Sudan University of Science & Technolo

College of Graduate

College of Languages Studies

English Language Section

Investigating the Role of Cohesion and Thematic progression on the Quality of EFL Written Performance

A Cause study of 3th years, Sudan University of Science and Technology

تقصى دور الترابط والتعقب اللغويان وجودتهما فى الاداء الكتابي عند

دارسي اللغة الانجليزية لغة اجنبية

Dissertation Submitted in Fulfillment of the Requirement of
M.A. degree in English languages (Applied Linguistics)

Presented by: Hassan Elsayed Ahmed Jaber

Supervisor: Dr. Ayman Ahmed Alniel Hamdan

2016

DEDICATION

To my parents

the dearest persons to my heart. Thank you

for all your encouragement, and above all

your love.

I dedicate my work to my family

Thank you for your patience and support.

Acknowledgements

Abstract

The purpose of this research work is to check whether students are familiar with the use of Cohesion and thematic progression in writing essays. It also aims at find out the importance of using cohesive devices to create cohesive discourse. Thus, it hypothesizes that the use of grammatical cohesive devices would strength students' writing. The hypothesis is evaluated by a descriptive study inferred from the results of the students' test. They show that the use of grammatical cohesive devices by 3rd- Year Students of English at the Department of English Languages, Sudan University of Science & Technology, However, some inappropriate uses of grammatical cohesive devices and thematic progression are easily noticed concerning the total use of those devices. In addition, some grammatical cohesive devices are widely used but inappropriately; and some of them are less used but appropriately. Students' use of grammatical cohesive devices mainly appears with the use of conjunctions because they are most probably known by learners; however, most of the conjunction devices are used inappropriately. Also, it is remarked that in each type of grammatical cohesive devices used there is always a predominant device. The data were analyzed by using the statistical program (SPSS), and then there was a textual analysis of subjects written texts. The data analysis showed that, there is weakness in university students, written work due to their ignorance of cohesion and thematic progression. Moreover, the most of the students do not use cohesive devices and thematic progression appropriately. Also the study revealed that there are no significant differences in the achievement of the students. At the end of the study the researcher presented some recommendations concerning the instructors and syllabus designers. These recommendations focused on paying attention to the questions of (cohesion and thematic progression) when teaching or designing syllabuses.

المستخلص

تهدف هذه الدراسة الي البحث عن كيفية المام الطالب / الطالبة باستعمال وسائل الربط اللغوية و مواضع التقدم او التعقب اللغوية. وتهدف ايضا الي ايجاد اهمية استخدام وسائل الربط اللغوية من اجل خلق نص محكم الربط. لهذا الغرض افترضنا ان استخدام وسائل الربط اللغوية تساعد علي تقوية كتابة الطالب / الطالبة . ولهذا الغرض تم اللجوء الي وسائل وصفية لتحليل الاختبار الذي قدم لطالب / لطالبة واوضحت النتائج المحصل عليها انه تم استخدام وسائل الربط بقدر كاف نوعا ما من طرف طالب / طالبة السنة الثالثة قسم اللغة الانجليزية، جامعة السودان للعلوم والتكنولوجيا. غير ان استعمال بعض وسائل الربط غير صحيحة وقد لوحظ بشكل سهل بالنسبة الي الاستعمال الكلي لتلك الوسائل. اضافة الي ذلك لقد لوحظ بان بعض وسائل الربط اللغوية ومواضع التقدم تستعمل بكثرة ولكنها بطريقة غير صحيحة والبعض منها استعمال بشكل اقل ولكن بطريقة صحيحة. ان معرفة الطالب / الطالبة لوسائل الربط اللغوية تتبلور بشكل اساسى في استعمال وسائل الربط والعطف الا ان بعض هذه الوسائل يستعمل بشكل غير صحيح. لقد لوحظ دائما في استعمال وسائل الربط اللغوية ومواضع التقدم بروز استخدام وسيلة ربط واحدة في كل نوع. قام الباحث بتحليل البيانات احصائيا مستخدم برنامج التحليل الاحصائى (SPSS) كما قام بتحليل النصوص لمقالات اولئك الطلاب و الطالبات. اظهر تحليل البيانات ان الضعف فى كتابات الطلاب الجامعين يعزى لعدم معرفتهم للمواضع التعقب اللغوي والترابط اللغوي. بالاضافة الي ان معظم الطلاب او الطالبات لايستطيعون استخدام ادوات الربط بطريقة صحيحة. في ختام الدراسة، اوصة الباحث علي ضوء النتائج المتحصل عليها بعدة توصيات للاهتمام بالعنصرين موضوع الدراسة (الترابط الغوي و مواضع التقدم) وذلك بوضعهما في الاعتبار في تصميم المناهج واهتمام اساتذة الجامعات نتدريسهما.

Table of Contents

Chapter One

Introduction

1.0 Overview

The research topic we are investigating is actually related to the domain of discourse analysis as such. In fact, any piece of discourse whether written or spoken has given regularities to be followed any piece of discourse must be stretched in a way that ensures its cohesion. For that, grammatical cohesion and thematic progression are used as one way to have a cohesive discourse. Indeed. Grammatical cohesion whether it is seen as a process or a product or both is an attempt to give a general view of discourse analysis and its relation to cohesion in general and grammatical cohesion in particular.

1.1 Statement of the problem

Second language acquisition researchers on writing skills as M.A.K. Halliday&Ruqaiya Hassan's work in 1976 (Cohesion in English) emphasize the act of producing coherent as well as cohesive discourse in order to ensure texture or cohesion in writing. The effect of discourse device on writing is very strong since they provide us with various kinds of grammatical devices which are used to stretch any piece of discourse to be cohesive. Researchers such as Hassan &Halliday see that using linguistic ties makes the text more cohesive and understandable. But, it seems that EFL students don't use grammatical cohesive devices and to know thematic progression efficiently because the problems notice by Teachers is that EFL students have many problems in writing effective discourse in general and in using cohesive devices in particular.

1.2 Objective of the study

This research work aims to see the various kinds of linguistic ties and their effects on writing cohesive discourse as well as to see EFL students, use grammatical cohesive devices and awareness of thematic progression.

1.3 The significance of the study

In the present study, we are going to focus on EFL students are aware of written performance and to show to what extent they were able to use

grammatical cohesive devices and thematic progression to have a cohesive discourse appropriately.

1.4 Questions of the study

This study attempts to find answers to the following questions:

- To what extent EFL students are poor in using grammatical cohesion as reflected in written performance?
- To what extent EFL students are poor in using lexical cohesion in written performance?
- To what extent EFL students are aware in using thematic progression in written performance?

1.5 The Hypotheses of the study

The researcher assumes that:

- EFL students are poor in using grammatical cohesion in written performance to make the text more cohesive and understandable.
- EFL students are poor in using lexical cohesion to show links between words which carrymeaning andhow to use in writing.
- EFL students are aware in using thematic progression to build meta-knowledge of coherence and thematic progression in order to give students more grammatical resources to improve the coherence of their written performance.

1.6 The limits of the study

Cohesion in English, discourse analysis, grammatical cohesive devices, thematic progression, lexical cohesion.

1.7 The methodology of the study

The researcher will use descriptive analytical method to conduct. The study, therefore a test andquestionnaire will be used as method of data collection; the population of the study will be 30 students are asked to write essays, and then describting to what extent they are able to use grammatical cohesive devices properly. Test and questioners will be designed for 3rdyears, Sudan University of science & Technology. After

that we try to provide an accurate analysis of the results of whole population, and we state the conclusion of the study.

Chapter Two

Literature Review and Previous Studies

2.0 Background

During the last century, most of the studies on linguistics concerning phonology, morphology and syntax concentrated on relations with sentences.

This study investigating actually related to the scope of discourse analysis& thematic progression as such. In fact, any piece of discourse whether written or spoken has given regularities to be followed, so any piece of discourse must be stretched in a way that ensures its cohesion. For that, grammatical cohesion and thematic progression are used as one way to have cohesive discourse analysis.

2.1 Discourse Analysis

For many years, linguists were concerned with the analysis of single sentences where the focus was on morphology and phonology areas. Then, the attention is shifted to the sentence level by the advent of Chomsky's transformational Generative Grammar (1957). However, the analysis was not really adequate because it still focused on the formal properties of language rather than achieving meaning (Coulthard, 1977). Cook (1989) states that linguists have become aware of the use of context and language function. This awareness came with Harris's paper published with the title «Discourse Analysis» in (1952). However, Zellig Harris was a sentence grammarian, he shifted attention towards sentences in combination; i.e., there was a sequence to produce coherent stretches of language (rules of use). Then, it is important to notice that earlier there was an attempt in discourse analysis where the emergence of other disciplines such as: semiotics, sociology, psychology…etc. These disciplines were influenced by the study of language in context and led from 1960's to 1970's to the work of Austin (1962), Hymes(1964), Halliday and Hassan(1976), Grice(1975), M.A.K. Halliday (1973), Sinclair and Coulthard (1977), Van Dijk (1972) and many others. McCarthy (1991) state that:

Discourse Analysis has grown into a wide ranging and heterogeneous discipline which finds its unity in the description of language above the sentence and an interest in the contexts and cultural influences which effect language in use. (1991: 07)

Text grammarians on discourse analysis worked mainly with written language where they assume texts as language elements hung together to give a relationship with the other parts of the text; i.e., to give a linked text with the necessary elements.

2.2 Definition of discourse analysis

As it is said in the early section, discourse is related to many disciplines. The principal concern of discourse analysis is to examine how any language produced by a given participants whether spoken or written is used in communication for a given situation in a given setting.

Thus, discourse analysis is concerned with written and spoken forms. Discourse devices also help to string language elements.

The organization of stretches of language greater than a sentence [It] can focus on conversation, written language, when searching for patterning of the language. Discourse analysis must determine the units of these larger stretches of language, how these units are signalled by specific linguistic markers, and/or the processes involved in producing and comprehending larger stretches of language. (Fine: 1988: 01)

Yule (1996) asserts that discourse structure is very important. It focuses on the main elements that can form a well-stretched text. These structural connections between sentences create cohesion. Moreover, the study of discourse is based especially on a pragmatic view where the background knowledge, beliefs and expectations are taken into consideration; i.e., what the speakers or writers have in mind.

Another definition of discourse analysis is quoted from (Allen and Corder1974: 200) "discourse analysis is taken to be the investigation into the formal devices used to connect sentences together".

Discourse is language in use and discourse analysis. It is organized system used to investigated into formal. Devices used to connect sentences together. (Allen and Corder,1974)

2.3 Why do we study Discourse Analysis?

1. As **linguists**, to find out how language works, to improve our understanding of an important kind of human activity

2. As **educators**, to find out how good texts work, so that we can focus on teaching our students these writing/speaking strategies.

3. As **critical analists**, to discover meanings in the text which are not obvious on the surface (e.g., analysing a politician's speech to see their preconceptions).

Discourse Analysis:

• Concerned with whole texts rather than sentences or clauses.

• **Divides into:**

1. **Spoken Discourse Analysis**: study of conversations, dialogues, spoken monologues, etc.

2. **Written Discourse Analysis**: study of written texts, such as essays, news, political speeches (?), etc.

• More concerned with naturally occurring data than in made up examples.

• A collection of techniques, rather than a single analysis.

(Whittaker &O,Donnell&Hidalgo)

2.4 Cohesion and sentence structure

The concept of cohesion is a semantic one (Halliday&Hasan 1976:4).

A semantic relation is expressed between one element in a text and some other element that is found in the same text. Halliday and Hasan (1976) claim that the relation between two cohesive elements found in a text is not determined by the grammatical structure. However, grammatical structure "determines the way in which cohesion is expressed" (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 8). In this respect the sentence, as the highest structural unit in the grammar, serves to be a significant unit for cohesion.

A text functions as a single meaningful unit when linguistic items correlate in sentences. Moreover a text has meaning as a text when each individual sentence has its cohesive relations with other sentences within a text (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 28).

Cohesive relations are found both within a sentence and between sentences. In terms of grammatical structure of sentences, there are certain rules that determine how cohesion is realized. The use of pronouns to refer to other nouns in order to avoid direct repetition is one of the examples of cohesive reference. This type of cohesion is always expressed when one entity is referred to one or more items in a sentence. The entity may be named again at the second mention, or it may be referred to by a pronoun. There are certain instances of cohesion, as conjunctions, that could be treated structurally, but only when they occur within the same sentence. Halliday and Hasan (1976) point out that conjunction are used in sentences to express various conjunctive relations that are associated with grammatical structure.

Cohesion is realized more obviously across sentence boundaries since it produces a more striking effect. As Hoey (1991) mentions, on the one hand, two sentences may be understood as being in contrast with each other. On the other hand, a whole group of sentences or clauses may be interpreted as exemplifying what has been said earlier.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) state that "cohesive relations are the same whether their elements are within the same sentence or not" (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 9).

Cohesion contributes to the establishment of relationships between sentences. Its contribution to the property of text is revealed in the idea of a text functioning as a text when sentences have a meaning together. Markels (1984: 20) quoting G. Leech writes that "Cohesion is the way in which independent choices in different points of a text correspond with or presuppose one another, forming a network of sequential relations".

Scholars assume that a sentence is structured grammatically. This grammatical condition presupposes that all the individual parts of a sentence are linked together and thus, they contribute to the construction of a text.

Cohesive relations established by various ties across sentences of a text help readers to perceive the meaning of individual sentences presented as a single entity – textual meaning. What makes it possible for readers to understand textual meaning is the continuity of semantic

relationships that is described as a necessary element in the interpretation of text (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 300).

2.5 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 (Hoey 1983: 15, 189). Discourse analysis refers to studies of the sentence in its linguistic context (Simensen 2007: 59). What is to be important for discourse analysts is that "readers interpret particular meanings and contexts in the light of their own existing knowledge and social associations" (Hillier 2004: 16).

Halliday introduces the main idea of cohesion saying that we need to establish relationships between sentences and clauses in order to construct discourse (1994: 309). The number of grammatical items in a sentence determines its length. However, these grammatical items or the number of sentences in a paragraph or the whole text are only a characteristic feature of discourse structure, but they do not determine whether a text is coherent or not.

What helps to interpret cohesion in written discourse is the study of semantic resources used for linking across sentences in order to see how the different parts of a text are connected. The relations among the parts (Halliday and Hasan1976:10). 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 a reader

Cohesion is one of the middle concepts in discourse. Analysis that has been developed to discover substitutable items in any extension of written or spoken language and refers to grammatical relationship between sentences and clauses in order to construct discourse appropriately. (Hoey Michael 1983)

2.6 Grammatical cohesion

In linguistics, grammar refers to the logical and structural rules that govern the composition of clauses, phrases, and words in any given natural language. The term refers also to the study of such rules, and this

field includes morphology and syntax, often complemented by phonetics, phonology, semantics, and pragmatics.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cohesion_(linguistics)

Grammatical cohesion refers to the various grammatical devices that can be used to make relation among sentences more explicit. (Harmer,J. 2004)

2.7 Types of grammatical cohesion

According to Halliday and Hassan (1976) provide the basic categories of grammatical cohesion pointing that we can systematize this concept by classifying it into a small number of distinct categories, they refer to them as: reference, substitution ellipsis and conjunction; these categories have a theoretical basis and specific types of grammatical cohesion, which has also provide a practical means for describing and analyzing texts.

Reference

One of the options that grammar of English offers creating surface links between sentences is reference .Halliday and Hassan (1976) point out that reference features cannot be semantically interpreted without referring to some other features in the text .Pronouns is the most common linguistic element as referring devices in a textual environment. However, there are other linguistic elements used to fulfill the same function such us: articles, demonstratives and comparatives.

Reference can be accounted as "exophoric" or "endophoric" functions. This is because simply when we refer to a given item, we expect the reader to interpret it by either looking forward, backward and outward. Exophoric involves exercises that require the reader to look out of the text in order to interpret the referent. The reader, thus, has to look beyond or out of the text with a shared world between the reader and the writer.
"Exophoric reference directs the receiver 'out of 'the text and into an assumed shared world" (McCarthy, 1991: 41). For example, 'that must have cost a lot of money' in this example we have to look out of the situation to retrieve the meaning of the sentences (Halliday and Hassan, 1976).

Endophoric function refers to the text itself in its interpretation. Brown and Yule (1983:192) point that "where their interpretation lies within a text they are called 'endophoric' relations and do from cohesive ties within the text". Endophoric reference is itself two classes: to start with, anaphoric relations is all kinds of activities which involve looking back in texts to find the referent .For example: "it rained day and night for two weeks, the basement flooded and everything was under water, It spoilt all our calculations" (McCarthy 1991: 36). Here the first "it" refers to the discourse itself, the second "it" refers to the event of two weeks, or the fact that it rained or flooded; i.e., the whole situation rather than an event in particular, whereas cataphoric relation looks forward for their interpretation, To exemplify the cataphoric reference "she was terribly afraid .All kinds of black memories of her childhood came up to her mind. She could not fight against them as had been her custom because simply Mary Brown was dying at that moment". This short text displays a number of cataphoric reference items which involve looking forward for determining what they refer to. In this example, all the pronouns (she /her) refer to Mary Brown. In this cataphoric reference, the referent has been withheld to the last sentence in order to engage the reader's /the listener's attention. Thus, Brown and Yule (1983) state that exophoric and endophoric co- reference need a processor based on mental representation .On the one hand we refer to the world, and on the other hand we refer to the world created by the discourse.

Substitution
According to Halliday and Hassan (1976) state that substitution takes place when one feature (in a text) replaces a previous word or expression, for instance: "I left my pen at home, do you have one?"
In this example, "one" is replaced or substitution for "pen".

It is important to mention that substitution and reference are different in what and where they operate, thus substitution is concerned with relations related with wording .Whereas reference is concerned with relations related with meaning. Substitution is a way to avoid repetition in the text itself; however, reference needs to retrieve its meaning from the situational textual occurrence.

In terms of the linguistic system, reference is a relation on the semantic level, whereas substitution is a relation on the lexicogrammatical level, the level of grammar and vocabulary, or linguistic form. (Halliday and Hassan 1976: 89

As such, we can substitute nouns; verbs and clauses .Kennedy (2003) points out there are three types of substitution nominal, verbal, and clausal substitution.

Nominal substitution: where the noun or a nominal group can be replaced by a noun.

"One" / "ones" always operate as a head of…. nominal group.

e.g.: "there are some new tennis balls in the baf .These ones have lost their bounce". In this example, "tennis balls" is replaced by the item "ones".

Verbal substitution: the verb or a verbal group can be replaced by another verb which is "do" .This functions as a head of verbal group, and it is usually placed at the end of the group.

e.g. A: Annie says you drink too much.

B: So do you?

Here,"do" substitutes "drink too much".

Clausal substitution: where a clause can be usually substituted by "so" or "not".

e.g. A: It is going to rain?

B: I think so.

In this example, the clause "going to rain" is substituted for "so".

Ellipsis

The relation between substitution and ellipsis is very close because it is merely that ellipsis is "substitution" by zero (0). What is essential in ellipsis is that some elements are omitted from the surface text, but they are still understood. Thus, omission of these elements can be recovered by referring to an element in the preceding text .Harmer defines it: "(…) words are deliberately left out of a sentence when the meaning is still clear". (Harmer, 2004:24).On considering the following example:

"Penny was introduced to a famous author, but even before, she had recognized him". It appeared that the structure of the second clause indicates that there is something left out "introduced to a famous author", the omission of this feature kept the meaning still clear and there is no need of repetition; Carter et al state that "ellipsis occurs in writing where usually functions textually to avoid repetition where structures would otherwise be redundant"(2000:182).

Starkey (2004) points out that on some occasions; ellipsis is used instead of substitution for the sake of conciseness. For example

e.g.1: Everyone who [can] donate time to a charity should do so.

e.g.2: Every one who can donate time to a charity should (0).

In the first example, where substitution was used, the sentence was somehow wordy in comparison to the other sentence (e.g2) which seems quite concise as Starkey explains.

Substitution has three types. Kennedy (2003:324) indicates that "ellipsis is the process by which noun phrase, verb phrase, or clauses are deleted or "understood" when they are absent" the three types of ellipsis are nominal, verbal and clausal.

Nominal ellipsis: means ellipsis within the nominal group, where the omission of nominal group is served a common noun, proper noun or pronoun.

e.g. "My kids practice an awful lot of sport. Both (0) are incredibly energetic". In this example, the omission concerned with "My kids".

Verbal ellipsis: refers to ellipsis within the verbal group where the elliptical verbs on a preceding verbal group.

e.g.: A: have you been working?

B: Yes, I have (0).

Here, the omission of the verbal group depends on what is said before and it is concerned with "been working".

Clausal ellipsis: clausal ellipsis functions as verbal ellipsis, where the omission refers to a clause

e.g.: A: why did you only set three places? Paul's, staying for dinner, isn't he?

B**:** Is he? He didn't tell him (0). In this example the omission falls on the "Paul's, staying for dinner"

We have basic categories of grammatical cohesion, reference Substitution, ellipsis and conjunction, there are very. Important in analyzing text. The aim is to help the reader. Understand the items referred to, the ones replaced and even The ones omitted. Types of grammatical cohesion describes the way in which Text is tied together by linguistic devices and to make cohesive. Discourse properly. (Halliday and Hassan, 1976)

Conjunction

Conjunction is achieved to have grammatical cohesion in texts which show the relationship between sentences. They are different from other cohesive, ties that they reach the meaning by using other features in the discourse. Because as Nunan (1993) points out, they use features to refer to the other parts of the text in order to make relationship between sentences extremely understood. Halliday and Hassan describe it as follows:

In describing conjunction as a cohesive device, we are focusing attention not on the semantic relation as such, as realized throughout the grammar of the language, but on one particular aspect of them, namely the function they have of relating to each other linguistic elements that occur in succession but are not related by other, structural means. (Halliday and Hassan, 1978: 227)

2.8 Lexical cohesion

Lexical cohesion refers to the way in which related words are chosen to link elements of a text. There are two forms: repetition and collocation. Repetition uses the same word, or synonyms, antonyms, etc. For example, "Which dress are you going to wear?" – "I will wear my green frock," uses the synonyms "dress" and "frock" for lexical cohesion. Collocation uses related words that typically go together or tend to repeat the same meaning. An example is the phrase "once upon a time"

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cohesion_(linguistics)

Lexical cohesion is investigated how they contribute to the centrality Of discourse units. Lexical cohesive relations need to be distinguished in order to identify. Central discourse units and refers to the way in which

relatedwordsare chosen to link elements of a text. (Wikipedia.org/cohesion).

2.9 Types of lexical cohesion

The recent attempt at studying vocabulary above sentences is Halliday and Hassan's description of lexical cohesion? According to them (1976), lexical cohesion is created for the choice of a given vocabulary and the role played by certain basic semantic relations between words in creating textuality. Thus, Halliday and Hassan divide lexical cohesion into two main categories: reiteration and collocation.

Reiteration can be identified through the following classes.
Repetitions
Restate the same lexical item in a later part of the discourse.
e.g.: what we lack in a newspaper is what we should get .In a word, popular newspaper may be the winning ticket. (The lexical item "newspaper" reiterated in the same form).

General nouns
They are used to refer back to a lexical item such as: person, people, man, woman for human nouns; things, object for inanimate, concrete countable nouns; stuff for inanimate, concrete uncountable; place for location …etc.
e.g1: A: Did you try the steamed buns?
B: Yes; I didn't like the things much.
e.g2: What shall I do with all this crockery?
Leave the stuff there, someone'll come and put it any way (stuff is a general noun that refers to 'crockery')

Synonymy
Used to express a similar meaning of an item
e.g1: you could try reversing the car up the slope. The incline isn't all that steep
("Slope" refers back to "incline" of which it is a synonym) e.g. 2: A T6 p.m. I range a taxi, but because of the traffic the cab arrived later and I missed my flight.

14

Super ordinations

It involves the use of general class words.

E.g. this car is the best vehicle for a family of six. (Vehicle is a super ordinate of car).

Collocation

Collocation is the tendency of some words to co-occur together. The Syntactic relations of words in which we have a combination of words by expectation; i.e., we predict the following items of a given combination by looking at the first item.The co-occurrence of certain words from a chain to ensure unity and centrality of the topic of this text. These words in chain form the lexical cohesion of the text. Nunan argued that:

Lexical cohesion is, in many ways, the most interesting of all the cohesive categories. The background knowledge of the reader or listener plays a more obvious role in the perception of lexical relationships than in the perception of other types of cohesion. Collocation patterns, for example, will only perceived by someone who knows something about the subject at hand.

(Nunan, 1993: 30)

Thus, collocates can be words used in the same context or it can be words that contribute to the same area of meaning (Kennedy 2003). For example, a text dealing with the chemical treatment of food contains lexical chains such as : fruit ,skin,citrus,lemon,orange ,chemicals ,products ,laboratory …etc .these words can be said to belong to the same register and contribute to the same topic.

2.10 Discourse analysis and Grammar

The relationship between the grammatical form of a sentence and the wider context in which it occurs lies in the intersection between grammar/syntax and discourse analysis.

Cohesion plays an extended role in this relation where the inclusion of the concepts *Theme* and *Rheme*are important in the progression of any discourse.

English learners consciously acquire the structure of the English sentence either b repetition or drills or by mere grammatical analysis. Thus; discourse analysts are interested in the implication of these different

structural options for the creation of text. It seems well known that English has a quite fixed word order, normally summarised as "SVOA", that is, Subject

+Verb + Object + Adveriable. "SVOA" means that a declarative statement must carry a subject at the front of the sentence, a verb after it and an object and/or an adveriable at the end of the sentence. However, McCarthy (1991) states that, there are a variety of ways in English in which we can reorder the basic elements of the sentence by altering different elements to the front of the sentence. This movement is called "fronting devices", as illustrated in:

E.g. Sometimes Joyce reads the Guardian

        A   S   V   O

E.g. What Joyce reads is the Guardian

Wh   S   V   O

E.g. it's the Guardian Joyce reads

             O   S   V

The writer decides where to start the sentence and the beginning of each sentence is its theme. The rest of the sentence tells the reader something about the theme. That the rest of the sentence is called rheme. The theme is the framework of the point of the departure of the message. The rheme is what the addresser wants to convey about the theme (McCarthy: 1991). Halliday (1994) describes the theme-rheme dichotomy. First, the theme is marked in intonation as a separate tone unit, frequently followed by a brief pause. Second, only the basic elements of the kernel structure can become topic themes: the process (main verb), the participants (subject and object) and the circumstantial factor (adveriables). In English, three possible themes are found: Textual theme (discourse markers and conjunctions) + interpersonal theme (vocative) + topic theme (SVOA elements).

The addresser uses theme and rheme to highlight a piece of information in the sentence .For example it is quite common that: *In spoken narrative and anecdotes, speakers will often front place keyorientational features for their listeners. These are most obviously time and place markers('once upon a time', 'one day', 'then, suddenly', 'at the corner', 'not far from here', etc), but may also be foregrounding of key*

participants and information about them felt to be important for the listener(McCarthy, 1991: 54).

Theme and rheme are also used to organize information in the text. Thus, the rheme in one sentence becomes the theme in a following sentence "Theme/rheme assignment is a general way of organizing information and carrying reference over from one proposition to the text" (Widdowson, 2007:43). Furthermore, there is also a thematic organization of the paragraph.

 In English, the sentence of a paragraph is also a theme of that paragraph (topic sentence), whereas the following sentences have a rhematic value (supporting sentences), which develop the idea proposed by the theme by means of examples, arguments…etc

2.11 The Concept of Theme and Rheme
Thematic definitions are divided into two sub-parts:
1. Pure definitions which mean that different scholars just provide us with the definitions of theme and rheme.

2. Applied definitions which mean that scholars do not just provide us with definitions of theme and rheme but they also consider the practical side of the definitions and how they are applicable to language teaching contexts.

A.1.Pure Definitions (Theme &Rheme)
The hallmark of the Prague School is 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 definitions of theme and rheme are to be found in the work of different scholars. Halliday (1985, p. 30) defines theme as the "Element which serves as the point of departure of the message and what the speaker hasin 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. The order is theme followed by rheme".

Halliday (1985) elaborates further by arguing that "theme is what clause is about, and it comes in the 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 each clause conveys a message that has two parts, what comes first is theme and what comes next is rheme" .

Green, Christopher, Lam, and Mei (2000) define the term theme 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 .

A.2. Applied Definitions (Theme &Rheme)

According to Fries (1992) declare that both native and non-native English speaking students have difficulty ordering words in their sentences. Teachers often experience difficulties explaining to students how they should order the information in their sentences. Two concepts are helpful in this task: theme and information focus. Theme is the point of departure of the clause as message. In English one can recognize themes because they occur first in the clause. Fries in his study showed that theme is a very important cohesive element that must be taken into account seriously in writing (p. 1).

Brown and Yule (1983) believe that one of the constraints on the speaker and writer is that they can produce only one word at a 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 the discourse. It influences 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 (p.125).

Ping (2000, p. 13) views theme as an element that generates the boundary of acceptability of possible rhemes from 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, unacceptable or dubious, because even an 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 (p. 5).

In light of the problems attached to Halliday framework, Ping (2000) suggested a new model called the inference-boundary model which interprets the theme/ rheme from a cognitive psychological perspective. Underlying this model is the schema theory and the role of inference during language processing. In this model the "head" and "non-head" distinction was used instead of using the textual, interpersonal, and topical theme labels. Thematic head of a clause refers to the element which is able to generate a boundary of acceptability and within which it 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 (p. 16).

This model can explain why clausal messages are sometimes difficult to process: Interference from the context, non-appropriate or less elaborate schema, and theme/rheme mismatch. However, this model has some restrictions:

1- As it is centrally concerned with the theme structure at the level of clause, it cannot clearly explain how some languages inputs succeed in conveying message even though they do not lend 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, p. 21).

19

Following his view of theme, he defines 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.

Theme is the main idea that you are talking about and lets the reader know what cause is going to be about. Rehme what you say about main idea. We can use theme and rehme to organize information In the text, the rehme in one sentence become the rehme. In the following sentence. (Hallidayand Hassan 1994)

2.12 Thematic progression

According to Halliday (1994) proposes that thematic principle lies behind the organization of paragraphs in written discourse (p. 55) in that the topic sentence of a paragraph is nothing other than its Theme. He also elaborates how Themes and Rhemes could be chained into thematic progression to produce coherent texts (1994, p. 388).

Indeed, as the text unfolds, the Themes connect to the Themes and Rhemes of preceding clauses in various ways, picking up or repeating the important concepts and developing them further, whose connections form patterns of thematic progression (Daneš, 1974). Daneš extends the concept of Theme as point of departure of a single utterance (clause) to that of explaining the inner connectivity of texts, which is represented by thematic progression (Herriman, 2011). Thematic progression refers to the way Themes interact with each other and with Rhemes in order to provide continuity in discourse and to organize the text. Daneš (1974) defines thematic progression as follows: …the choice and ordering of utterance Themes, their mutual concatenation and hierarchy, as well as their relationship to the hyper Themes of the superior text units (such as the paragraph, chapter…), to the whole text and to the situation. Thematic progression might be viewed as the skeleton of the plot (p.114). Thus, thematic progression concerns the way that the texts develop the ideas they present. More specifically, thematic progression concerns where Themes come from—how they relate to other Themes and Rhemes of the text. Patterns of thematic progression are formed by a systematic relation between the Theme- Rheme selections and experiential selections in a text (Ghadessy, 1995; Yang, 2008).

Thematic progression refers to the way themes interplay. With each other and with rehemes in order to provide. Continuation in discourse and to regularize the text.(Danes,1974 & Herriman,2011)

2.13 Thematic organization and thematic progression

According to Halliday (1985, p. 54) classified the elements which occur in initial position of the clause as follows:

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

2. Interpersonal theme which consists of any combination of vocatives (direct addresses such as: personal names), modal adjuncts and mood marking elements (finite verbal operator (temporal & modal), WH-interrogatives and imperative *let's*.

3. Textual theme that includes continuatives (small set of discourse items which signal that a new move is beginning, such as: yes, no, oh…), structural elements (coordinates & subordinates) and 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.

1. Simple themes always have a topical element.
For example: *She* was so kind to her four cats. Topical

2. Multiple themes may have the interpersonal and textual themes in addition to topical theme (p. 55). 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 an 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 (p.44) For example: *In the morning,* the goat went to

jungle to find the wolf. Danes (1974, as cited in Downing, 2001, p. 5) proposed a number of thematic progression patterns that manifest differently in different genres as follows: linear TP, constant TP (or thematic iteration), split rheme, and split theme progression.

1. Linear TP: Danes (1974, as cited in Downing, 2001, p.5) refers to this as the most elementary or basic thematic progression pattern, where the item in the rheme of the first clause becomes the theme of the subsequent clause.

For example:"*At this point* we must add an important qualification to what we have just said. *That* is, we are using the terms rule and rule-governed in the special way that linguists use them. *This usage* is very different from the layperson's understanding of the terms".

2. Constant TP: In this pattern, the item in the theme of the first clause is also selected as the theme of the following clause, though not necessarily with identical wording.

For example:*"And yet we* understand them and don't even notice that they are new. *We* speak, *but usually we* are not aware of the movements of our tongue, lips, or other parts of themouth or throat involved in the production of sounds".

3. Split rhematic progression: In this pattern, the rheme of the first clause is split into two items, each in turn being taken as a theme element in subsequent clauses.

For example:

"*I* will use the term 'language teaching method' to mean a coherent set of links between actions and thoughts in language teaching. *The actions* are the techniques *and the thoughts* are the principles in the title of this hook: *Techniques andPrinciples in Language Teaching*".

4. Split theme progression: To Danes' patterns of thematic progression one has been added. In this kind of thematic progression which was proposed by McCabe (1999, p. 175), the theme of the first clause is split into two or more ideas, and these ideas are developed in the themes of subsequent clauses.

For example*:*

"The mother and the child made a plan. She first found the wolf and tore his stomach, and the child brought some stones to fill the wolf's stomach".

Adopting the Danes' thematic progression patterns, McCabe (1999, p. 176) considered a revised model of Danes' TP patterns. She catagorized these patterns into 2 overall types: a) theme progression including constant theme and split theme and b) rheme progression including simple linear and split rheme. McCabe (1999) did not consider derived theme as a different sort of TP, since it may be related to proceeding themes and rhemes through some types of inference involved in simple linear or constant theme (p. 171). According to McCabe (1999), there are a rather large percentage of clauses which do not fit into any of the TP patterns proposed by Danes, since it appears that Danes employed a standard for theme specification which accords more with the notion of "given". Therefore, it is necessary to modify Danes' model in order to apply it in other analyses which use a different standard for theme specification (p. 270). What's more is that, Danes' model was only tested on English texts and a few other languages. So, more evidence is needed from other languages to see whether other systematic patterns emerge in text in other languages.(Ebrahimi and Khedri 2012)

2.14 The Importance of Thematic Structure in Students' Writing Cohesion

Introduction

In accordance with Halliday and Matthissen's scheme, grammar is part of language that can be interpreted from different viewpoints. In one view, language is a set of rules to specify structures; so, grammar as a subsystem of language is also a set of rules that specifies grammatical structures. In the other view, language is a resource that can create meaning through wording (1997, p. 1). Systemic functional grammar theory associated with the school of linguistics was first developed in the work of the grammar of Chinese and used in educational and computational contexts. Unlike the grammatics that is usually presented in school, "systemic-functional grammatics takes the resource perspective rather than the rule perspective" and shows "the overall system of

grammar rather than only fragments" (Halliday&Mathiessen, 1977, p. 2).
In the same line of argumentation, Martin and Rose (2007) also report:
"Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is a big multi-perspectival theory
with more dimensions in its theory banks that might be required for any
one job.

SFL is called systemic because compared with other theories it
foregrounds the organization of language as options for meaning and is
also functional because it interprets the design of language with respect to
ways people use it to live (pp. 21, 24)."

In this approach, the main focus is on clause, and as Halliday (1994, p.
19) states, the mode of interpretation in this approach is functional in
which the grammatical structure is being explained referring to the
meaning and there is a general principle in language that larger units act
more directly in the realization of higher-level patterns.
In the existing literature in Systemic Linguistics, researchers consider
clause as made by a combination of three metafunctions (Halliday, 1985;
Halliday&Mathiessen, 1997; Martin & Rose, 2007; Ping, 2003). These
three metafunctions are as follows:

1. Interpersonal metafunction: Martin and Rose (2007) point out that
interpersonal

metafunction "is concerned with negotiation of social relations: How
people are interacting, including the feelings they try and share" (p. 24).
Halliday and Mathiesse (1997) emphasize that one of the major
grammatical systems of this kind of metafunction is mood, the
grammaticalization of speech function (p. 11).

2. Ideational metafunction: Martin and Rose (2007) say that ideational
metafunction "is concerned with construing experience: What's going on,
including who's doing what to whom, where, when, why, how, and the
logical relation of one going on to another" (p.24).
In Halliday and Mathiessen's viewpoint, transitivity, "the resource for
construing our experience the flux of 'goings-on', as structural
configurations, each consisting of a process, the participants involved in

the process, and circumstances attendant on it, is one of major ideational metafunction's grammatical systems (1997, p. 11). As Halliday (1994) states, "transitivity structures express representational meaning: what the clause is about, which is typically some process, with associated participants and circumstances" (p. 179).

3. Textual metafunction: As Martin and Rose (2007) mention, textual metafunction "is concerned with information flow: The ways in which ideational and interpersonal resources are distributed in waves of semiotic, including interconnections among waves and between language and attendant modalities" (p. 24). Halliday and Mathiessen (1997) argue that theme is one of the major textual systems. It is the resource to set up a local context for a clause by selecting a local point of departure in the flow of information (p.11).

Davidse (1987) argues that these metafunctions are both intrinsic and extrinsic to language. In the first place, they are separate components, or semantic organizing principles, of the grammar.
But the ideational and interpersonal functions also finally refer to social reality. They represent the social uses to which language is put (p. 51). He also asserts that the metafunctions are a key concept in Halliday's theory since they explain the internal organization of language and are systematically related to the register variables of field, tenor, and mode (p.57).

Matthiessen (2004) also mentioned that the textual mode of expression is based on degree of prominence. Prominence may be considered in one of three ways: 1) positionally by means of culminative placement at the beginning or the end of the clause; 2) segmentally by means of some prominence marker that emphasizes one element out of the other elements of the clause; 3) intonationally by means of tonic prominence (p. 549).

In Halliday and Mathiessen's (1997) mind, the textual metafunction-which, as stated by Gosden (1992), is manifested as *theme* in the clause-engenders resources for presenting interpersonal and ideational meanings as information organized into text that can be ongoingly exchanged

between producer and receiver. This involves transitions in the development of text (conjunctive relations) and the assignment of different textual statuses. These transitions and statuses enable the exchange of information; the producer is guiding the receiver in interpreting the unfolding text (p. 19).

2.15 Review of previous studies

It has been shown that cohesion and thematic progression plays 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 cohesion and thematic progression in the writings of EFL learners.

Hubbard (1989) in his study 'Reference cohesion, conjunctive cohesion and Rational coherence in the students, of cohesion errors in the academic writing of EL2 students in South Africa.

Lautamatti. (1978:60) conducted a study on some observations on cohesion and coherence in simplified text". He analyzed several simplified texts, he found that simplification affects the natural of the textual cohesion and coherence 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.

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 Al-Quds 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 specially it will comprise the research problem, the research questions, the hypotheses, the objectives and methodology of the study.

2.16 Conclusion

The present study is based on a literature review of Grammatical cohesion is found to be a multi-type concept. From a structural view, it is a number of cohesive devices governing the organization of the text in terms of the devices used from the sentence level to the discourse level. Grammatical cohesion is used to produce a package discourse concerning both the writer and the reader. In addition, any written discourse is assumed to use the necessary connectors as grammatical cohesion to have a cohesive discourse and to help the reader understand the text as much as possible. Theme and thematic progression in English Learner produce. It is shown that scholars have studied how appropriate Theme choices and thematic progression patterns help make learner output more coherent and cohesive.

All of the activities in this instructional comprehensive are designed to build students' meta-knowledge of coherence and T/TP in order to give students more grammatical resources to improve the coherence of their writing. Furthermore, these activities help students become aware of how information and ideas should flow in a text so that it could be easily understood by the reader. In addition, students would copping which T/TP patterns are evaluated in English writing; these activities provide students with the opportunities to apply this knowledge to enhance their own writing.

Chapter Three

Methodology of the Research

3.0 Introduction

This study describes the methodology used in this research. It includes the introduction of the chapter, the research method, the research subjects (respondents), the research tools (instruments), procedures, validity and reliability.

3.1 Research method

The data for this study were obtained from responses:

A) test (write essay) for third level university students majoring in English language.

B) A questionnaire to the university English language teachers.

C) In addition to that, basic statistical methods were used so as to identify the significant differences between the means in the dependent variables.

Although the method used in this research is descriptive, quantitative in form of questionnaire and test is known to be fixed and objective in contrast to subjective qualitative one. It aims at finding objectively abstract facts about a phenomenon through numbers it could be argued that quantitative researchers deal with facts and studies the relationships of one set of facts to another to produce quantified generalized conclusion. A quantitative research involves numerical data and statistics relying on precise scientific criteria.

3.2 Research subjects (respondent)

The university English language teachers and students who are the subjects of this study were classified into two main groups:

The first group consisted of students who were tested in English language and it included third class students at university level. The second group was that of teachers, experts and instructors of English language at university level. These experts and teachers have long experience in different areas of education especially university level teaching and examinations.

Sample of the students

The first sample consisted of (30) students at third level, both boys and girls from Sudan University of science and technology. The sample has been chosen randomly.

Sample of the teachers

The second sample consisted of (10) Sudanese English language teachers from Sudan university of science and technology. It is important to mention that, the sample represented male and female teachers of English language. The teachers have long experience in teaching English at university level. Many of them had been familiar with previous English language syllabus. The study sample respondents are different according to the following characteristics:

The respondents from different year of experience in English language (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, over 20 years).

3.3 Research tool (instrument)

The researcher used two types of data collection tools:

A) Students test and,

b) A questionnaire for teachers at university level.

The students, test

Third year university students, test:

The test was for writing an essay. The test consisted different types of topic and students were asked to write about any one in your own choice. The test was administered to a sample of (30) boys and girls of third year at Sudan university of science and technology. It is worth mentioning that the following essential points concerning the reasons for selecting the sample of the students of these specific classes for this   research study are as follows:

Firstly, the test was meant to measure university students the role of cohesion and thematic progression on the quality of EFL written performance.

Secondly, they were chosen because of easiness in handling the test and the capability of reasonable answers to ascertain the research problem and check the hypotheses of the study (i.e. competency to write). Also how they used the target language after completing the basic, secondary and three academic years in university.

Thirdly, the selected samples were accessible and more acknowledgeable. This can help the researcher to get more suitable information and data that could help in obtaining the expected results.

The teachers' questionnaire:

The study sample of respondents differs according to the following characteristic:

The respondents from different years of experience English language (1-5 years, 6-10 years ……etc.).

The purpose of the questionnaire was mainly to get the opinions of the teachers as relates to the causes of the role of cohesion and thematic progression on the quality of EFL written performance and their effect on the university students, written performance. The questionnaire was directed to a sample of (10) teachers of English language at university level.

3.4Procedures:

The researcher distributed the test to respondents in order to get their response; it was given to them hand by hand in classroom. It was distributed and collected in a period of an hour and a half.

As it has been mentioned earlier in section (3.2) the researcher has used the random sample of 30 respondents. The data collected from these 30 subjects will be statistically analyzed and discussed in chapter four.

3.5 Validity

To check the validity in this study, the test has been prepared and passed to a juries consisting of two PhD. Holders at the college of language department of linguistics. The result of the evaluation and judgment of test started that it was valid for learners, use and understanding of each device in grammatical cohesive devices and concentrated on the

frequencies of students, appropriate and inappropriate use of the types of grammatical cohesive devices.

The copies of the questionnaire designed for experts and teachers of English language at university level were similarly distributed to the following ten experts teachers of English language.

3.6 Reliability

Research is defined as the consistency in performance results, and intended to measure the ability to get the same results if re-use the same tool as second time.

The test was distributed to the subjects to be answered in order to prove whether the collected data will achieve the purpose of the study.

Chapter Four

Data analysis, Results and Discussion

4.0 Introduction

This chapter aims at testing our hypothesis whether and to what extent students use cohesion and thematic progression? It is also intended to finding out which type of cohesion and thematic progression are widely used, and to what extent they are appropriate or not. For this purpose, a test and questionnaire was used as an instrument to collect the data. The analysis of the test was undertaken in the form of frequencies of use devices and errors. Explanation of the results was also provided in some cases as to why some usages of cohesive devices are emerged, and why some ties are used inappropriate?

4.1 Description of the university students, essay:

An essay test was designed to elicit data from students majoring in English in the Sudan university of science and technology .this test consisted of many topics and the students were asked to write about one topic in your own choice (see appendix A). The test was administered to sample of (30) boys and girls of third year, at Sudan university. It's worth mentioning that test was meant to measure university students the Role of cohesion and thematic progression on the quality of EFL written performance. After the administration of test,30 copies of the test to write essay were returned and analyses by the recognized computer packaged call "statistical package for social sciences" (SPSS 15-0).

4.2 Description of the teachers, questionnaire:

A closed- ended questionnaire was designed to elicit data from teachers of English at sudan university of science and technology on investigating role of cohesion and thematic progression on the quality of EFL written performance and their impact on university students written performance (see appendix B). This questionnaire was designed after reviewing many available studies in testing learners' written competence and knowledge derived from research methodology references. Initially, the questionnaire was composed of 12 statements, but after a process of revision and

modification the questionnaire statements were reduced to 5 statements, composed of positively and negatively worded statements. This questionnaire was designed in accordance with likers' 5 point scale (strongly agree,agree,undecided,disagree,strongly disagree). It is worth mentioning that the final version of the questionnaire came out after long discussions and consultation with teachers of English.

4.3 textualanalyses of the students, tests

The learners, use of Reference:

The students, use of reference will be analyses according to the total number of grammatical cohesive devices used and the number of references used too. The results will be show in the following table:

	Frequency	**Percent**
5	13	43%
6	9	30%
7	7	23.3%
8	1	3.3%
Total	**30**	**100**

Mean	**Median**	**Mode**	**Std. deviation**	**range**
5.86	6	5	0.89	3

Table 1: learners, use of reference

The results reveal that students use reference (5.86%) is adequately. references are known and taught from their previous study.

The learners, use of substitution

The following table represents the number of substitution used concerning the total number of grammatical cohesive devices:

	Frequency	Percent
2	2	6.7%
3	7	23.3%
4	3	10%
5	5	16.7%
6	13	43.3%
Total	**30**	**100**

Mean	Median	Mode	Std. deviation	range
4.66	5	6	1.42	4

Table 2: learners, use of substitution

The frequencies obtained reveal that learners, use substitution (4.66%) is very little concerning than the use of reference and conjunction (5.86% and 5.90%) respectively.

The learners, use of conjunctions

The total number of grammatical cohesive devices used by subjects and the corresponding number of conjunction used are shown in table below:

	Frequency	Percent
4	1	3.3%
5	13	43.3%
6	6	20%
7	8	26.7%
8	2	6.7%
Total	**30**	**100**

Mean	Median	Mode	Std. deviation	range
5.90	6	5	1.06	4

Table 3: learners, use of conjunction

The results show that students widely use conjunction (5.90%) because they seem familiar with this type of grammatical cohesive device.

4.3.1 Grammatical Cohesion

The table below represents the types of grammatical cohesion:

	Frequency	Percent
Bad	11	36.7%
Pass	4	13.3%
Good	14	46.7%
Very Good	1	3.3%
Excellent	0	0%
Total	**30**	**100**

Mean	Median	Mode	Std. deviation	range	Minimum	Maximum
16.43	17	13	3.11	10	12	22

The table above shows that the mean score of the test is (16.43) inside of 30% the mean also is above the average. This means the significant, because it is above 15% accordingly this is an indication of the good of

the students, written texts. The students were well acquainted with rules of grammatical cohesion.

Descriptive Analysis of Grammatical Cohesion for Teacher questionnaire

Statement		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
EFL students, written performance shows poor awareness in terms of cohesion by reference	Freq	1	8	1	0	0
	%	10%	80%	10%	0%	0%
EFL students, written performance shows poor awareness in terms of cohesion by substitution	Freq	4	5	1	0	0
	%	40%	50%	10%	0%	0%
EFL students, written performance shows poor awareness in terms of cohesion by Conjunctions	Freq	4	5	1	0	0
	%	40%	50%	10%	0%	0%
Total	Freq	9	18	3	0	0
	%	30%	60%	10%	0%	0%

The result above show that (30% - 60%) most of the respondents strongly agree and agree, while 10% undecided, whereas 0% disagree and 0% strongly disagree that **" EFL students, written performance shows poor awareness in terms of cohesion by (reference, substitution, conjunctions)".**

ANOVA Test for Element of Grammatical Cohesion

	Mean	Std. deviation	F value	Sig
Reference	5.86	0.89	11.221	0.000
Substitution	4.66	1.42		
Conjunctions	5.90	1.06		

As shown in the table above, the value of (F) calculated (11.221) significant value is (0.000) there are no significant differences, It is clear that the students, use of reference and conjunction are the most, whereas their use of substitution is the least. Moreover, to clarify these differences the researcher used (ANOVA) Tests.

LSD Test for Element of Grammatical Cohesion

LSD		
Reference & Substitution	Reference & Conjunctions	Substitution & Conjunctions
0.000	0.911	0.000

The results of comparison between Reference and Substitution of the study, the researcher used (LSD) test to clarify that there are statistically variation between them (0.000), While there are no a statistically variation between the Reference and Conjunction (0.911), whereas there are statistically variation between Substitution and Conjunction (0.000).

The learners, use of antonyms

The table below represents the number of antonym used concerning the total of lexical cohesive devices:

	Frequency	Percent
3	4	13.3%
4	6	20%
5	12	40%
6	5	16.7%
7	3	10%
Total	**30**	**100**

Mean	Median	Mode	Std. deviation	range
4.90	5	5	1.15	4

Table 4: **learners, use of antonyms**

The results show that the students, use antonym (4.90%) larger than the use of synonymy and hyponymy (4.63% and 4.56%) respectively.

The learners, use of synonymy

The following table shows the whole number of lexical synonymy:

	Frequency	Percent
3	5	16.7%
4	5	16.7%
5	17	56.7%
6	2	6.7%

7	1	3.3%
Total	**30**	**100**

Mean	Median	Mode	Std. deviation	range
4.63	5	5	0.96	4

Table 5: **learners, use synonymy**

The results reveal that students use synonymy and not adequately.

The learners, use of hyponymy

The table below represents the total number of lexical hyponymy:

	Frequency	Percent
2	1	3.3%
3	7	23.3%
4	6	20%
5	6	20%
6	10	33.3%
Total	**30**	**100**

Mean	Median	Mode	Std. deviation	Range
4.56	5	6	1.27	4

Table 6: **learners, use of hyponymy**

The frequencies obtained reveal that learners, use hyponymy (4.56%) is very little concerning the use of other lexical cohesive devices.

4.3.2 Lexical Cohesion

	Frequency	**Percent**
Bad	14	46.7%
Pass	15	50%
Good	1	3.3%
Very Good	0	0%
Excellent	0	0%
Total	**30**	**100**

Mean	**Median**	**Mode**	**Std. deviation**	**range**	**Minimum**	**Maximum**
14.10	15	16	3.14	12	8	20

The results above show that the mean score of the test is (14.10) out of 30% the mean also is below the average. This mean is significant, because it is below 15% accordingly this is an indication of the weakness of the students, written an essay. The students were not well acquainted with of the rules of lexical cohesion.

Descriptive Analysis of Lexical Cohesion for Teacher questionnaire

Statement		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
EFL students, written performance shows poor awareness of antonyms	Freq	1	2	5	2	0
	%	10%	20%	50%	20%	0%
EFL students, written performance shows poor awareness of synonymy	Freq	0	2	4	4	0
	%	0%	20%	40%	40%	0%

EFL students, written performance shows poor awareness of hyponymy	Freq	4	6	0	0	0
	%	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%
Total	Freq	5	10	9	6	0
	%	16.7%	33.3%	30%	20%	0%

The results above reveal that (16.7% - 33.3%) most of the respondents strongly agree and agree, whereas 30% undecided, while 20% disagree and 0% strongly disagree that **"EFL students, written performance shows poor awareness in termsof lexical cohesion by (antonyms, synonyms, hyponymy)**

NOVA test for element of Lexical Cohesion

	Mean	Std. deviation	F value	Sig
Antonyms	4.90	1.15	0.718	0.490
Synonymy	4.63	0.96		
Hyponymy	4.56	1.27		

As show in the table above, the value of (F) calculated (0.718) significant value is (0.490) there are no significant differences. In mean of the three categories of lexical cohesion it is clear that the students use of (antonyms & synonymy & hyponymy) are the least. Moreover, to clarify these differences the researcher used (ANOVA) tests.

The learners, use of topical theme

The following table represents the number of topic theme used concerning the total number of thematic progression devices:

	Frequency	Percent
3	5	16.7%
4	7	23.3%
5	15	50%
6	3	10%
Total	**30**	**100**

Mean	Median	Mode	Std. deviation	range
4.53	5	5	0.89	3

Table 7: learners, use of topical theme

The results above show that the use of topical theme (4.53%) is lower than the use of other thematic progression devices.

The learners, use of interpersonal theme

The table below represents the whole number of interpersonal theme:

	Frequency	Percent
3	6	20%
4	3	10%
5	9	30%
6	9	30%
7	3	10%
Total	**30**	**100**

Mean	Median	Mode	Std. deviation	range
5	5	5	1.28	4

Table 8: **learners, use of interpersonal theme**

These results show that the predominant interpersonal devices in using (5.00%).

The learners, use of textual theme

The following table shows that the students use textual theme concerning the total number of thematic progression:

	Frequency	**Percent**
3	3	10%
4	6	20%
5	7	23.3%
6	8	26.7%
7	6	20%
Total	**30**	**100**

Mean	Median	Mode	Std. deviation	Range
5.26	5	6	1.28	4

Table 9: **learners, use of textual theme**

The results reveal that the use of textual theme (5.26%) is exceeds the use of both of topical and interpersonal theme. However, it is noticed that students' use of topical theme (4.53%) is less than interpersonal theme (5.00%).

The learners, use of theme and rheme

The students, use of theme and rheme will be analyses according to the total number of thematic progression devices used and the number of theme &rheme used too. The results will be shown in the following table:

	Frequency	Percent
2	1	3.3%
3	7	23.3%
4	6	20%
5	16	53.3%
Total	**30**	**100**

Mean	Median	Mode	Std. deviation	Range
4.23	5	5	0.93	3

Table 10: **learners, use of theme and rheme**

The frequencies obtained reveal that students use theme and rheme (4.23%) is lower than the used other types of thematic progression.

These differences in use may refer to the students, knowledge about the more used type rather than the other types.

4.3.3 Thematic Progression

	Frequency	Percent
Bad	7	23.3%
Pass	5	17.6%
Good	6	20%
Very Good	12	40%
Excellent	0	0%
Total	**30**	**100**

44

Mean	Median	Mode	Std. deviation	range	Minimum	Maximum
19.03	20	23	4.12	13	11	24

The mean score of the test is (19.03) out of 40% the mean also is below the average. This mean is significant, because it is below 20%. Accordingly this is an indication of the weakness of the students, written an essay. The students were not well acquainted with of the rules of thematic progression.

ANOVA test for element of Thematic Progression

	Mean	Std. deviation	F value	Sig
Topical Theme	4.53	0.89	5.15	0.002
Interpersonal Theme	5.00	1.28		
Textual Theme	5.26	1.28		
Theme/ rheme	4.23	0.93		

As shown in the table above, the value of (F) calculated (5.15) significant value is (0.002) there are no significant differences. It is clear that the students, use of interpersonal and textual theme are the most, while their use of topical theme and theme/rheme are the least. Moreover, to clarify these differences the researcher used (ANOVA) tests.

LSD					
Topical Theme & Interpersonal Theme	Topical Theme & Textual Theme	Topical Theme & Theme/rheme	Interpersonal Theme & Textual Theme	Interpersonal Theme & Theme/rheme	Textual Theme & Theme/rheme
0.108	0.012	0.030	0.357	0.009	0.000

The result of comparison between four categories of thematic progression in the study, the researcher used (LSD) test to clarify that there are statistically significant differences between topical and interpersonal theme (0.108), also there are statistically significant differences between (topical & textual theme (0.012) and (topical theme & theme/rheme (0.030) and (interpersonal & textual theme (0.357) and (interpersonal theme & theme/rheme (0.009), while there are no statistically significant differences between textual theme and theme/rheme (0.000).

Statement		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
EFLstudents, written performance shows little knowledge of the thematic progression category: named the topical theme	Freq	3	6	1	0	0
	%	30%	60%	10%	0%	0%
EFL students, written performance shows little knowledge of the thematic progression category: namely interpersonal theme	Freq	2	2	3	3	0
	%	20%	20%	30%	30%	0%
EFL students, written performance shows little knowledge of the thematic progression category: named textual theme	Freq	4	6	0	0	0
	%	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%
The written performance of the EFL students reflects poor awareness of single theme/rheme sentences	Freq	5	5	0	0	0
	%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
Total	Freq	14	19	4	3	0
	%	35%	47.5%	10%	7.5%	0%

The frequencies obtained reveal that (35% - 47.5%) most of the respondents strongly agree and agree, while 10% undecided, whereas 7.5% disagree and 0% strongly disagree that **"EFL students, written performance shows little knowledge of the thematic progression category: named (topical theme, interpersonal theme, textual theme, theme and rheme sentences)**

Test

	Frequency	**Percent**
Bad	14	46.7%
Pass	13	43.3%
Good	3	10%
Very Good	0	0%
Excellent	0	0%
Total	**30**	**100**

Mean	**Median**	**Mode**	**Std. deviation**	**range**	**Minimum**	**Maximum**
49.56	52	57	10.21	35	31	66

As shown in the table, the mean score of the test is (49.56) out of 100% the mean also is below the average. This mean is significant, because it is below 50%. Accordingly this is an indication of the weakness of the students, written an essay. The students were not well acquainted with of the rules of cohesion and thematic progression.

ANOVA test of the cohesion and thematic progression

	Mean	Std. deviation	F value	Sig
Grammatical Cohesion	5.47	1.04	14.981	0.000
Lexical Cohesion	4.70	1.05		
Thematic Progression	4.75	1.03		

As show in the table above, the value of (F) calculated (14.981) significant value is (0.000) there are no significant differences, it is clear that the students, use of grammatical cohesion is the most, whereas their use of lexical cohesion and thematic progression are the least. Moreover, to clarify these differences the researcher used (ANOVA) tests.

LSD		
Grammatical Cohesion & Lexical Cohesion	Grammatical Cohesion & Thematic Progression	Lexical Cohesion & Thematic Progression
0.011	0.005	0.000

The result of the comparison between grammatical cohesion & lexical cohesion and thematic progression of the study, the researcher used (LSD) test to clarify that there are statistically significant differences between the grammatical cohesion & lexical cohesion (0.011), whereas there are statistically significant differences between grammatical cohesion and thematic progression (0.005), while there are statistically significant differences between the lexical cohesion & thematic progression (0.000).

4.4 **Date analysis of teachers, questionnaires**

Dear colleague, please put (√) in the appropriate place. Providing, your appropriate response, will undoubtedly help the researcher arrive at this required aims.

No	Statement	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	EFL students, written performance shows poor awareness in terms of cohesion by reference.	1 10%	8 80%	1 10%	0 0%	0 0%
2	EFL students, written performance shows poor awareness in terms of cohesion by substitution.	4 %40	5 %50	1 10%	0 0%	0 0%
3	EFL students, written performance reflects poor awareness in terms of cohesion by ellipsis.	7 70%	2 20%	1 10%	0 0%	0 0%
4	EFL students, written performance reflects poor awareness in terms of cohesion by conjunctions.	0 0%	4 40%	5 50%	1 10%	0 0%
5	Sudanese EFL students, written performance reflects poor awareness in terms of lexical cohesion.	1 10%	8 80%	1 10%	0 0%	0 0%
6	The written performance of the EFL students shows poor awareness of antonyms.	1 10%	2 20%	5 50%	3 30%	0 0%
7	The written performance of the EFL students reflects poor awareness of synonymy.	0 0%	2 20%	4 40%	4 40%	0 0%

8	The written performance of the EFL students shows poor awareness of hyponymy.	2 20%	2 20%	3 30%	3 30%	0 0%
9	EFL students, written performance shows little knowledge of the thematic progression category; named the topical theme.	4 40%	6 60%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
10	The written performance of the EFL students reflects little knowledge of the thematic progression category; namely interpersonal theme.	5 50%	5 50%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
11	EFL students, written performance shows little knowledge of the thematic progression category; named textual theme.	4 40%	6 60%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
12	The written performance of the EFL students reflects poor awareness of single theme/rheme sentences.	3 30%	6 60%	1 10%	0 0%	0 0%

According to the table, we can demonstrate the results as follows:

The calculated value the median for the respondents, answers of the 1st question is 10% strongly agree, whereas 80% most of the respondents agree, while 10% undecided, whereas 0% disagree and 0% strongly disagree that *"EFL students, written performance shows poor awareness in terms of cohesion that "EFL by reference".*

The calculated value the median for the respondents, answers of the *2st* question is 40% strongly agree, while 50% most of the respondents agree, whereas 10% undecided, while 0% disagree and 0% strongly disagree that *"EFL students, written performance shows poor awareness in terms of cohesion by substitution" .*

The calculated value of the median for the respondents, answers of the *3st* question is 70% most of the respondents strongly agree, whereas 20% agree, while 10% undecided, whereas 0% disagree and 0% strongly disagree that *"EFL students, written performance reflects poor awareness in terms of cohesion by ellipsis"*.

The calculated value of the median for the respondents, answers of the *4st* question is 0% strongly agrees, while 40% agree whereas 50% most of the respondents undecided, while 10% disagree and 0% strongly disagree that *"EFL students, written performance reflects poor awareness in terms of cohesion by conjunctions"*.

The calculated value of the median for the respondents, answers of the *5st* question is 10% strongly agree whereas 80% most of the respondents agree, while 10% undecided, whereas 0% disagrees and 0% strongly disagree that *"Sudanese EFL students, written performance reflects poor awareness in terms of lexical cohesion"*.

The calculated value of the median for the respondents, answers of the *6st* question is 10% strongly agree, while 20% agree, whereas 50% most of the respondents undecided, while 30% disagree and 0% strongly disagree that *"The written performance of the EFL students shows poor awareness of antonyms"*.

The calculated value of the median for the respondents, answers of the *7st* question is 0% strongly agree, whereas 20% agree, while 40% most of the respondents undecided, also 40% disagree, whereas 0% strongly disagree that "*The written performance of the EFL students reflects poor awareness of synonymy"*.

The calculated value of the median for the respondents, answers of the *8st* question is 20% strongly agree, also 20% agree, while 30% most of the respondents undecided and 30% disagree too. Whereas 0% strongly disagree that "*The written performance of the EFL students shows poor awareness of hyponymy"*.

The calculated value of the median for the respondents, answers of the *9st* question is 40% strongly agree, whereas 60% most of the respondents agree, while 0% undecided, whereas 0% disagree and 0% strongly

disagree that "*EFL students, written performance shows little knowledge of the thematic progression category; named the topical theme*".

The calculated value of the median for the respondents, answers of the *10st* question is 50% most of the respondents strongly agree and 50% agree too. While 0% undecided, whereas 0% disagrees and 0% strongly disagrees that "*The written performance of the EFL students reflects little knowledge of the thematic progression category; named interpersonal theme*".

The calculated value of the median for the respondents, answers of the *11st* question is 40% strongly agree, whereas 60% most of the respondents agree, while 0% undecided, whereas 0% disagree and 0% strongly disagree that "*EFL students, written performance shows little knowledge of the thematic progression category; namely textual theme*".

The calculated value of the median for the respondents, answers of the *12st* question is 30% strongly agree, while 60% most of the respondents agree, whereas 10% undecided, while 0% disagree and 0% strongly disagree that written "*The performance of the EFL students reflects poor awareness of single theme and rheme sentences*".

CONCLUSION

The first conclusion one can draw from all these results is that third-year students somehow master adequately the English grammatical cohesive devices. Analyzing globally the results, we found that learner's problems of English with grammatical cohesive devices and thematic progression are of the following:

Students usually use a given grammatical cohesive device from each type while writing.

When students produce writing discourse, they demonstrate an ability to use a particular feature in their creative writing. This ability in using a given device might be the reason why some grammatical cohesive devices are embedded. Moreover, learners' writing experience could be a source of students' more or less used devices. The result reveal that students, appropriates used grammatical cohesive devices (reference & conjunctions and substitution (16.43) constituting (15%) the mean is good average. In such cases, the percentage of less use in substitution was of (4.66%).This was explained in terms of avoidance in that, students tended not to use such type because they do not know how, when and where can be reached, and the percentage of more use in conjunctions and reference was of (5.90% - 5.86)   which was explained in terms of awareness; i.e., students are probably familiar with the use of most conjunction and reference devices, however some of them are used inappropriate. Also the result reveal that students, inappropriate used categories of the lexical cohesion (14.10) which is (15%) the mean is below the average, and categories of the thematic progression (19.03) representing (20%) the mean is below the average.

We also reached the conclusion that students have little difficulty in using grammatical cohesive devices. Thus, the more grammatical cohesive devices and thematic progression are used, the more they are inappropriate, and the less grammatical cohesive devices and lexical cohesion are used, the less they are inappropriate. Furthermore, learners' incorrect forms in using cohesion and thematic progression and their confusion in using plural and singular are explained in terms of misinformation and misanalysis respectively in that students tend to misuse the production of grammatical cohesivedevices in using plural and singular reference.

Chapter Five

Conclusions, Recommendations and Suggestions for Further studies

5.0 Introduction:

This chapter provides a summary for the present study. It sheds light mainly on the study problem, hypotheses, objectives, significance, and limits of the study. In addition, the methodology followed for collecting data and conducting the present study will be summing-up. Then, general conclusion about the findings of the study will be presented, finally, recommendations concerning university students.

5.1 Conclusions

This research was conducted to gain more insights in the students' use of cohesive devices ingeneral and cohesion and thematic progression in particular and to focus on the use of grammaticalcohesive devices to strength students' writing from a discourse viewpoint. In this research,students are not taught cohesion and thematic progression, they are asked to write an essay where it issupposed to be cohesive in the use of the different types of cohesion and thematic progression.

The conclusion we got from the analysis of the students' test was that students use quiteenough cohesion and thematic progression in their writing. It seems that the inappropriate use of cohesion and thematic progression is concerned with some of them as conjunctions which are mostcommonly used. This can be due to the overuse of some types of conjunctions. For that, theconclusion we draw from this research is that when students use appropriate devices they willachieve cohesive discourse; however, the overuse of some grammatical cohesive devicesembed the use of other devices and make some of them inappropriate.

The present study investigated the outcome of the research when students write essays. Word choice, omission, and redundancy were some of lexical errors and grammatical cohesive devices made by university students. Most of data obtained from the essay showed the existence of word choice, omission, and redundancy errors.

University students' errors have negative effect on their written performance. It was found that most of the students' errors have negative effect on the students, tests.

Future studies may replicate the study in other ways and involve a large sample. As we haveseen in the theoretical part, a cohesive discourse cannot be conducted by using only grammatical cohesion because it is clear that using lexical cohesion and thematic progression has a great role in effective written performance.

5.2 Recommendations

In the light of the findings and general conclusion of the present study, the researcher would like to forward the following recommendations:

1- More systematic assignments on the use of the right word within the context should be applied and practiced by the university students. Moreover, a systematic written test should also be adopted immediately and gradually (first year and second years, then proceed to the third year).

2- University students should encourage practicing writing, regardless of difficulties that may be encountered. Putting such test into practice would help in facing up the grammatical cohesive devices and thematic progression errors difficulties. As more brainstorming and correction of errors, the more production of free -error lexical sentences will be achieved.

3- The impact of the mother tongue language on the written performance are clearly noticed in the essay test done by university students. Hence, applying group work as a teaching technique is likely to result in the production of a good performance in students writing. Students, when working in small groups, create an intimate atmosphere; where they could share ideas, exchange information, encourage each other and above all learn from each other error since each student provides at least a positive contribution. All these factors may enhance students thinking, better performance and achievements.

4- Instructors alwaysneed to revised and evaluate the students written work and 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- English syllabus designers should give a considerable attention to the cohesion and thematic progression in the syllabus.

6- **T**he errors made by the university students proved that the standard of the university level is worsening and it is known that most of teachers are abroad outside. Here, the researcher voices out a call to be adopted by the government to encourage creative and experienced expatiates in all sectors and in the educational sector in particular, to be back to Sudan. Such a call will pay back, if accompanied by real incentives.

5.3 *Suggestions for Further studies*

This study attempted to investigate the role of cohesion and thematic progression on the quality of EFL written performance. Thus further research and more investigation should be made in this area. The researcher suggests that, this kind of study should be applied on graduate students. Nearly all the previous studies had been done at 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 make 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 aren't majoring.

References

- Allen, J.P.B &Corder, S.Pit.(1974). Papers in Applied Linguistics.(Volume 2). Oxford: University Press.

- Austin, J.L. (1962) How to do things with words oxford: Clarendon press.

- 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.

- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). Discourse Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Cook, G. (1989). Discourse. Oxford: University Press.

- Coulthard, M. (1977). An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. Longman Group Ltd.

- Davidse, K. (1987). M.A.K. Halliday's functional grammar and the Prague School. In R. Dirven & V. Fried (Eds.), *Functionalism in linguistics* (pp. 39-79). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Fine, J. (ed). (1988). The Place of Discourse in Second language study, in Second Language.

- Fries, P. H. (1992). Theme and new in written English. Retrieved from http:// Google/Functional Approach/ Section 17.htm.

- Ghadessy, M. (1995). Thematic development and its relationship to registers and genres. In M. Ghadessy (Eds.), *thematic development in English text* (pp. 129–146). London: Pinter.

- Gosden, H. (1992). Discourse functions of marked theme in scientific research articles. *Journal of English for Specific Purpose*s, 11, 207-224.

- Grice, H.P. (1975) Logic and Conversation, in (eds.) P. Cole &J. Morgan Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts New York: Academic Press.

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

- Halliday, M.A.K & Hassan, R. (1976).Cohesion in English.Longman.

- Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). An introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Edward Arnold.

- Halliday,M.A.K.(1994).Introduction to Functional Grammar (2nd Eds).London: Arnold.

- Halliday, M. A. k. , & Matthiessen, C. (1997). Systemic functional grammar: A first step into the theory. Retrieved from: http://SFG intro (peng chapter) New.htm.

- Hymes D. (1964) Toward ethnographics of communicative events, in (ed.) P.P Giglioli.

- Hoey, Michael. 1983. *on the Surface of Discourse*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

- Hoey, Michael. 1991. *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Harmer, J. (2004).How to Teach Writing. Pearson Educated Limited.

- Kennedy, G. (2003). Structure and Meaning in English. Pearson Educated Limited.

- McCarthy, M. (1991). Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers. Cambridge University Press.

- Martin, J. R. , & Rose, D. (2007). *Gener relations: Mapping culture.* London: Equinox.

- Matthiessen, C. (2004). Descriptive motifs and generalizations. In A. Caffarel. ,J. R. Martin. , & C. Matthiessen (Eds.), *Language functional perspective* (pp. 537-673). Amsterdam: John
- Benjamins.
- McCabe, A. M. (1999). Theme and thematic patterns in Spanish and English history texts. Retrieved from: http: // www. wagsoft.com/systemics/archive/McCabe.phd.
- Markels, Robin Bell. 1984. A New Perspective on Cohesion in Expository University Press Paragraphs.
- Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois.
- Nunan, D. (1993). Introducing Discourse Analysis. London: Penguim.
- Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford: University Press.
- Language in India www.Language in India.com / 12:4 April 2021
- SeydFoadEbrahimi and Mohsen Khedri
- The Importance of Thematic structure in students, writing cohesion 67.
- Lautamatti. (1978) some observation on cohesion and coherence in simplified texts (Eric Document Reproduction service No. ED, 275191).
- Ping, A. L. (2000). The inference-boundary model: Reinterpreting theme and rheme. *Language Sciences*, 22, 1-26.
- Simensen, Aud Marit. 2007. *Teaching a Foreign Language*. 2nd ed. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Sinclair, J.MCH.& Coulthard, R.M. (1975) Towards an Analysis of Discourse oxford University Press.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1972). Some Aspects of Text Grammar. The Hague: Mouton.

- Widdowson, H.G. (2007). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: University Press.
- English Discourse Analysis: An introduction
- Rachel Whittaker(Grp 41) Mick O'Donnell, Laura Hidalgo(Grp 46). March 2011.
- https://en.Wikipedia.org/wiki/cohesion (linguistics).

Appendixes

Appendix (A)

Sudan University of Science & Technology

Post graduate studies

Linguistics department

Level: Three

Times: an hour &half

Marks: 100

Name: …………………………………………………………

Research Test

Dear students, you are kindly requested to write a well-organized essay

1. The importance

2. The telephonewasanimportant invention.

3. Write an essay in your **own** choice.

Title topic ………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

Appendix (B)

Questionnaire

(For University Teachers of English Language)

Dear colleagues,

This questionnaire is one of the tools for MA research work entitled (Investigating the Role of Cohesion and Thematic progression on the quality of EFL written performance) at the College of Languages, Sudan University of Science and Technology. The researcher attempts to investigate the Role of Cohesion and Thematic progression on the quality of EFL students, written performance. You are kindly requested to cooperate by answering the questions or responding to the given statements.

Dear colleague, please put (√) in the appropriate place. providing your appropriate response, will undoubtedly help the researcher arrive at this required aims.

No	Statement	Strongly Agree	agree	undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	EFL students, written performance shows poor awareness in terms of cohesion by reference.					
2	EFL students, written performance shows poor awareness in terms of cohesion by substitution.					
3	EFL students, written performance reflects poor awareness in terms of cohesion by ellipsis.					
4	EFL students, written performance reflects poor awareness in terms of cohesion by conjunctions.					

5	Sudanese EFL students, written performance reflects poor awareness in terms of lexical cohesion.					
6	The written performance of the EFL students shows poor awareness of antonyms.					
7	The written performance of the EFL students reflects poor awareness of synonymy.					
8	The written performance of the EFL students shows poor awareness of hyponymy.					
9	EFL students, written performance shows little knowledge of the thematic progression category; named the topical theme.					
10	The written performance of the EFL students reflects little knowledge of the thematic progression category; namely interpersonal theme.					
11	EFL students, written performance shows little knowledge of the thematic progression category; named textual theme.					
12	The written performance of the EFL students reflects poor awareness of single theme/rheme sentences.					