is nearness in place and time occurrence or relation, demonstrative reference items can represent a single or phrase and they can range across several paragraphs

 we went to opera last night .that are our first outing for months

(that refers anaphoricaly to last night).

The definite article' the 'is classified together with demonstratives and possessive .

The third types of referential cohesion is comparative reference comparative reference express through adjective and adverb and serves to compare items within a text in terms of and identity or similarity (Nunan:1993). tTable 3 provides examples for reference .

Table.2-3. Comparative Reference

Comparative reference			
Particular		**General**	
Ithere were twice as many people there as last time.	Quantity/ Numerative	We have received exactly the <u>same</u> report as was submitted tw*o months ago.*	Identity
We are demanding higher living standard.	Quality/ Epithet	The candidates gave three <u>similar</u> answers.	Similarity
		A:would you like <u>these seats?</u> <u>B</u>*: No, I d like the other seats*	Difference

2.2.4.1.2 Substitution

The other types of grammatical cohesion substitution and ellipsis ,are presented separately in the early work of Haliday and Hassan (1976) theses two types are essential the same

Substitution and ellipsis can be treated as the same process providing cohesion   a discourse where ellipsis can be interpreted as that form of substitution in which the items is replaced by nothing .Halliday and Hassan(1976) described substitution on the lexicogrammatical level it is a type of cohesive relation between words and phrase with in text Reference is on the

other hand interpret on the semantic level as a relation between meaning .Both types of cohesion constitute likes between parts of text ,but substitution is most used anaphorically items that may point in any direction .As with endophorially reference substitution holds the text together and avoid repetition . in contrast to reference it implies non identity of meaning and serve to define a new referent .

The term repudiation is used by Halliday and Hassen 1976 to provide a key to the understanding of substitution and to distinguish it from reference item and the one that it presuppose have a referential identity of definition .in substitution ,some new specification ,or redefinition ,can be added in the presupposition relation when apart of the element in the preceded text is not carried over .

Halliday and Hassan (1976).used the term (A substitution likes A substitution is a sort of counter which is used in place of repetition of a particular item .

-You think john already knows ?

-I think every body <u>does</u> . (does substitutes for knows) .

Haliday and Hassan (1976)define deferent types of substitution as grammatical relation l in the wording. They Introduce three types of substitution: Nominal, verbal and clausal.

Table2-.4. provide three types of substitution

.Clausal substitution	Verbal substitution	Nominal substitution
A: is it going to rain ? B:I think <u>so</u>	<u>drink too much</u>A: Annie says you B: so do you	There are some new <u>tennis</u> Balls in the bag .theses <u>ones</u> have lost their bounce.

The first type of substitution is represented by the following nominal substitution :one ,ones ,same ,so Iii have a glass of apple Juice please?

-I have read several books by this author .but this one is best I think .The second type of substitution is verbal substitution **do its always found in final position** and it is substitute the lexical verb or the predicator .

I don't know the meaning of the those long words .and what more idont

 In this example above , the verbal substitute do and the presupposed item are found in the same sentence but different unite.

The verbal substitution do which it is depended one a report ,a condition or opinion.

2.2.4.13 Ellipsis

Many scholars base their dissertation of ellipsis on the study of ellipsis on study of Haliday and Hassan (1976) who define it as substitution by zero the basic different between the two types of cohesion is that in ellipsis there is nothing to be inserted into structural slot of missing information --whose is this hat ?- its **mine**

In this example a deictic element **mine**_presupposes an item expressing thing.

Hiller (2004:25) define ellipsis as leaving out and distinguish be recoverable from else where in the text exophoric not cohesive where the latter one can be understood form the immediate situation

Honey (1983:11) treats ellipsis as delectation that accurse when the structural of one sentence is incomplete and missing elements can be recovered from a previous sentence unambiguously

as with the substitution there are. three types of ellipsis nominal ,verbal ,clausal .

Table2-5 types of ellipsis

Nominal ellipsis	Verbal	Clausal
My kids play an awful lot of sport .both(x)are incredibly energetic	A:Have you been working? B:yes I have (x)	A:why do you set only set three places? pauls staying fore dinner isn't he ? B: is he ? he didn't tell me (X).

Nominal ellipsis occurs s within the nominal group where the function of omitted head. is taken by some modifying element such elements are deictic (determiners) numerative .

-four other oyster following them ,and yet another four .

 Thus the second clause is cohesive becaus it presuppose the previous on that is not elliptical .

The presuppose item in elliptical clause can be restored anaphoric ally and always replaced by a full a nominal group . the role of nominal ellipsis is to up great a word function as deictic ,numerative.

Epithet or classifier form the states of modifier to states of head page Halliday and Hassan (1976).

In the case of pronominal possessive such items as hers yours and others presuppose both possessor (by means of reference) and a thing possessed (by means of ellipsis) non- specific deictic, either ,neither ,both presuppose to sets and each can presuppose two or more post deictic elements differ from adjective in their function as epithet with determiner s and may be followed by numerative .

- The identical three questions.

- deictic - Identical three questions (epithet).

Numerative element in nominal   ellipsis:

Ordinal : first ,second ,thi   rd ,fourth etc .

Have some more tea .

-no thanks , that was my0+ third .(third cup of tea).

 Cardinal: the three , theses three , any three , all three , usual three , the same, three etc.

-Smith first person to live .

I was the second .

(the second person indefinite quantifiers .

Much, many ,more, most ,few several , little , abit , ,hundreds, etc.

-    can or cats climbs trees?

-     they all can, and **most** do .(most cats)

Table2-6 Verbal ellipsis

Lexical Ellipsis	Operator Ellipsis
Is she complaining?-he by be I don't care.	Has she be crying ?-no laughing .

The different between the two types of verbal ellipsis is that in lexical verb is omitted form the verbal group ,where operator ellipsis is involved the omission of operator .

Clausal ellipsis

There are three types of clausal ellipsis

Prepositional

Who was going to plant arrow of popular in the park ?-the duke was.

Omission of the complent and the adunctlexical ellipsis .

Modal

What was the duke going to do ? plant a row of poplars' in the park

Omission of subject and the finite   (operator ellipsis)

General

Are you coming ? –yes – no

All element but one omitted

Zero

England won the cup .who told you ? entire clause omitted

2.2.4.1.4 Discourse markers and conjunctions

The four type of grammatical cohesion is through discourse markers and conjunctions. Discourse markers are linguistic elements used by the speaker/writer to ease the interpretation of the text, frequently by signalling a relationship between segments of the discourse, which is the specific function of conjunctions. They are not a way of simply joining sentences. Their role in the text is wider that that, because they provide the listener/reader with information for the interpretation of the utterance; that is why some linguists prefer to describe them as discourse markers.

Conjunction acts as a cohesive tie between clauses or sections of text in such a way as to demonstrate a meaningful pattern between them, though conjunctive relations are not tied to any

particular sequence in the expression. Therefore, amongst the cohesion forming devices within text, conjunction is the least directly identifiable relation.

∗ Conjunctions can be classified according to four main categories: additive, adversative, causal and temporal.

* **Additive conjunctions act to structurally coordinate or link by adding to the presupposed item and are signalled through "and, also, too, furthermore, additionally", etc. Additive conjunctions may also act to negate the presupposed item and are signalled by "nor, and...not, either, neither", etc.**

* **Adversative conjunctions act to indicate "contrary to expectation" and are signalled by "yet, though, only, but, in fact, rather", etc.Causal conjunction expresses "result, reason and purpose" and is signalled by "so, then, for, because, for this reason, as a result, in this respect, etc.".**

* **The last most common conjunctive category is temporal and links by signalling sequence or time. Some sample temporal conjunctive signals are "then, next, after that, next day, until then, at the same time, at this point", etc.**

* **The use of a conjunction is not the only device for expressing a temporal or causal relation. For instance, in English a temporal relation may be expressed by means of a verb such as *follow* or *precede*, and a causal relation by verbs such as *cause* and *lead*. Moreover, temporal relations are not restricted to sequence in real time, they may also reflect stages in the text (expressed by *first, second, third, etc.)***

Examples: time-sequence

- *After the battle, there was a snowstorm.*
- *They fought a battle. Afterwards, it snowed.*
- *The battle was followed by a snowstorm.*

A more comprehensive list of conjunctions

 Could be the following:

* **Some languages (like Italian) tend to express relations through subordination and complex structures. Others (like English)prefer to use simpler and shorter structures and present information in relatively small chunks.**

* **Whether a translation has to conform to the source-text pattern of cohesion will depend on its purpose and the freedom the translator has to reorganize information.**

2.2.4.2 Lexical Cohesion

* **Lexical cohesion differs from the other cohesive elements in text in that it is non-grammatical. Lexical cohesion refers to the "cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary" We could say that it covers any instance in which the use of a lexical item recalls the sense of an earlier one.**

* **The two basic categories of lexical cohesion are reiteration and collocation.**

Reiteration is the repetition of an earlier item, a synonym, a near synonym, a superordinate or a general word, but it is not the same as personal reference, because it does not necessarily involve the same identity.

After the sequence:

* **I saw a boy in the garden.The boy (repetition)was climbing a tree. I was worried about the child (superordinate).The poor lad (synonym)was obviously up to it. The idiot (general word) was going to fall if he (pronoun)didn't take care.**

We could conclude by saying: "Boys can be so silly". This would be an instance of reiteration, even though the two items would not be referring to the same individual(s)

As we have already seen, collocation pertains to lexical items that are likely to be found together within the same text. It occurs when a pair of words is not necessarily dependent upon the same semantic relationship but rather they tend to occur within the same lexical environment.

* **Examples**
* **Opposites (man/woman, love/hate, tall/short).**
* **Pairs of words from the same ordered series (days of the week, months, etc.)**
* **Pairs of words from unordered lexical sets, such as meronyms:**

part-whole (body/arm, car/wheel)

part-part (hand/finger, mouth/chin)

or co-hyponyms (black/white, chair/table).

* **Associations based on a history of co-occurrence (rain, pouring, torrential).**

* *John drove up in <u>his old estate wagon</u>. <u>The car</u> had obviously seen a lot of action. <u>One hubcap</u> was missing, and <u>the exhaust pipe</u> was nearly eaten up with rust.*

* **Lexical cohesion is not only a relation between pairs of words. It usually operates by means of lexical chains that run through a text and are linked to each other in various ways.**

* **The notion of lexical cohesion provides the basis for what Halliday and Hasan call *instantial meaning*.**

* **The importance of this concept for translators is obvious. Lexical chains do not only provide cohesion, they also determine the sense of each word in a given context.**

* **For example, if it co-occurs with terms such as "universe, stars, galaxy, sun", the word "earth" must be interpreted as "planet" and not as "ground".**

* **In a target text, it is not always possible to reproduce networks of lexical cohesion which are identical to those of the source text, for example because the target language lacks a specific item, or because the chain is based on an idiom that cannot be literally translated. (ex. It was raining cats and dogs and the dogs were barking). In this case one has to settle for a slightly different meaning or different associations.**

* **Cohesion is also achieved by a variety of devices other than those we have mentioned. These include, for instance, continuity of tense, consistency of style and punctuation devices like colons and semi-colons which, like conjunctions indicate how different parts of the text relate to each other**

* **In the approach to text linguistics by de Beaugrande & Dressler (1981), text, oral or printed, is established as a communicative occurrence, which has to meet seven standards of textuality. If any of these standards are not satisfied, the text is considered not to have fulfilled its function and not to be communicative.**

* *Cohesion* and *coherence* are text-centred notions. Cohesion concerns the ways in which the components of the surface text (the actual words we hear or see) are mutually connected within a sequence. Coherence, on the other hand, concerns the ways in which the components of the textual world, i.e. the concepts and relations which underlie the surface text, are relevant to the situation.
* The remaining standards of textuality are user-centred, concerning the activity of textual communication by the producers and receivers of texts:
* *Intentionality* concerns the text producer's attitude that the set of occurrences should constitute a cohesive and coherent text instrumental in fulfilling the producer's intentions.
* *Acceptability* concerns the receiver's attitude that the set of occurrences should constitute a cohesive and coherent text having some use or relevance for the receiver.
* *Informativity* concerns the extent to which the occurrences of the text are expected vs. unexpected or known vs. unknown.
* *Situationality* concerns the factors which make a text relevant to a situation of occurrence.

* *Intertextuality* concerns the factors which make the utilisation of one text dependent upon knowledge of one or more previously encountered texts.
* The above seven standards of textuality are called constitutive principles, in that they define and create textual communication as well as set the rules for communicating.
* There are also at least three regulative principles that control textual communication: the *efficiency* of a text is contingent upon its being useful to the participants with a minimum of effort; its *effectiveness* depends upon whether it makes a strong impression and has a good potential for fulfilling an aim; and its *appropriateness* depends upon whether its own setting is in agreement with the seven standards of textuality.

2.3 .Martin and Rose

In working with Discourse (2002) Martin and Rose approach the analysis Of discourse not from the point of view of the text as ,a sequence of clauses, but of Discourse as a social phenomenon that is ,constructed through text,(PI). They address three areas that are related to cohesion in a text, namely conjunction, Identification and taxonomic relations.

2.3.1Conjunction

According to martin and rose (ibid) conjunction realizes

44 types of logical relations

additive(and),comparison(like),consequence(all

because)and time(then ,finally).conjunction can be used to

construe different field of social activity, to link event s

together in a sequence in time ,or to construe the logical

of an argument from hypotheses to evidence to

conclusions, (ibid).

2.3.2 Identification

Identification involves tracking participant: with

introducing people and things in to discourse and keeping

them once there (ibid).the participant can be introduced or

presented for the first time in a discourse using a paper

name .(e.g.Helena) or a lexical item with an indefinite

article (Awomen) .one participant has been introduced

,s/he or it can then be tracked is also referred to pass

presumed tracking resources include personal pronoun (he

,we) ,indefinite article(the woman),proper names

(Helena),comparatives (someone else) and possessive

pronouns (my).

However the identity of a participant is presumed ,the

identity has to be recovered . the can be recovered either

endophorically or exophorically. The use of identification

resources differ from genre to genre . Martin and Rose

suggest that a narrative or argument text is more likely to

display a chaining effect in tracking as opposed to an

administrative or legal text which ,for reasons of un

ambiguity uses forward and back ward reference throughout, creating a complex lattice of intratextual relations (2002).

2.3.3 Taxonomic relations

Taxonomic relations construe the types of relations that develop between semantic element as a text unfolds they are either classificatory or whole part .Martin and Rose identify five type of taxonomic relations that can be used cohesively between element of a text .parts contrast synonyms and repetition .relations of class to member could be, a make of a car or a breed of dogs .relations of whole part can have different labels depending on the field (e.g ingredient ,component episodic). Relation within a class (Englihman ,Africaner).are referred to as co –class

Whole to part is further divided in to facets, which describe parts that are locations of the whole and measure that refer to portion the whole. Contrasts are element that differ significantly in meaning the include element that opposed in meaning to each other (win-lose ,happy-sad) and elements that belong to series of time (hot –warm ,tepid-cold) opposed element .in turn include antonyms and converses series includes scales (pass ,credit-distinction) and cycles(Sunday –Monday-Tuesday).

Synonyms are different elements that share similar experiential meaning as an example Martin and Rose

propose the items public hearing and open session from adesmond tutu text from which it is drawn .

Finally repetition is described by Martin as the simplest type of relation between element it is include all forms derived from a single lexical item ,for example ,marry ,marriage ,failing failure.(ibid).

2.4 Theme and Rheme

The concept of theme and Rheme

Thematic definitions are divided into two sub-parts:

1-pure definitions which

The hallmark of the Prague as the division of the communicative structure in two areas (theme and rheme) and simultaneous assumption that this is basic order of sentence if there is no contextual reason for changing it.

Different functional definition of theme and rheme are to be found in the work of different scholars .Halliday(1985)defines theme as the element which serves as the point of departure of the message and what the speaker has in mind to start with .it is the element in a particular structural configuration taken as whole ,organizes the clause as a message . the reminder of the message is called the rheme . therefore a clause consists of a theme combined with a rheme and the sentence is expressed by order is theme followed by rheme.Halliday

(1985) elaborates further by arguing that theme is what clause is about ,and its comes in first position ,but this position is not what defines the theme , it is a means which realizes the function of the theme.

For Ghaddessy (1995) the building blocks of spoken and written texts is clause, and clause conveys a massage that has two parts, what comes next is rheme.

Green, Christopher ,lam ,and mei (2000)define the term as a material immediately preceding the main verb of the main clause. the material which includes the main verb and all other remaining constituents of the sentence constitutes the rheme.

2.4.1Applied definitions

Firs (1992) declares that both native and non-native English speaking students have difficulty ordering words in their sentences .Teachers experience difficulties explaining to students how they should order the information in their sentences .Two concepts are helpful in this task, theme and focus. theme is point of departure of the clause as message. In English one can recognize themes because they occur first in the clause. Fires in this study showed that theme is a very important cohesive element that must be taken into account seriously in writing. Brown and Yule (1983) believe that one of the constraints on the speaker and writer is that they can produce only one at time when they are producing their message ,they have to choose a beginning point for their utterance in order to

organize their message.the initial point is important in the clause and also in discourse .it influence the hearer and reader interpretation of everything that follows in the discourse since it constitutes the initial textual context for everything that follows. What is placed in the initial position is called theme.

Ping (2002) views theme as an element that generates the boundary of acceptability of possible rhemes form which only one is selected as the actual rheme since they would result in unacceptable clauses . considering Hallidian framework of theme and rheme ,Ping(2000) argues that this model has two fundamental problems.

1- It cannot be used to distinguish whether a clause is well-formed ,unacceptability or dubious ,because even unacceptable clause is deemed to have a thematic structure .

2- It cannot clarify that an initial element identified as theme of the clause is functioning as such .

In the light of the problems attached to Halliday framework , model which interprets the theme/rheme form cognitive   psychological perspective. Underlying   this model is the schema theory and the role of interference during processing. In this model head and non head distinction was used instead of using the texual, interpersonal . and topical theme labels. Thematic head of a clause refer to the element which is able to generate a boundary of acceptability and within which is permissible

for rheme to occur .Any element either preceding or following the thematic head is a thematic non- head and all called per –head or post –head respectively.

This model can explain how why clausal message are sometimes difficult interference from the context, non appropriate or less elaborate scheme, and theme/ rheme mismatch. However this model has some restriction

1- As it is centrally with the theme structure at the level of clause, it cannot clearly explain how some languages inputs succeed in convening message even though they do not led themselves easily to thematic analysis.

2- It becomes less useful when less reliance is needed on the thematic structure of language for successful communication to take place. Ping (2000).

Following his view of the theme , he define the theme as a constraining force on the development of the message . For him, theme /rheme notions have an explicit force to organize the clause as a message and draw attention to various cognitive psychological considerations.

2.4.2   Thematic   organization   and   thematic progression

Halliday and Hassan(1985) classified the elements which occur in initial position of the clause as follows:

1-Topical theme which is presented by nominal group (e.g,every one),a prepositional phrase (e.g,with ships continually at seat),or an adverbial group (e.g by the middle of 15th century)

2-**Interpersonal theme** which consist of any combination of vocatives (direct address such as: personal names),model adjuncts and mood marking elements (finite verbal operator) ,temporal &model ,WH-interrogatives and imperative lets.

3-**textual theme** that includes continuatives (small set of discourse items which signal that anew move is beginning, such as: yes ,no ,oh .....),structural element (coordinate &subordinates) conjunctive adjuncts which relate the clause to the preceding texts (e.g in other words).

Following the above classification, Halliday (1985) introduced simple and multiple themes

Simple themes always have a topical element .

for example :she was so kind to her four cats topical

multiple themes may have interpersonal and textual themes in addition to topical theme.

for example :and, the servant was waiting for the cats.

Textual   topical

The other categorization made by Halliday (1985)is marked and unmarked theme .when the element that occupies the theme position of the clause conflates with grammatical subject ,this theme is called unmarked theme .

for example :the goat went shopping .

But in marked theme, an element other than the subject occupies the theme position , so a condition is created for the appearance of marked theme.

For example: in the morning, the goat went to jungle to find the wolf.

2-4 Previous Studies

 Several researches Related to this research have been conducted in different universities in Sudan and outside Sudan.

Zuhair AbdulRhamn (2013) research entitled "The Use of Cohesive Device in descriptive Writing by omani studnt-teachers" he concluded that :

-the student-teachers at Sohar university face many problems in using cohesive in their writing.

- the students overuse certain types of cohesivese.eg repetition ,reference and connective, while ignoring the other types.

It seems obvious that the students are not familiar of all types of cohesive devices to same degree.

. The misuse of cohesive devices is a good indication that they still experience difficulties in writing English despite length period of time such students have studied EFL.

    In Sudia Arabia –aljarf (2001) Investigate the Use of Cohesive by 59 EFLStudents from king Saud University .substitution was deemed to be the most problematic form

of cohesion followed by reference and ellipsis .cohesion anomalies were caused by poor linguistic competence.

Mubarak (2013)research entitled "Analysis of Student Ability in Building Cohesion and Coherent in Argumentative Essay Written by Fourth Year student of English Department of University of Bengkulu in 2012/2013.academic year the subject of the study were randomly chosen by using data sample technique ,the data was analyzed by using percentage formulae and scoring rubric the research result show that the students gained low score which were in range 3+0 3,5 in constructing cohesion and coherence in a text and they had low understanding of cohesion in a text and cohesive material.

in Sudan university Science & technology many researchers conducted research related to this subject.

Hassan Dawood(2006)thesis of phd in applied linguistics his study deals with "manifestation of cohesion and coherence in writing English" of Palestinian senior university student ,a textual analytical study his study adopting a descriptive approach both quantities and qualities in analysis of 30 essay written by 30 English major seniors study at alQuds university in Palestine his study which compress six chapter has revealed the following results:

-There is a very serious weakness in student manifestation of rhetorical and linguistic features cohesion reference,

conjunctions, lexical, ellipsis and substitution also in coherence organization and parallelism.

There is a very astonishing degree of weak weakness in the student ability to produce cohesive and coherent text.

In his study he has recommend for this serious weakness should be taken and treated very seriously by school-teacher university instructors syllabus designer and decision maker altogether.

Ayman Hamad (2015) PH D thesis entitled "the Impact of Grammatical Accuracy and Discoursal Features on the Quality of EFL M.A Students written Performance" at SUST .study his reveals that.

Reference and lexical error yield the high percentage, substitution ellipsis represent third problematic area followed by conjunctions.

Amel Elfadel (2012)MA dissertation her study dealing with the "difficulties facing English as foreign language learners in using cohesive in writing "the study covered third year secondary school students at Alwia Abelrafe modle secondary school-Karari locality. the analysis of the data of her study focused on the answer sheets of Khartoum state mock Examination of academic year (2012).she used analytical and descriptive method the result of her study found that the students tend to :

-Misuse a lot of cohesive devices

-Writing ungrammatical sentence

-Use more than one tense in the topic

-Present their ideas n ambiguity way

She has recommended for the following:

-teachers, syllabus designers and decision makers should treat students

-teacher should give more emphasis on teaching of cohesive device through reading and more exercise and activities to spine series.

-students should be exposed to enough practice in using cohesive by focusing on both grammatical and semantic convention.

To comparative to this study the present study unlike in sample and tools of the study.

Chapter three

Methodology of the research

3-0 introduction

The key objective of this chapter is to describe the general methodology of present study and the steps in conducting the research tools, it was designed as analytical and descriptive research. The study was conducted at Sudan University for Science & Technology at College of Languages it aims at investigating student's knowledge of cohesive device in their written work.

3-1 Population and sample of the study

3-1-1 Population

The population of this research was the third year of English language students at College of Language Sudan University Science &Technology in academic year 2015/2016. the total number of the population was 80 students ,they had taken writing courses and discourse analysis ,they had learn and practiced writing essay ,therefore, those students most reliable population in this research.

3-1-2 Sample of the study

The participant selected for purpose of this are between 21-22 years old, the sample consists of 22 female and 18 male students at College of Languages Department of English languages at Sudan University for Science & Technology in academic year 2015-2016 .they were 50% of the target population ,they were selected randomly.

3-2 Instrument

The test of written essay work for cohesive was conducted in order to know whether or not the students had the knowledge of cohesive within their mind. the students were asked to write an essay in advantage and disadvantage of mobile phones for students as suitable topic for students they were got guidance points to facilitate the writing. The essay had been consulted and validated an expert.

3-3-Validation technique

In order to achieve a good and reliable test, the researcher validated the test by using face/surface validity. Arifin(2012) states that face /sure face validity technique is a simple way to see the instrument through its face or surface form if it is good already, so the instrument is categorized as valid, therefore researcher consulted the content of the test to an expert , an expert ,is a person who capability and   ability in performing demonstrating the grammatical and lexical cohesive devices to observe the test .

At first the researcher, asked the expert to check the test before distributed them to the students then the expert revised some parts of the test that were not relevant and good for being tested the experts who were validated the test of this research were two PHD doctors and two MA

teacher in linguistics at Sudan University College of Languages.

3 -4 Procedure of data collection

After the subject of the study have determined the researcher got permission from the lecturer of English language for third year students at Sudan University for Science and technology via the head department of English language at collage of language and supervisor of this research.

The students have selected randomly from 80 students as total target population of study and 28 female, 18 male as sample, they were told that their essay would be used for the purpose of data collection of this study.

3-5 Technique of Analysis data

After data had been gathered by writing an essay the analysis were carried out through the computer by using the statistical package for social science (SPSS).

Chapter Four

Data analysis and Discussion of the Results

0-4 introduction

This chapter deals with the obtained data from the administered written work for students. The data were processed by the computer using the statistical package for social studies (SPSS) program.

4-1 The results of data collection

4-1-1 Reference

4-1-1-1 Table .1. References

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Use	25	62.50%
Misuse	9	22.50%
Unused	2	5.00%

Over use	4	10.00%
Total	40	100.00%

The table ~~and figure~~ above showed that (62.50%) of the sample of the study used reference,(22.50%) misused it ,10% overused and only(5.00%)failed to use it .that means the majority of the students had used the pronoun reference correctly .as shown in the following figure and graph :

4-1 -1-2 figure .1.

4-1-1-3 graph .1.

4-1-2 substitution

4-1-2-1 Table Substitution

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Use	3	7.50%
Misuse	0	0.00%
Unuse	37	92.50%
Over use	0	0.00%
Total	40	100.00%

The table proved that only (7.50%)of the sample of the study used substitution while (92.50%)unused and no one misuse or overuse substitution .

 This indicates that the students are very poor in terms of substitution in their written work this could be clarified in the following figure and graph:

4-1-2-2- figure .2.

4-1-2-3 graph .2.

4-1-3- Ellipsis

4-1-3-1 Table 3 Ellipsis

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Use	6	15.00%
Misuse	0	0.00%
Unused	34	85.00%
Over use	0	0.00%
Total	40	100.00%

The table and figure above pointed that (15.00%)of the study sample used ellipsis correctly while (85.00%)failed to use it ,0.00% misuse ,(0.00%) overuse ellipsis .

~~this~~This indicates the lack of competence in their use of ellipsis as appreciated in the following figure and graph :

4-1-3-2 figure .3.

4-1-3-3 graph .3.

4-1-4 conjunction

4-1-4-1Table 4 Conjunction

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Use	25	62.5~~0~~%
Misuse	3	7.5~~0~~%
Unused	4	5.~~00~~%
Over use	10	25.~~00~~%
Total	40	100.~~00~~%

 the table above showed that (62.5~~50~~%) of study sample used conjunction in their written work ,(7.5~~0~~%)misuse , 5.~~00~~%unuse ,(25.00%)overuse it . that means the majority of the students used conjunction correctly in their essays

and a large number of students overuse it. As in the figure and graph below:

4-1-4-2 figure .4.

4-1-4-3 graph .4.

4-1-5 Repetition

4-1-5 -1 Table 5 Repetition

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Use	17	42.550%
Misuse	0	0.00%
Unused	9	22.50%
Over use	14	35.00%
Total	40	100.00%

The table an~~d figure above~~ showed that (42,5~~0~~%)of the sample of the study use repetition in their essay, (22.5~~0~~%)unused it ,(35.~~00~~%) overuse ,(0~~.00~~%)misuse it .

~~this~~This indicates that the students lack knowledge of writing skills they write one item again and again the weakness as shown in the following figure and graph :

4-1-5-2   figure.5

4-1-5- 3 graph 5

4-1-6 Synonyms

4-1-6-1 table 6 synonyms

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Use	0	0.00.00%
Misuse	0	0.00%
Unuse	40	100.00%
Over use	0	0.00%
Total	40	100.00%

The table and figure above proved that (100.00%) of the students unused synonyms in their written work.

that means the students have astonished weakness of discourse features of cohesion as in the figure and graph:

4-1-6-2 figure .6.

4-1-6-3 graph .6.

4-1-7 Antonyms

4-1-7-1Table .7. Antonyms

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Use	0	0.00%
Misuse	0	0.00%
Unused	40	100.00%
Over use	0	0.00%%
Total	40	100.00%

The table and figure showed that (100.00%) of the student unused antonyms in their written work. this indicates the students have poor linguistic knowledge. for more illustrate the following figure and graph:

4-1.7-2 figure .7.

4-1-7-3 graph 7

4-1-8 collocation

4-1-8-1 table .8. collocation

Valid	Frequency	Percent
Use	3	7.5%
Misuse	0	0.00%
Unuse	37	92 .5%
Over use	0	0.00%
Total	40	100.00%

The table above showed that response using collocation (7.5~~0~~%) while (92.5~~0~~%) unused collocation, (0~~0.00~~%) misuse (0.~~00~~%) overuse it .because this category is not available in students essay. This illustrated in the following figure and graph:

4-1-8-2- figure .8.

4-1-8-3graph 3

4-2 Summary of this chapter

This chapter has presented the results and the discussion of the study. In this study Halliday &Hassan's (1976) cohesion framework was adopted to analyze the students' written work. the researcher analyzed 40 essay written by 40 students 22 female students and 18 male students from Sudan university for science and technology at college of languages level three .the researcher adopted the analytical and descriptive method .as results to statistical analysis and~~the researcher~~ adopted the statistical analysis using the(SPSS) ~~programe~~program.

Summary, Findings, Recommendations and suggestions for further studies

5-0 Introduction

This chapter is comprise of a summary of study , conclusions , recommendations and suggestions for further studies .

5-1 summary

of the study attempted to investigate very crucial aspect of learning English as foreign language that's the writing skills namley, that's cohesive devices the researcher talked this topic applying both descriptive and analytical methods . theThe study is comprised of five chapters the subject of this study wereear sSudan university students at collage of language at level three . to investigate the

problem of the study the research raised question , t~~he question~~ heses questions were as follows.

1- What problems do these students faces in using cohesive devices to a chive ~~cohesion ?~~ cohesion?

2-to what extent the students aware of cohesive devices in their written work?

3-what are common errors in usage of written cohesive device?

Based on these questions ,three hypotheses were put .theses hypotheses were as f follows:

1-there are many difficulties that faces Sudan university student in using cohesive device in their writing .

2-the English language student in Sudan university of science &technology overuse certain types of cohesive in their writing, while they missing the others.

3-the low English proficiency of the students caused no cohesive writing.

To test these hypotheses, the researcher has used an essay ~~to~~ for the students' .the analysis of ~~this study, the analysis of~~ the data of this study focused on the textual analysis for cohesive devices the analysis revealed the weakness in using cohesive devices .

5-2 Findings

Based on the result on chapter four, the study revealed the following results :-

.

1-   The students over use certain types of cohesive devise ,eg . conjunction , repetition ~~repetition~~ and reference , this over use of particular cohesive is tediousness and redundancy in their written work.

~~Suggestion for further studies this study attempted to investigation of cohesive devices in students written in Sudan university.~~

2-   The students do not achieve balance between the use of cohesive that is they over use others and ignore others .

3-   The problem that appears to be quite obvious to anyone who goes through the students writing is the in appropriative use of deferent types of cohesive devises this means that in some cases , the students use a certain cohesive devi~~cs~~e and in other case ~~use but~~ the students do not use some of them .

4 It seem that obvious that the students are not familiar with all types of cohesive to some degree so they only utilize those that they are familiar with because they find them easy to implement . therefore , they use repetition and reference in over abundance .

5-3 Recommendationons:

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

To students improve their use of cohesive devise to ~~achive~~achieve better cohesive in writing the writer recommends several pedagogical implications .

1-   The types of problems stated above especially the over use of certain types while ignoring or misusing the other encourage the writer to state that the student, teacher are urgent need of being taught how to thank in English rather than thinking and preparing their ideas in Arabic and then transferring them into English while writing in English ,the negative transferring caused by , stylistic rhetorical ,educational and cultural differences lead to the appearance of incoherence in most of texts writing students participant ,to solve the aforementioned problem ,the writer suggests the students revise great topic written by native speakers deal of this fact has been asserted by Holes(1984) who stated that some of the texts written by the non speaker of the English are relative free form gorse g grammatical errors ,they do not feel English texts writing by native speakers which they critically and analytically competent devise by the participant can be relate to teaching methods ,.

2- there is a need for teachers of writing and discourse to avoid focusing on the word and sentence level because that will definitely result in no cohesive texts.

3- it has been showed by teachers of writing teachers and that discourse that teaching cohesive devices in isolation dose not help the student to use them in appropriately in their writing this asserted by Hiller(1995) therefore is a need for teachers to teach in the way cohesive are used in novels written by native speakers of English where a demonstration of all those devices is made manifest in writing .

5-teachers can motivate their repertoire of vocabulary which will help use synonyms and antonyms rather than overemphasizing repetition as indicated by finding of this study.

5-4 Suggestions for further study

Further research need to be carried out to examine the effectiveness of various approaches to teaching these devices, as it is clear that the present approaches necessary not equipped in the students with linguistic resources necessary to write descriptive texts successfully.

References

- AbdulAmir,Z . (2013) the use of cohesive devices in descriptive writing of   Omani students- teacher. Unpublished research PH.D. thesis.

-A.J,Thomoson. Martnt . (1986)practical English grammar: ~~oxfrd~~oxford   university press.

- Apyle ,M.and Mary ,E. (1986) test of English foreign :USA.

- Brandon,L.and Brandon. (2012) sentence ,paragraph and

Beyond with integrated reading :~~wadsworth~~wads worth USA.

 .

- Bender ,S. (2011) creative writing: British.

- Crème, PH and etl (2008) writing at university A guide for student: Open university press ,England

-

- Dawood ,A. (2006)manifestation of cohesion and coherence in writing English :Sudan university .

- ~~Ebrahim~~Ebrahim F.and Mohesin (2012) .Artical. ~~importane~~importance of thematic structure in students writing.vol .12.: ~~india~~India.

-   Haliday,M.and Mathiessen,C.(2004)   A_____introductional   to FunctionalGrammar,3rd:London,

-   Haliday,m Hassen,R.(1976)   cohesion in .~~london~~London :~~longman~~Longman.

-   Hamed ,A (2015) the impact of grammatical accuracy and discoursal features on the quality of EFL MA_students written   performance.PHD thesis .~~unpublised~~unpublished research : ~~sudan~~Sudan university

-   ~~Mcarthy~~McCarthy ,M .(1991)discourse analysis for language for language
teachers   Oxford university press

-   Martin ,R.and Rose   ,D   (2003)Working   with   discourse. London:continuum

-   Mukhtar,.M. (2010) An investigation into coherence and cohesion in Sudanese EFL learners' writing. PH.D thesis

-   unpublished research three ~~sudaneses~~Sudanese universities .

- Marianne ,J. and ~~Philips.L~~Philips (2002)discourse analysis and ~~Method:London~~Method: London.

- Saputr ,A.J. (2012) ~~studens~~students knowledge of cohesive device in essay:

Schiller ,A. (2008) aspect of cohesion in website translations :   PH.D thesis unpublished research :Dublin city university.