

TEXTUAL COHESION
AN ANALYSIS OF ESL STUDENTS' ORAL NARRATIVES

by

ELIZABETH NORAH WEST
B.A., University of Victoria, 1980
Diploma in Applied Linguistics, University of Victoria,
1981.

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

ACCEPTED

in the Department
of
Linguistics

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

Dr. John Esling

Dr. Barbara Harris

Dr. Norma Mickelson

Dr. Robert Armstrong

© ELIZABETH NORAH WEST 1985

University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in
whole or in part, by mimeographic or other means, without
the permission of the author.

P53
W48

Supervisor: Dr. John Esling

ABSTRACT

A growing body of linguistic research, in the study of both first and second language, examines language beyond the sentence and focuses instead on discourse or text, either oral or written, as the unit of analysis. Textual cohesion, the semantic relations between sentences, provides some of the resources that a speaker or writer draws upon when constructing a text. These devices, termed cohesive ties, include reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion.

Drawing on the research in both first and second language cohesion studies, this research reports the use of cohesive devices by adult English as a Second Language (ESL) students. The questions addressed are (1) What cohesive devices do these subjects use to maintain the flow of spoken discourse? (2) What, if any, is the difference among the levels of proficiency? (3) What problems arise?

In order to address these three questions, oral narratives from twenty-eight Quebecois students in the summer English Language Program at the University of Victoria were elicited and analyzed for cohesive devices.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
Chapter 1: Aspects of Discourse	1
1.1. Introduction	1
1.2. General Overview	2
1.3. Statement of Purpose	5
Chapter 2: Approaches to Cohesion	6
2.1. Halliday and Hasan's Model	6
2.2. Other Models	11
2.3. Cohesion in Context	15
2.4. Cohesion and Coherence	17
2.5. Cohesion Studies	23
Chapter 3: Background to the Present Study	27
3.1. Subjects	27
3.1.2. Selection	28
3.2. Method	28
3.2.1. The Film	28
3.3. Procedure	31
3.4. Analysis	31
Chapter 4: Results and Discussion	39
4.1. Reference	39
4.1.1. Pronominals	42

	PAGE
4.1.2. Demonstratives and Definite Article	46
4.1.3. Extended Reference	52
4.1.4. Comparative Reference	57
4.1.5. Repairs	60
4.1.6. Reference Problems	65
4.1.7. Summary of Reference	68
4.2. Substitution	71
4.3. Ellipsis	73
4.3.1. Substitution and Ellipsis	73
4.4. Conjunction	77
4.4.1. Additive Conjunction	82
4.4.2 Adversative Conjunction	86
4.4.3. Causal Conjunction	89
4.4.4. Temporal Conjunction	91
4.4.5. Summary of Conjunction	96
4.5. Lexical Cohesion: Reiteration	97
4.5.1. Summary of Lexical Cohesion	105
Chapter 5: Conclusions	106
References	113
Appendix: Narratives	118

LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
Table 1. Use of Reference: Percentage of Use to Total Number of Sentences per Level.	41
Table 2. Number and Percentage of Pronominals to the Total Number of Referents per Level.	42
Table 3. Z-Test for Difference Between Proportions ...	43
Table 4. Number and Percentage of Demonstratives and Definite Article to the Total Number of Referents per Level.	49
Table 5. Z-Test for Difference Between Proportions. ..	50
Table 6. Number and Percentage of Comparative Reference to the Total Number of Referents per Level.	57
Table 7. Repairs: Number of Repairs and Percentage of Reference Repairs per Level.	62
Table 8. Instances of No Presupposed Item per Level.	66
Table 9. Conjunction: Number and Percentage to Number of Sentences per Level.	81

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. John Esling for his help and guidance throughout the writing of this thesis. My appreciation goes also to my two other committee members, Dr. Barbara Harris and Dr. Norma Mickelson, for their helpful suggestions and comments. Also, I extend my gratitude to my husband, Thom, for his encouragement, support and many hours of help.

Chapter 1

ASPECTS OF DISCOURSE

1.1. INTRODUCTION

There is a growing body of research in the study of second language acquisition (SLA) which focuses on discourse as its area of analysis. Much of this research draws on the findings of first language discourse research. Some of this first language research includes conversational analysis in which the researchers attempt to isolate the rules used in conversation and analyze the function of certain speech events. Others investigate how context influences structure (Celce-Murcia, 1983). Still others, such as Downing (1980), Tannen (1980) and Clancy (1980) use natural speech data to analyze the choices people use in narratives.

This study attempts to determine choices in narratives made by adults learning English as a second language. The analysis involves the cohesive devices these students use to connect text. Textual cohesion, describing the semantic relations within texts, is one of the resources available to speakers for text construction. The cohesive devices that comprise textual cohesion are: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion.

1.2 GENERAL OVERVIEW

In the last decade, many researchers of both first and second languages have recognized the necessity to analyse language beyond the sentence. That is, it is not enough to look simply at the syntax of sentences in isolation since they form part of a larger unit. Discourse analysis is that field of study which uses spoken or written text as the unit of analysis, and which covers a wide range of areas, including narrative analysis.

The research in first language discourse has demonstrated that people draw on rules and conventions; discourse is rule-governed and speakers recognize the constraints. Researchers analyzing text, as in narratives, have found, too, that people draw on rules to organize their text.

Tannen (1982) notes that narrative has been a common topic of study; it is comparatively easy to elicit and says Tannen, many people like to tell stories. Also, Tannen (1982:5) remarks, "For the purpose of comparing multiple versions of a text, or texts produced by different people about the same material, narratives are again particularly apt." Labov and Waletzky's (1968) study is perhaps the first to deal with the personal non-literary narrative. One current large-scale cross-cultural study is that of Chafe (1980), known as the Pear Film Project. The Pear Film is a

film with no dialogue that has the picking of pears as its subject. It has been shown to people of at least ten different languages in their respective countries, and narratives have been elicited. Researchers involved in this project have looked at different aspects of narratives. Chafe (1980:13) looks particularly at consciousness expressed in a spurt of language he calls an "idea unit." Using the same film, Clancy (1980) analyzes referential choices made by the English and Japanese narrators. Dubois (1980), again using the Pear Film, examines how narrators first introduce people and objects into a narrative and how they are subsequently traced through that narrative.

The analysis of narratives is productive in first language research and is proving to be so in second language research (L2) as well. In L2 research, narratives are used as a means of finding out what second language learners do in discourse. Godfrey (1980), for example, uses narratives based on a film to examine ESL students' use of tense, finding that learners' errors do not necessarily decrease with increased proficiency. This results from a variety of sources such as avoidance, attention limitations, types of topic continuity established, and relative difficulty of maintaining continuity (1980:109). Faerch (1979,1982) uses ESL

narratives of films as part of a large-scale project investigating interlanguage communication.

One productive area of narrative research is textual analysis focusing on cohesion. Textual cohesion, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976), provides the resources that speakers use to connect text. Others such as van Dijk (1977) and de Beaugrande (1980) have also dealt with textual cohesion although from a slightly different perspective. Nevertheless, it is agreed that speakers draw on these conventional devices which contribute to the unity of a text and, in de Beaugrande's terms, promote efficiency. Halliday and Hasan (1976) list five types of cohesion: reference (either anaphoric or cataphoric), substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. While native speakers draw on these devices readily, non-native speakers do not. Stimmer (1981 cited in Faerch and Kasper, 1981:45), for example, has shown that learners "have problems in using appropriate cohesive devices when responding to their interlocutor's preceding act." Larsen-Freeman and Celce-Murcia (1983) also note that ESL students have real problems using certain cohesive devices. It is therefore important to look at just what ESL students do when they attempt to connect text.

Keller-Cohen (1979:256) underlines the importance of studying cohesion. She maintains that, " cohesion is an

important phenomenon to examine in the acquisition of language since it allows us to see how a child learns not only to make his speech relevant to the context, in general, but to the linguistic context of other speakers in particular." While Keller-Cohen refers to children learning English as a second language, her statement can also be applied to adults learning English.

1.3. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The purpose of the present study is threefold. First, an attempt is made to see how ESL students maintain the flow of discourse with cohesive ties. Second, an attempt is made to see if and what sort of developmental trends are involved in using cohesive devices to connect text. For the five categories cited by Halliday and Hasan, a description of how these devices are used will be offered. Finally, a consideration of problems in the use of cohesive devices will be undertaken. To study these three issues, narratives from twenty-eight Francophones at seven levels of English proficiency were elicited. These subjects were enrolled in the summer English Language Program at the University of Victoria, 1984. Generally they all had the same background; they were young adults enrolled in universities in Quebec. A full explanation of the study will be provided in Chapter 3.

Chapter 2

APPROACHES TO COHESION

2.1. HALLIDAY AND HASAN'S MODEL

With the relatively recent development of text linguistics, certain linguists have been concerned with stating formally what actually constitutes a text. One area of this endeavor is that of textual cohesion. There are a number of linguists addressing the issue but Halliday and Hasan (1976) were the first to deal with textual cohesion in a comprehensive fashion.

Halliday and Hasan (1976:1) "attempt to identify the properties of texts in English and what it is that distinguishes a text from a disconnected sequence of sentences". They use the notion of texture to express the property of 'being a text'. They say, " a text has texture, and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text. It derives this texture from the fact that it functions as a unity with respect to the environment"(1976:2). In Cohesion in English, Halliday and Hasan investigate the resources that English has for creating texture and state that there will be certain linguistic features present in any given passage which contribute to its total unity. This texture is provided by cohesive relations, termed cohesive ties. According to

Halliday and Hasan (1976:4), "the concept of a tie makes it possible to analyze a text in terms of its cohesive properties, and give a systematic account of its pattern of texture." They say further that the concept of cohesion is semantic; it refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as a text" (1976:4). They claim that cohesion occurs in a text when (1976:4):

the INTERPRETATION of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one PRE-SUPPOSES the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed are thereby at least potentially integrated into a text.

Halliday and Hasan identify the place of cohesion within the linguistic system. They note that the three major functional-semantic components are the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual. The ideational component, that which is concerned with the expression of content, has two parts, the experiential and the logical. The experiential is "more directly concerned with the representation of experience" while the logical "expresses the abstract logical relations which derive only indirectly from experience" (1976:26). The interpersonal component is concerned with the social, expressive and conative functions of language" (1976:26-7). According to Halliday

and Hasan the ideational component represents the speaker in his role as intruder. The textual component comprises the resources that language has for creating text. The textual component includes such things as rank within the grammar. For example, the speaker or writer organizes the clause as a message which Halliday (1967) refers to as the theme. However, the textual component also incorporates patterns of meaning outside the hierarchical organization of the system. An example of this is the information structure which is the ordering of the text into units of information on the basis of the given-new distinction-- in other words, the information the speaker is treating as recoverable or given as opposed to what he is treating as non-recoverable or new.

The remaining part of the textual component is concerned with cohesion. Halliday and Hasan point out that cohesion is closely related to the information structure but claim that unlike the information structure, cohesion is non-structural because it refers to relationships between sentences. They maintain that since everything in the text has some status in the 'given-new' framework, the information structure is a form of structure. Cohesion, however, is a "potential for relating one element in the text to another, wherever they are and without any implication that everything in the text has some part in

it" (1976:27). Cohesion provides the means whereby elements that are structurally unrelated to one another are linked together in that they are dependent on one another for their interpretation. A simplified outline of the system of cohesive ties Halliday and Hasan describe contains the following elements

1. reference
 - personal
 - demonstrative
 - comparative
 } anaphoric or
 } cataphoric
2. substitution
 - nominal
 - verbal
 - clausal
3. ellipsis
4. conjunction
 - additive (the and type)
 - adversative (the but type)
 - causal (the so type)
 - temporal (the then type)
5. lexical cohesion
 - collocation
 - reiteration - repetition
 - synonym
 - superordinate
 - general noun

The following written text provides examples of all five elements of textual cohesion and shows both intersentence and intrasentence cohesion:

The great aqueducts built by the Romans(1) were originally designed to transport water(5) from one

place(3) to another(3). However(4), it took them(1) several centuries to realize that some of the water(5), when allowed to fall from the height of an aqueduct, could be used to power a corn-mill. Such a use(2) of the aqueduct was to have an even greater impact on history than the original one(2). (from Williams, 1983: 37).

Example 1, the Romans - them illustrates personal anaphoric reference. Example 2, a use - one indicates substitution, in this case nominal substitution. Example 3, one place - another, is an example of nominal ellipsis, that is the word place is not repeated after another. Example 4, however, coheres with the preceding sentence. However is an adversative and so signals a change of direction in the text. Example 5, Water - water is a case of lexical cohesion, in this instance repetition.

Register

The notion of register has an important place in Halliday and Hasan's model of textual cohesion. The context of situation, and furthermore context of culture must be taken into account. Halliday and Hasan (1976:23) maintain that if a "passage hangs together as a text, it will display a consistency of register." A text then is a passage of discourse which is coherent both with regard to register and cohesion. They claim (1976:23):

A text, is coherent with respect to the context of situation, and therefore consistent in register; and

it is coherent with respect to itself, and therefore cohesive. Neither of these two conditions is sufficient without the other, nor does the one by necessity entail the other. Just as one can construct passages which seem to hang together in the situational-semantic sense, but fail as texts because they lack cohesion, so also one can construct passages which are beautifully cohesive but which fail as texts because they lack consistency of register - there is no continuity of meaning in relation to the situation. The hearer, or reader, reacts to both of these things in his judgement of texture.

2.2. OTHER MODELS

While Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model of textual cohesion is the most comprehensive, there are some powerful models which have a slightly different perspective. These alternative perspectives aid in understanding textual cohesion because their explanatory power rests with the notion that the speaker has strategies for communicating the message. Van Dijk (1977), de Beaugrande (1980), and de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) look at textual cohesion from a cognitive point of view. Halliday and Hasan provide a linguistic analysis of cohesion whereas these other researchers look at cohesion from a psycholinguistic perspective, viewing textual cohesion as the means speakers have for making a message more economical.

De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) maintain that continuity is based on the supposition that certain occurrences in the text and its "situation of utilization" are related to each other. In cognitive terms, then, each

occurrence is instrumental in accessing at least some other occurrences. In order to access these occurrences an organizational pattern must be imposed upon the surface text; syntax imposes this needed organization. Incorporated into this model is the notion of memory. Because one cannot hold a great deal in memory, syntax is the "ancillary organizational system." Thus syntax reflects the cognitive factors in that it indicates grammatical dependencies. The usual units, phrases, clauses and sentences can all be utilized in a short span of time and processing resources. However, for larger units, such as a length of text, it is necessary to have devices for showing how already used structures and patterns can be "re-used, modified or compacted" (1981:48) According to de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981:48), these devices "contribute to the stability and economy with respect to both materials and processing effort."

De Beaugrande(1980:132) maintains that throughout a text one must constantly manage blocks of knowledge which are not always relevant at a particular moment. Because the volume of this knowledge is so great much of it is not made explicit in a given statement. So a language must provide options for "compacting the surface expression without damaging the connectivity of underlying knowledge." The outcome, according to de Beaugrande, is

that these sets of options indicate the portion of active knowledge which is to be presently expanded or modified. These options are important contributions to the efficiency or textuality of a passage. Processing the largest amounts with the smallest expenditure of resources is what contributes to this efficiency and this is how de Beaugrande determines the criteria for textual cohesion. Generally his cohesive devices are the same as Halliday and Hasan's. They are as follows (1980:133-134):

1. Recurrence is the actual repetition of expressions. The repeated elements may have the same, different or overlapping reference, and the extent of conceptual content they can be used to activate varies accordingly.

2. Definiteness is the extent to which the text-world entity for an expression at a given point is assumed to be identifiable and recoverable, as opposed to being introduced just then.

3. Co-reference is the application of different surface expressions to the same entity in a textual world.

4. Anaphora is the type of co-reference where a

lexical expression is later followed by a pro-form (e.g. pronoun) in the surface text.

5. Exophora is the application of a pro-form to an entity not expressed in the text at all, but identifiable in the situational context.

6. Ellipsis is the omission of surface expressions whose conceptual content is nonetheless carried forward and expanded or modified by means of noticeably incomplete expressions.

7. Junction subsumes the devices for connecting surface sequences together in such a way that the relations between blocks of conceptual text world knowledge are signalled, such as: addition, alternativity, contrast and causality.

According to de Beaugrande (1980:134), these devices contribute to efficiency in a number of ways. First the surface expression is compacted. Second, surface elements are omitted. Third, materials to be expanded, developed, modified or repudiated are carried forward. Fourth, that which is already known or is unique is signalled. Finally, there is a manageable balance between repetition and variation in surface structure; this is required by the

considerations of informativity.

2.3. COHESION IN CONTEXT

Within current text linguistics cohesion is an important consideration, but it is just one of a number of considerations that must be taken into account when considering a text. According to de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) and de Beaugrande (1980), a text is defined as a communicative occurrence which must meet certain standards of textuality. If any of these criteria are not met, the text is rendered non-communicative and hence is not a text. The standards are (de Beaugrande, 1980:19-20; de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981:3-11):

1. The first standard is cohesion where cohesive devices signal relationships among surface elements within a text.

2. The second standard is coherence which utilizes people's stored knowledge of the world. It refers to the ways in which the arrangement of concepts and relations which underlie the surface text are mutually accessible and relevant. De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981:4) define a concept as "a configuration of knowledge (cognitive content) which can be recovered or activated with more or less unity and consistency in the mind.". Relations form the links between concepts. De Beaugrande and Dressler

illustrate this relationship with the example children at play. Children is an object concept and play an action concept. Since the children are the agents of the action, the relation agent-of exists. There are a number of coherence relations (de Beaugrande, 1980; de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981; Brown and Yule, 1983). However, it is beyond the bounds of this thesis to look at them. Nevertheless, one important point concerning coherence should be stressed. Coherence is the outcome of cognitive processes among text users and is not simply a feature of texts.

3. Intentionality concerns the text producer's attitude towards the text with respect to producing both a cohesive and coherent text. Unlike cohesion and coherence which are both text-centered, intentionality is user-centered.

4. Acceptability refers to the text receiver's attitude to the text, that is that the text is both coherent and cohesive. The receiver's attitude is responsive to such things as text type, social or cultural setting, and the desirability of goals.

5. Informativity "concerns the extent to which the occurrences of that presented are expected vs. unexpected or known vs. unknown/certain" (1981:8-9). The less expectations are met, the greater the informativity.

6. Situationality refers to those factors which make a

text relevant to a situation of occurrence.

7. The final standard of textuality is called intertextuality. This deals with the elements which make the utilization of one text dependent on that of another text.

These seven standards of textuality function as constitutive principles (Searle, 1969, cited in de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981) of textual communication. They "define and create the form of behavior identifiable as textual communicating, and if they are defied, that form of behavior will break down" (1981:11). Again following Searle (1969), de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) use the notion of regulative principles which are used to control textual communication. According to de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) there are three regulative principles. The efficiency of a text is the principle that ensures that the participants use a minimum expenditure of effort. The effectiveness of the text depends upon it leaving a strong impression and creating favorable conditions for attaining a goal. Finally, the appropriateness of a text is "the agreement between its setting and the ways in which the standards of textuality are upheld" (1981:11).

2.4. COHESION AND COHERENCE

While Halliday and Hasan's (1976) analysis of cohesion

is comprehensive and extremely useful, there has been some criticism of it. These criticisms stem from issues in reading research, but they are also relevant to spoken narrative. The present thesis will demonstrate that it is essential to analyse cohesion within a framework that takes these criticisms into account.

According to current reading research, comprehension can be impeded by both a language deficit or inappropriate or lacking schemata, that is, world knowledge. Proponents of this interactive view of reading are critical of Halliday and Hasan's treatment of cohesion. Their contention is that Halliday and Hasan treat cohesion as a linguistic property contributing to the coherence of a passage and, according to these theorists, this is fundamentally misguided. To quote de Beaugrande (1981:84) again on coherence:

A text "makes sense" because there is a CONTINUITY OF SENSES among the knowledge activated by the expressions of the text (cf. Hornmann 1976). A "senseless" or "non-sensical" text is one in which text receivers can discover no such continuity, usually because there is a serious mismatch between the configuration of concepts and relations expressed and the receivers' prior knowledge of the world. We could define this continuity of senses as the foundation of COHERENCE .

That cohesion creates texture or coherence is what some researchers criticize. They claim that texture (or coherence) is not created by cohesion. Carrell (1982:482),

argues, for example, that "Halliday and Hasan's main point seems to be that mere coherence of content is insufficient to make a text coherent; rather, that there must be some additional linguistic property, such as cohesive ties, that contribute to the coherence of a text." According to these researchers, cohesion is not an index of coherence (or texture); it is rather the effect of coherence. For example, Carrell (1982:486) argues that if a reader does not have the appropriate schema underlying a text, "all the cohesive devices in the world will not help that text cohere for the reader." Morgan and Sellner (1980:180) use Halliday and Hasan's first example of cohesion to criticize the concept that cohesion is necessary for texture.

Wash and core six cooking apples.
Put them into a fireproof dish.

According to Halliday and Hasan, the anaphoric function of them gives texture to the text. However, Morgan and Sellner claim that it is not merely knowledge of language that enables one to see that them refers to six cooking apples. They say (1980:180):

What forces the conclusion them, in fact, is intended to refer to the apples and not, say, to the author's children? It is not knowledge of language that supplies this conclusion. It is our knowledge of cooking and of the author's purpose, our ability to reason, and the assumption that the recipe is coherent ... It is because we assume the text is coherent that we infer that them is intended to refer to the apples.

A further criticism of the recipe example is that the model formulated by Halliday and Hasan does not take into account the change of state. As Brown and Yule (1983:201) point out, in the first sentence, the apples were pristine, "straight from the supermarket", but in the second sentence, their description has changed. They are "washed and cored." Brown and Yule (1983) and Morgan and Sellner (1980) both maintain, then, that the substitution model of co-reference is too simplistic.

The instance of the red apples that Morgan and Sellner draw on is not the only example illustrating that cohesion is not an indicator of coherence. There are many types of examples to illustrate this in the other types of cohesion. For example, Enkvist (1978, cited in Brown and Yule, 1983: 197) provides an example in which he shows that lexical collocation in a passage does not make an already incoherent passage coherent. For example, the following two sentences are obviously incoherent although words are used in collocation:

I bought a Ford. A car in which President Wilson rode down the Champs Elysees was black. ... (Enkvist, 1978, cited in Brown and Yule, 1983).

Another problem stems from how one perceives reference. Again this criticism stems from Brown and Yule (1983:200). They quote Halliday and Hasan (1976:52):

Note, finally that it is characteristic of 3rd person forms that they may be cumulatively anaphoric. One occurrence of John at the beginning of a text may be followed by an indefinitely large number of occurrences of he, him or his all to be interpreted by reference to the original John. This phenomenon contributes very markedly to the internal cohesion of a text, since it creates a kind of network of lines of reference, each occurrence being linked to all its predecessors up to and including the initial reference.

With the perspective presented by Halliday and Hasan, Brown and Yule consider the position of the listener. They claim that if one were to describe to a friend the odd behavior of a person he met with a long series of events always referring to this person subsequently as he, it is unlikely and unnecessary for comprehending the story that one remember the original exact referent. They claim that it is more likely that the "processor establishes a referent in his mental representation, rather than to the original verbal expression in the text" (1983:200-201). This, then, according to Brown and Yule, calls into question Halliday and Hasan's distinction between endophoric, within text, and exophoric, context of situation, reference. In each case the processor is drawing on his mental representation of the world: in the case of exophoric reference the mental representation of what is in the world and in the case of endophoric reference what is in the discourse created world.

While there have been many criticisms of Halliday and

Hasan's formulation of textual cohesion recently, it is to some degree unfair to be critical of their entire formulation since it provides insights into the resources that people draw on to create text. Also, Halliday and Hasan (1976:54) recognize that, regardless of the cohesive devices used and regardless of the text's coherence, hearers will go "to enormous lengths to interpret it as complete and intelligible." They say further, "this is an aspect of the very general human tendency to assume in the other person an intention to communicate" (1976:54). Nevertheless, Tierney and Mosenthal (1983:4) ask:

Is cohesion analysis simply what Halliday and Hasan claim it to be, a type of linguistic description of text, or have they invited readers to assume that their linguistic description will serve as a psychological model of comprehension complete with predictive power?

As a cautionary note it is worthwhile to quote Tierney and Mosenthal (1983:7-8) further:

As linguistic description, cohesion analysis cannot presume to determine a text's coherence; rather it must assume coherence and then describe the linguistic, cohesive consequences of this coherence.

It is from this perspective that the present study regards textual cohesion.

These examples provide an illustration of the criticisms levelled at Halliday and Hasan's treatment of

cohesion. Many others have also been critical (Steffensen, 1981; Freebody and Anderson, 1981; Carrell, 1983). While all these criticisms are well-founded, they do not undermine the study of textual cohesion. What they do provide is a warning not to consider cohesion as the answer to textuality. This is clearly not the case and so textual cohesion must be placed within a broader framework. The framework that de Beaugrande provides (outlined above) puts textual cohesion within an appropriate context.

2.5 COHESION STUDIES

Typically cohesion studies have considered both production and comprehension primarily within the written mode; production involves writing and comprehension reading. In first language studies of both writing (Perfetti and McCatchen, 1982) and reading (Stoodt, 1972; Garrod and Sanford, 1977; Richek, 1977; Chapman and Stokes, 1980), there is evidence of developmental trends in both use and understanding of cohesive devices.

In second language studies there is some evidence that by not recognizing cohesive ties, comprehension is impeded. Cohen et al., (1979) discovered that advanced ESL students were not using conjunctive words to signal relationships between sentences, even the most simple ones

such as however and thus. Connor (1984, cited in Carrell, 1984) found that advanced ESL writers do not use the variety of cohesive devices that native speakers do.

While there is a fairly substantial body of work analyzing production and comprehension of cohesion in the written mode, there is relatively little of the spoken language. Nevertheless there has been some. Halliday (1979), for example, traces the development of texture in child language. The cohesive devices he comments on are reference, substitution and ellipsis. Keller-Cohen (1979) looks specifically at the development of lexical cohesion in the conversation of children learning English as a second language.

There has been even less investigation of the cohesion creating devices of second language adults in the process of acquiring the language. One study, by Sunday (1982), considers a selected group of advanced, Spanish L1 ESL junior high school students. She reports (1982:2):

We know that at this higher level of learning, the student is expected to communicate academic material through spoken and written text. In other words, the secondary student needs to be able to produce full explanations in areas such as the social sciences and the physical sciences. No description of how this group was performing at the explanatory textual level was available in the literature when this writer began a search some three years ago.

In order to gain information in this area, Sunday had her

subjects perform both an oral and a written task. She then determined how these subjects create cohesion and where problem areas lie.

The oral task involved giving directions in English; the students were provided with a map, a starting point and a goal. This student describes how to get to the National Bank from the corner of City Limit Drive and Main Street:

Go to south on Main Street, and then you stop at fire station. Then go to the left. On Mason Street three corners, and then stop. And the bank will be on the left side (1982:21).

Sunday then analyses these directions for cohesion and discusses the problem areas. For example, sentence 4 causes real problems because the left side has no presupposition, causing a break in cohesion. The subject has left out part of the directions which would logically precede this sentence -- that one must turn right on Tucker Street. This break in cohesion results in incorrect information and, according to Sunday, creates a coherence problem.

Sunday (1982:26) maintains that by using the method of analysis described by Halliday and Hasan one can isolate errors and also determine the "cohesive strategies known and used correctly." She maintains that this method of analysis "provides a description of the integral network of

semantic parts which characterizes a textual unit and isolates breaks in the network as they may occur in the performances of second language learners" (1982:25).

In summary, Halliday (1979) analyzes the development of cohesion in a child's first language while Keller-Cohen (1977) looks specifically at one aspect of cohesion in the development of cohesion in a group of children learning English as a second language. Sunday (1982), on the other hand, studies the use of textual cohesion of a group of advanced ESL speakers. She does not look at the development of cohesion. This is a neglected area in the study of second language discourse.

Chapter 3

BACKGROUND TO THE PRESENT STUDY

To determine the types of textual cohesion ESL students employ in oral narratives, three questions are addressed: (1) How do these students maintain the flow of spoken discourse, i.e. what cohesive devices do they use? (2) What is the difference among the various levels of proficiency? (3) What problems arise?

3.1. SUBJECTS

The subjects were twenty-eight adult Quebecois ESL students enrolled in the summer English Language Program at the University of Victoria, 1984. With the exception of three subjects, the students were eighteen to twenty-one years old. There were two students who were twenty-eight and one who was forty. Generally the subjects were either Cegep students from the two year college system in Quebec, or in their first couple of years at university. A few students already had degrees. In general though, they were all of the same educational background; that is they were all post-secondary students. Although their background in English varied considerably, most had studied English in the Quebec school system for at least four years.

3.1.2 SELECTION

Four subjects, two male and two female, were randomly selected from each of seven proficiency levels in the English Language Program. There were one hundred and seventeen students in the program, and each level had sixteen students. Proficiency levels were determined on the basis of scores on the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency, a written test designed to determine L2 students' English proficiency. The narratives were elicited two weeks after the students had taken the test.

3.2. METHOD

The subjects were shown the short NFB film, A Sufi Tale. They were instructed to watch it carefully and then to recount it to the researcher who tape-recorded and transcribed each narrative.

3.2.1. THE FILM

A Sufi Tale is appropriate for the study for a number of reasons. First, the film has no dialogue and the story is accessible only through the actions of the characters. The inhabitants of a rural village are surprised one day to find a large unknown object growing in their fields. This unknown object, a watermelon, frightens the villagers. Two strangers arrive and both know the identity of the object.

The first visitor, because of his explanation techniques, only succeeds in scaring the people more; they chase him away from their village. The second visitor, however, is adept at explaining, showing and including the people in his demonstration of the watermelon, and so he succeeds in calming the people. This film demonstrates beautifully how two different approaches to the same problem create different responses and outcomes. The people's reaction to the unknown and the two different approaches to explain what is not understood are clear in this film. Because of this clarity, it was felt that the film should be relatively easy to relate to the researcher.

An analysis of the structure of the film reveals this order and clarity. This can be demonstrated by drawing on Stein and Nezworski's (1978) analysis of what they claim is an "ideal" story structure. Stein and Nezworski (1978) note that an ideal story has both a setting and an episode, although there can be more than one episode. A Sufi Tale can be explained exceptionally well within Stein and Nezworski's (1978:178-179) system of classification.

Setting: This involves the introduction of a protagonist and generally includes information about social, physical or temporal context pertaining to the development of the episode.

Episode: This includes:

1. an initiating event which marks a change in the story; its function is to evoke a response from the protagonist; this response is the internal response category;

2. an internal response which can include goals, affective states and cognition and finally serves to motivate a character's subsequent overt behavior;

3. an attempt, which includes actions which describe this overt behavior;

4. a consequence; the attempts result in the consequence which marks the attainment or nonattainment of the character's goal;

5. a reaction, which is the character's response to a consequence.

Although the setting and episodes contain no dialogue they are well-defined.

The setting is an agrarian, rural community and the protagonists the people of this community.

Episode 1

The initiating event is the first view the people have of the watermelon. It marks a change in the story since it is something the people have never seen before. This in turn evokes an internal response which is fear of the unknown. The attempt is manifested in the screaming of the villagers. This fear is further compounded by the arrival

of the first visitor who only succeeds in infuriating the people and consequently they throw him out of their village. They react by being angry.

Episode 2:

The second episode is initiated by the second visitor. The internal response indicates the people's curiosity towards this visitor who explains what the watermelon is in a patient manner. The attempt is manifested by the fact that the people try the watermelon and listen to this second visitor attentively. The consequence is that the people understand that the watermelon is a fruit, and so they need not fear it. Their reaction is that they have a sense of ease.

3.3. PROCEDURE

The subjects were instructed to tell the researcher what occurred in the film. The researcher did not interject with questions, but if the subject seemed hesitant or unsure, then the researcher would encourage the subject to continue by nodding her head. Although this point may seem trivial, it was important to the research because the intent was to elicit connected uninterrupted narrative discourse. All the narratives were tapé-recorded on cassette and later transcribed.

3.4. ANALYSIS

Each narrative was analysed for cohesive devices based on the system of Halliday and Hasan (1976). Their coding system includes the following elements.

1. Reference is coded as R and subcategorized as:

R1. Pronominals eg. he, her, it, they, them etc. (NB. These are further subcategorized according to number and gender)

R2. Demonstratives and definite article eg. this/these (near), that/those (far), the

R3. Comparatives eg. same, similar, different, as many (Comparatives are further subdivided according to identity, similarity, dissimilarity, comparison of quantity and comparison of quality).

2. Substitution is coded as S and subcategorized as:

S1. Nominal eg. one/ones, the same

S2. Verbal eg. do, be, have

S3. Clausal eg. so, not

3. Ellipsis is coded as E and subcategorized as:

E1. Nominal eg. Did you like the paintings? Some (of the paintings) were alright, but not all.

E2. Verbal eg. Have you been jogging? Yeah, I have (been jogging).

E3. Clausal eg. Everything o.k.?
 Yep, (everything's o.k.)

4. Conjunction is coded as C and subcategorized as:

C1. Additive eg. and , also, etc.

C2. Adversative eg. but, yet, though etc.

C3. Causal eg. so, because, etc.

C4. Temporal eg. then, next, before, after etc.

5. Lexical cohesion is coded as L and subcategorized as:

L1. same item - repetition of the presupposed item

L2. synonym or near synonym (includes hyponym)

L3. Superordinate eg. fruit = superordinate of watermelon

L4. 'General Item' eg. Didn't everyone make it clear they expected the professor to finish early today? - They did. But it seems to have made no impression on the man.

L5. Collocation - words within a semantic

environment. The present study omits this category in its analysis.

Each narrative was analysed using this system. Because the narratives are produced by second language speakers, they were also analysed for either missing or inappropriate cohesion. Pauses, housekeeping moves such as ..ehh.., and strings of repeated words have not been included in the analyzed versions (See the Appendix for the complete transcripts). However, all repairs have been included since, as will be explained later, they form part of the analysis.

The following is an example of an analyzed narrative.

Example of an analyzed narrative: Narrative 1 Level 1

<u>Sentence number</u>	<u>No. of ties</u>	<u>Text</u>	<u>Type of cohesive device</u>	<u>Presupposed item</u>
1.	0	First the sun wake up		
2.	2	And after the birds go up	C1 C4	- -
3.	0	I saw many people work for the crop		
4.	3	And they work long time	C1 R1 L1	many people
5.	3 1 repair	And after (the) a new fruit for them arrive	C1 C4 R2 (repair) R1	many people
6.	4	And (they don't) they didn't know what is the fruit	C1 R1 R2 L1	 many people a new fruit

7.	1 1 repair	And (the) a man very big and strong arrive	C1 R2 (repair)	
8.	3	And he cut the fruit with a big knife	C1 R1 R2 L1	a man a new fruit
9.	4	And all the people taste this fruit	C1 R2 R2 L1	many people a new fruit
10.	2	And after I don't know	C1 C4	
11.	2 1 repair	I think (he) the people didn't like this fruit	R1 (repair) R2 L2 R2 L2	many people a new fruit
12.	3	And after this big man left	C1 C4 L2	
13	2	And another man arrive	C1 R3	

14. 6 2repairs And C1
 (he) R1 (repair)
 this man R2 L2 another
 (show man
 us (no)) R1 (repair)
 show
 them R1 many p.
 this fruit R2 L2 a new
 and fruit
 the pepin
15. 5 And C1
 he R1 another
 said man
 them R1 people
 it's R1 fruit
 a
 very good
 fruit L1
16. 3 And C1
 you R1 people
 can
 to make
 (a rake)
 a crop
 with
 fruit L1
17. I
 don't
 know
 this word
18. 3 And C1
 after C4
 many people
 crop L1
19. 1 Many people
 put

 in
 the ground

Each narrative was analysed in this way. Halliday and Hasan do not include the entire narrative in their analyses but rather only the cohesive ties. However it is easier to see the relationships if the total narrative is used. In addition to the analysis of each narrative the total number of sentences per level was added and the total type of each cohesive device to see how frequent the use was. In addition, a Z-Test for the difference between proportions was done; if significant the results are included in the discussion. It is recognized that isolating "sentences" in oral language is somewhat artificial since people tend to talk in short "information spurts" (Chafe 1980). Nevertheless this method was followed simply for the sake of determining cohesive ties. An attempt was then made to see how these cohesive devices were used.

Repairs

Repairs were also taken into consideration because it was felt that the type of repair could shed light on textual cohesion. An analysis of repairs involving cohesive devices was undertaken and types of cohesive ties were itemized.

Chapter 4

Results and Discussion

4.1 REFERENCE

First Language Use

In English, as has been noted earlier, personal pronouns, demonstratives and comparatives characterize reference. These items are generally directives which indicate that information is to be retrieved from elsewhere and carried through the discourse. Illustrations of the three types of reference can be seen in the following examples from the narratives under study.

Personal: (1) I saw many people work for the crop.
And they work long time (Narr.1, L.1, S.3-4).

Demonstrative: (2) I remember a girl look in the
recolte and saw a melon
But she don't know what is that (Narr.5, L.2,
S.7-8).

Comparative: (3) A person come back near the melon
...
And after another persont come near of the same
melon (Narr.3, L.1, S.5-6).¹

In example (1), they refers to many people. In (2) that refers to the melon. However, a native speaker of English would be more likely to use the personal pronoun it. In example (3) another refers to a person. Each of these examples illustrates the function of each type of

reference.

Second Language Use

Results indicate that there is a developmental trend in the use of reference. This, however, is more marked with certain types of reference than with others. The use of pronominal reference increases as proficiency increases, particularly at Levels 6 and 7. As the use of pronominals increases, the use of the definite article decreases significantly. Comparative reference is not widely used; there is a slight, but insignificant decreasing trend. Repairs provide some interesting results. Although there is no decreasing or increasing trend in repairs across levels, the majority of them are referential. Also, the types of reference repairs at different levels are interesting. At the low levels, there is a tendency to replace a pronoun with a lexical noun, while at the higher levels the corrections generally concern number. There are other problems in addition to the correct use of reference. The most glaring ones are with the use of pronouns with no presupposed item and with number. These problems occur across levels with no decreasing trend. The following table illustrates the trends in referential usage. The percentages are calculated according to the number of sentences at each level. This was done to get a

rather gross estimate of how often the various types of referential items were used overall in relation to the number of sentences in the narratives. The starred section indicates incorrect use.

TABLE 1. Use of Reference: Percentage of Use to Total Number of Sentences per Level.

LEVELS		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SENT.		46	70	60	80	106	76	101
REFERENCE								
Pronom. #		16	44	29	54	62	86	102
%		39	63	48	68	59	113	101
Demon. #		26	28	29	47	68	15	19
%		57	40	48	59	64	19	19
Comp. #		4	9	5	7	5	4	6
%		9	13	8	9	5	5	6
*	#	5	12	11	13	14	16	8
	%	11	17	18	16	13	21	8

4.1.1. PRONOMINALS

Pronominals are extensively used and also indicate a sharp increase as proficiency increases. This increase is most marked at Levels 6 and 7. In fact, the use remains fairly constant from Levels 1-5. The following two tables illustrate this leap in pronoun use at the two highest levels. Table 2 indicates the number and percentage to the total number of referents used throughout the narratives. Table 3 illustrates the significance of these differences between proportions. The two stars of Table 3 represent relationships where $p < .01(2.58)$. Other differences are not significant.

TABLE 2. Number and Percentage of Pronominals to Total Number of Referents per Level.

LEVEL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
TOTAL REF	50	93	72	122	146	117	131
PRO #	16	44	29	54	62	86	102
%	32	47	40	44	42	74	78

TABLE 3. Z-Test for Difference Between Proportions.

LEVEL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1		1.77	.93	1.49	1.30	5.04**	5.79**
2			.90	.44	.74	3.88**	4.73**
3				.54	.31	4.54**	5.36**
4					.30	4.59**	5.49**
5						5.04**	5.98**
6							.80

** $p < .01$ (2.58)

There appears to be a number of reasons for the increase of pronominals at the two highest levels. First, there is a tendency at the lower levels to use reiteration rather than replace the item with a pronominal referent. It is possible to see this by comparing a narrative from Level 1 with one from Level 7:

(4) And ..ehh.. suddently a a melont is born
 And ..ehh.. a people. a person ..ehh.. come back
 near the melon and ..ehh.. cut with aggressivity the
 melont. (Narr.3, L.1, S.2-3)

(5) And someone dis discover something they had
 never see seen
 Umm.. it's a watermelon

And so . . . eh . . . someone come
 And probably it's a foreigner someone from outside
 who knows what it is
 And umm the person cuts the melon and start to eat
it (Narr.23, L.7, S.8-12)

Both examples (4) and (5) refer to the same episode in the film. While the first speaker uses melon repeatedly to refer to the same fruit, the second and more proficient speaker in two cases uses the neutral pronoun it to refer to the watermelon once it has been introduced into the discourse.

The use of reiteration at the lower levels corroborates Keller-Cohen's (1979) findings in the conversation of children learning English as a Second language. She found that repetition decreased as fluency increased. Connor (1984, cited in Carrell, 1984), in a study of advanced ESL learners' writing, found that ESL writers lack the variety of cohesive devices that native writers use, particularly in the use of lexical cohesion. ESL writers tend to overuse repetition. They do not use the variety of synonyms that the native speakers do. These results indicate that ESL students rely heavily on repetition both in writing and in speaking. Connor's study, however, has a different explanation than the present one. In Connor's study, for example, a native speaker used these lexical collocations in a composition on tests and testing situations: methods of measuring, a set

of questions, a satisfactory means of measuring a student's achievement, means of testing, gauge a student's mastery and administering examinations. A non-native speaker, on the other hand, demonstrated a limited use of synonyms and instead relied heavily on repetitions: tests, the tests, put scores, good scores, bad scores, tests (Connor, 1984 cited in Carrell, 1984:10). The use of repetition in Connor's study is attributed to general vocabulary deficiencies while the study under investigation demands a different explanation. That the subjects at lower levels tend to use repetition seems not necessarily to be a problem of vocabulary development but an insecurity with the pronominal system of English. This then brings in the notion of strategies in language use. As mentioned earlier, textual cohesion enables one to make a text more efficient by "processing the largest amounts with the smallest expenditure of resources" (de Beaugrande, 1980:132). Not only is the text rendered more efficient with the use of reference, but it also enables one to connect the second reference with the first thereby building up a textual world. Less proficient speakers do not have the means to make their texts more efficient, so in order to maintain coherence, they use repetition and it is this repetition that enables the hearer to connect references.

4.1.2. DEMONSTRATIVES AND THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

Demonstratives

First Language Use

Although it is not the purpose of this study to compare L1 and L2, there are some interesting observations which deserve mention. The use of this in the L2 narratives is really very much in keeping with what Halliday and Hasan (1976) say about the distribution of the and this in L1. The demonstrative this (and that ²) refers anaphorically to something that has been said before. Halliday and Hasan note that there is a tendency to use this to refer to something one has said oneself and that that is used to refer to something said by the interlocutor. This distinction is part of a broader issue governing the distribution of this-that -- the concept of distance. What the speaker has just mentioned is textually speaking near the speaker while that which he or she has not said is not near the speaker. Halliday and Hasan remark further that, in conversational narrative, there is a tendency to use this rather than that since it conveys a "sense of immediacy and also of solidarity with the hearer, of shared interest and attention" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:61).

If the demonstrative is used with a noun, the meaning is always identical with the presupposed item. This is

even true when the noun following the demonstrative is not identical with the presupposed item. A demonstrative without a noun following, that is used as a pronoun is very likely to refer to the broader class.

Basically the, like the demonstratives, is a "specifying agent." It identifies "a particular individual or subclass within the class designated by the noun; but it does this only through dependence on something else - it contains no specifying element of its own" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:70-71). With demonstratives, for example, the proximity of the element is indicated. The definite article simply indicates that the item in question is specific and identifiable, that somewhere the information necessary for identifying it is recoverable. With the, unlike the demonstratives, reference can be either cataphoric or anaphoric. However, it is only with anaphoric reference that the functions in a cohesive way.

It should be mentioned here that the distribution of the definite article is much more complex than is indicated here. Halliday and Hasan describe four ways in which it is used and Hawkins (1978) provides a comprehensive analysis in which he maintains that there are eight general ways in which the definite article is used, seven of which are first-mention. For example, Hawkins points out that the use of the or a depends not only on the

relationship between two things but also "knowledge of that relationship as shared by speaker and hearer." He says (1978:100):

If I am talking to another linguist about transformational grammar, this fact enables me to talk about the deep structure without any previous mention of it ... But if I am talking to a non-linguist, who knows nothing about transformational grammar, then the sequence transformational grammar:the deep structure would be inappropriate without an intervening indefinite (a) deep structure .

This is just one aspect of the first mention use of the definite article, but it illustrates that it is more complex than the treatment given here. The subjects under study used the as first mention appropriately in many cases: the sun, the earth etc. However, these uses are non-cohesive and so do not form part of the analysis.

Examples of this + NP are fairly numerous as subsequent mentions. There is a recent use of this that is receiving consideration in the literature that corresponds in meaning to the indefinite article a. It has been called the "new-this" by Wald (1983: 103) and is illustrated in the following example:

(8) . . . so I took off my jacket y'know n I had on this turtleneck sweater, it was a knitshirt y'know n everything of my brother's . . .

The turtleneck sweater in example (8) could have been

appropriately introduced also by a. There was no use of new-this in the oral narratives, although this use has become quite common in native English speech.

Second Language Use

While pronominal use increases considerably at levels six and seven, the use of demonstratives and the definite article decreases radically at these two levels. This is certainly not surprising given that pronominals replace many of the already mentioned nouns. Indeed, it is the definite article that decreases in use rather than this and that whose use remains steady. The following table indicates the percentage of demonstrative and definite article use in relation to the total number of referents; from this table one can see the constant use of this and that and the decrease of the definite article.

TABLE 4. Number and Percentage of Demonstratives and Definite Article to the Total Number of Referents per Level.

LEVELS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
TOTAL REFERENCE	50	93	72	122	146	117	131
DEMONSTRATIVES	# 9	9	6	18	22	7	14
	% 18%	10%	8%	15%	15%	6%	11%

TABLE 4. Cont'

DEFINITE	# 16	19	21	23	44	7	4
ARTICLE	% 32%	20%	29%	19%	30%	6%	3%

In addition to the percentages of use, a Z-test for the difference between proportions was also done for the definite article since its use decreases drastically. As can be seen from Table 4, the decrease is significant at $p < .01$ for the differences in Levels 1-5 compared with Levels 6 and 7; other differences are not significant:

TABLE 5. Z-Test for Differences Between Proportions.

LEVEL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1		1.93	.46	2.11*	2.03*	4.69**	6.24**
2			1.48	.18	1.63	2.94**	3.77**
3				1.66	.16	4.28**	5.01**
4					1.81	2.78**	3.62**
5						4.42**	5.14**
6							1.02

* $p < .05$ (1.96) ** $p < .01$ (2.58)

In many cases the demonstratives and the definite article are used in much the same way. For example:

(6) And (the) a man ..ehh.. very ..ehh.. very ..ehh..
 very big and ..ehh.. strong ..ehh.. arrive
 And ..ehh.. he ..ehh.. cut the the the fruit with a a
 big ..ehh.. knife
 And ..ehh.. he ..ehh.. and ..ehh.. all the people
 ..ehh.. test.ta.taste ..ehh.. this fruit
 And after I don't know
 Ehh.. I think he ..ehh.. the the people ..ehh.. the
 people didn't like this fruit
 And after ..ehh.. an.and after the the this ..ehh..
this ..ehh.. big man ..ehh.. left (Narr.1, L.1,
 S.7-12).

The fruit of example (6) is first mentioned in sentence 5 as a new fruit and is referred to as the fruit in both sentences 6 and 8 while in sentences 9 and 11 it is referred to as this fruit. Both the and this refer to shared referents; they are introduced by the use of a and subsequently carried through the discourse with either the or this, so both are shared referents by the speaker and the addressee. Both the and this are used with recurrences of the referents as lexical nouns. The use of the and this is a general pattern throughout the narratives. There are numerous examples of it: Narrs: 8:1-2; 13:6-7; 14:7-10; 17:8-9. The examples of this + lexical noun are numerous from levels 1-5 (27 instances) while in levels 6 and 7 there is one instance. Some instances are: Narrs: 1:6; 2:1; 3:5; 4:9; 5:11; 7:1. In addition one repair

is telling with respect to this. In the following narrative, the speaker says:

(7) And this man knows what's tha what's that
what's 'this fruit (Narr.18, L.5, S.13).

This speaker indicates a preference for this plus the lexical noun over either the demonstrative that or that with a lexical noun; it is unclear which one. What this example does indicate, however, is the propensity for using this with a noun.

4.1.3. EXTENDED REFERENCE - THAT

First Language Use

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), demonstratives can also be used to refer to extended text, including text as fact. They note, too, that this applies only to singular forms. Halliday and Hasan (1976:66) illustrate this with the following example:

- (9) They broke a Chinese vase.
 (i) That was valuable.
 (ii) That was careless.

In (i) that refers to the vase while in (ii) that refers to the entire event. Halliday and Hasan remark that extended reference probably accounts for the majority of all instances of demonstratives in English.

Second Language Use

There are no instances of this used as extended reference in the narratives, but there are many instances of that. These uses can be divided into three categories:

1. that = it as reference to a specific object and extended reference
2. formulaic use
3. that used in the coda of the narratives

That = it: as reference to a specific object and extended reference

As Halliday and Hasan note, it is distinct from the other personals in that it can refer not only to a particular object but also to a portion of text. As we have seen in example (8), this is also the case with the demonstratives. It is interesting to note that in many instances of that, it would have been more appropriate to use it. Some examples illustrating this with reference to a specific object are:

(9) And after another persont another persont come come near the of the same melon and ..ehh.. explain ..ehh.. to the other persont ..ehh.. what is that (Narr.3, L.1, S.6)

(10) And they ..ehh.. wonder what was that (Narr.8, L.2, S.5)

(11) An o.k. they ..ehh.. were afraid about that (Narr. 10, L.3, S.6)

(12) And you can have a garden with that (Narr. 19, L.5, S.7)

(13) So when they saw the watermelon they don't know what is that (Narr. 24, L.6, S.7)

In examples (9) - (12), in each case the presupposed item is watermelon; that is, the reference is not extended to include larger portions of text. While each example is grammatical, strictly speaking, the use of that distances the item referred to.

Subjects also use that as extended reference. Some examples are:

(13) And ..ehh.. the years after you have a a good recolte and ..ehh.. a lot of food
And everybody understand that (Narr.5, L.2, S.24-25).

(14) So the people was was was afraid by that that because she didn't understand why why this man . eat ..ehh.. the watermelon like that(Narr.14, L.4, S.7)

(15) That's the same thing for the life (Narr. 16; L.4, S.33)

(16) And ..ehh.. first I think ..ehh.. I thought that's the evolution of the man a little bit (Narr. 17, L.4, S.3)

(17) So ..ehh.. the people are hungry angry about that (Narr.20, L.5, S.30)

(18) And everyone got involved in that (Narr. 25, L.7, S.9)

These are the only examples of that as extended reference. Examples (13) and (14) both use that where this would have been more appropriate. In (13) the people

understand that one can harvest food and the watermelon is just one of the many things to be harvested. Example (14) refers to the man's actions. He does not explain what the watermelon is and proceeds to eat it, still not explaining. Because of his actions, the people are afraid and angry about this fact.

While (13) and (14) contain that where this would be more likely from a native speaker, examples (15) and (16) contain that, distancing information that is integral to the subject of the narrative, where it would be more likely. The narrator of (15) is referring to the philosophical notion that when one encounters something new, such as the watermelon in A Sufi Tale, one fears it and in order not to fear it, one must try to understand it. The narrator extends this idea to life. In (16) the speaker refers to the entire film and so, again by using that to refer to this sequence of events, she distances it. In both (15) and (16), it would be a better choice.

The final example, (17), refers to the frightened behavior of the villagers; they were screaming in fear of the new fruit, this watermelon which they did not understand. In this case, either it or this would be acceptable.

While all these examples differ slightly, they do have one thing in common; by using that, the event is distanced

somewhat. This is different from the L1 situation described by Halliday and Hasan, where in conversational narrative, a speaker is likely to use this, indicating a sense of immediacy and solidarity with the addressee (1976:61).

Formulaic Use

The second type of anaphoric reference using that includes extended reference of a more formulaic nature. These are common expressions in English, "felt and handled as a unit" (Jespersen 1924, cited in Fakhri, 1984:21), and so they are included here as fixed expressions. These are not numerous in the narratives; in fact, they only occur five times. These expressions are:

(18) Something like that (3 times)

(19) After that (2 times)

That: used in the coda of the narrative

Finally, the third use of that is in the final statement or coda of the narrative. Of the 28 narratives, 14 narrators finish with either that's it or that's all. This is of course a formulaic expression and refers to the entire text. The difference from the previous formulaic use is that it is used to finish off the narrative, to provide an identifiable end. Labov and Waletzky (1967)

note that this is a common occurrence in the telling of narratives. Since narratives are generally the telling of past events, many narratives end with a coda which serves to "return the verbal perspective to the present moment. Deixis is one such example as in 'That was it' " (1967:32).

4.1.4. COMPARATIVE REFERENCE

The third type of reference, comparative, is not widely used. This is certainly not surprising since there are really only a few places where it could occur. The use of comparative reference is minimal at all levels but shows a slight decrease. This trend is obviously insignificant. Nevertheless, it is interesting to see where and how comparative reference is used. The following table indicates the number of instances of comparative reference:

TABLE 6. Number and Percentage of Comparative Reference to the Total Number of Referents per Level.

LEVELS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
# REF.	46	81	63	105	133	104	127
COMPARATIVE #	4	9	5	7	5	4	6
REFERENCE %	9	11	8	7	4	4	5

At the low to intermediate levels comparative reference is always used to refer to the second man or the people of the community in contrast with the "visitors". For example:

(20) And after another person another person come come near of the same melon and ..ehh.. explain ..ehh.. to the other person ..ehh.. what is that (Narr.3, L.1, S.6)

(21) After another man came but he's ..ehh.. gentle .. and ..ehh.. more ..ehh.. (Narr.5, L.2, S.17-18)

(22) So a man arrive and cut the melon in two parts And ..ehh.. for the other people it's like..ehh..blood I think (Narr.9, L.3, S.10-11)

At levels 6 and 7 what is particularly noticeable is the variety of use of comparative reference. While there are instances referring to the second man as another man, the more advanced students seem to have more linguistic resources to refer to the second visitor. For example:

(23) And someone else came and explain it what the other person before didn't (Narr.23, L.6, S. 19)

(24) Then after a smarter guy came (Narr.25, L.7, S.17).

Example (23) is an instance where a word other than the more common comparative is used. Else is distinguished from the other comparatives since it follows rather than precedes that which it modifies. It also is restricted by what it can modify, only general nouns such as someone and adverbs such as everywhere. In (24), the narrator uses

the comparative adjective to make a qualitative judgement, adding richness to the discourse. The comparison is made with respect to a particular quality. While the difference in use is not great among levels, the variety of use increases with proficiency. The speaker is more able to draw on reference to comment and make judgements on individuals rather than simply state the "otherness" of the character. This is certainly not to say that the characters of the two men are not described by certain speakers. Rather, less proficient speakers have different means of expressing the comparison. For example:

(25) After another man came
But he's ..ehh.. gentle ... (Narr.5, L.2, S.17-18)

The comparison of the two men is obvious here. However, the speaker does not use comparative reference to make the particular comparison. The general comparison is first made with another and then the adversative but signals that there will be some difference in character. It is very clear that the second visitor is gentle where the first is not. Another example of a qualitative comparison made by a novice English speaker indicates another but similar use of comparison. This speaker says:

(26) And after there was a.another guy ..ehh.. short shorter and ..ehh.. thinner (Narr.6, L.2, S.17).

This speaker first establishes the general comparison and subsequently moves to a more particular comparison.

4.1.5. REPAIRS

Two important tasks of these L2 narrators are to establish distinct reference and maintain it throughout the discourse. The number of reference repairs at all levels indicates that the narrators are extremely conscious of the necessity for this. The number of repairs is great at all levels, indicating that even the least proficient speaker is aware and takes pains with this aspect of discourse.

First Language Repairs

The work of Schegloff et al (1977) provides insight into repairs in naturally occurring conversation and also offers some explanation of repairs in second language discourse. Their formulation of repair includes correction as the replacement of an error with the correct item, but they see repair more generally as a "self-righting" mechanism. They make the distinction between "self-initiated repair", that made at a trouble source by the speaker himself, and "other-initiated" repair, that initiated by the other speaker. Subsequently, the trouble may either be repaired by the speaker, "self-repair" or repaired by the other speaker, "other-repair".

Second Language Use

While Schegloff et al (1977) worked with native speakers, other researchers (Gaskill 1980, Schwartz 1980) have had similar results looking at the conversation of L2 speakers. Other-corrections are relatively infrequent and other-initiations generally result in self-repair. It is true that these studies analyse conversation, but they point to the prevalence of self-repair in all speech. What is particularly germane to the present L2 study is the evidence for a preference towards self-correction and self-initiated repair, a trend which is most in evidence in the oral narratives. In the case of the oral narratives, there is obviously no negotiation for meaning between speakers. In other words, no one is demanding clarification or asking for the trouble source of the other speaker to be rectified. Nevertheless, in extended, uninterrupted discourse, the speaker must frame and reorganize ideas or replace items which are potentially troubling to the addressee.

The repairs looked at in the present study are limited to corrections and only those corrections that contribute to an understanding of how the subjects build up a textually cohesive text. (At each level a large percentages of corrections are referential in nature. The following table illustrates this:

TABLE 7. Repairs: Number of Repairs and Percentage of Reference Repairs per Level.

LEVELS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
REPAIRS #	18	19	13	22	20	11	17
REFERENCE#	7	6	7	6	4	5	6
REPIAIRS %	39	32	54	27	20	46	35

Although the repairs do not show a particular trend with respect to frequency, the types of reference repairs indicate some differences across the levels; at the low to intermediate levels the repairs concern definiteness and the use of lexical nouns, while at the higher levels they are repairs of number.

Definiteness

In levels 1-4, two types of repairs are particularly interesting because they point to the lower level subjects' propensity to use nominal reference rather than pronouns. The first type of repair shows that these subjects are concerned with given-new information. The following examples demonstrate this:

(27) And after ..ehh.. after that the a new ..ehh..
 à new fruit for for them ..ehh.. arrive (Narr.1, L.1,
 S.5)

(28) And the a man ..ehh.. very ..ehh.. very big
and ..ehh.. strong ..ehh.. arrive (Narr.1, L.1, S.7)

These two examples illustrate how the speaker organizes topics through referential choice. Both the fruit and the man are integral to the narrative, and so their introduction must be clearly stated. Much of an understanding of the story hinges on the watermelon and the visitors so they must be clearly established topics in the discourse. Examples (27) and (28) are indications of the speaker's awareness of this. The speaker first uses the definite article, signalling that which is understood between the speaker and the listener, but changes to the indefinite article to indicate that both the fruit and the man are being introduced into the discourse.

Maintaining Reference

The subjects further indicate through repairs their awareness of how important it is to maintain reference. The less advanced subjects again demonstrate their tendency to use lexical nouns rather than pronouns:

(29) And ..ehh.. he ..ehh.. this man show ..ehh..
show show show us ..no.. show them ..ehh.. this fruit
and this ..ehh.. and the the pepin (Narr.1 L.1, S.14)

(30) And they all the people scare by the new thing
they see (Narr.11, L.3, S. 3)

(31) When he see the the watermelon he shsh ..ehh..
the people was afraid (Narr.12, L.3, S.7)

Examples (29) - (31) all indicate the speakers' tendency to use full noun phrases rather than pronouns. These repairs indicate a clarification strategy; that is, it is necessary for the speakers to make it clear who they are talking about, and so the pronoun is followed by the full noun, clarifying the pronoun.

Number

The repairs from levels 1-4 demonstrate the subjects' proclivity to stay away from pronominal reference in order to maintain a clear message, but the repairs at the higher levels exhibit quite a different pattern. Rather than repairs from a pronoun towards a full noun phrase, they are generally pronoun repairs concerning number. The following examples indicate this:

(32) And he they ..ehh.. explain to others ...
(Narr.16, L.4, S.21)

(33) And they he showed to them to the the the seeds
(Narr.24, L.6, S.15)

(34) And he show him he show them that it's good
(Narr.28, L.7, S.17)

Examples (32) - (34) all indicate pronominal repairs of number. In addition, none of the repairs change pronoun

type. Examples (32) and (33) illustrate number corrections for subject pronouns and (34) demonstrates number repair of object pronouns. This is true of all repairs; the type is always appropriately used, but in certain cases the number is corrected. This is also true of the one instance of gender correction. The object pronoun, her, is appropriately changed to him (Narr.16, L.4, S.16).

4.1.6. REFERENCE PROBLEMS

While the narratives are generally very clear and the subjects exhibit efficient strategies for conveying information and in so doing maintain reference, there are certain problems. These include lack of a presupposed item and trouble with number.

No Presupposed Item

The greatest problem with reference in the narratives concerns lack of a presupposed item, but compared to the amount of successful reference, the problems with this are not numerous. It is also interesting to note that the problems do not seem to show any sort of trend across levels; there are problems at all levels. The following table indicates the number of problems across levels:

TABLE 8. Instances of No Presupposed Item per Level.

LEVEL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
# OF NO P.I.	2	5	2	4	1	5	1

Some of the problems simply involve using the definite article in place of the indefinite. For example:

(35) I saw the the people ..ehh.. on the little town (Narr.5, L.2, S.3).

(36) And ..ehh.. after I don't know why but ..ehh.. we we I saw the water watermelon (Narr.13, L.4, S.5).

(37) And ..ehh.. after the man arrive arrived will arrive (Narr.17, L.5, S.5).

The natural response, of course, on the part of the addressee would be to ask, "what people, what little town, what watermelon and what man?" However, there are few examples such as these, and, as has already been explained, new entities are generally introduced into the narratives successfully.

A more serious problem with no presupposed item is the use of pronouns with no antecedent. This of course does pose problems in understanding for obvious reasons. Examples (35) - (37) at least indicate that the discourse is

about people in a little town, a watermelon and a man. With pronouns with no presupposed items, there is much less to go on and the addressee is left with larger questions. An example of how confusing it can be when pronouns are used with no referents is illustrated in the following example:

(38) At the beginning we see we saw the pe the world
the creation of the world

And ..ehh.. they live in a country

They they live with the culture(?) o.k.

They culture something ...

And ..ehh.. once upon a time he's put ..ehh..
something in a grass ..ehh.. un grain (Narr.16, L.4,
S3-6;S.9).

This section of the narrative is very confusing because there is no indication of who they are. Earlier the narrator mentions that this is "the human story" so we can assume that they are the humans. However, there is a problem because the narrator refers to the story of humanity in general but fails to introduce the participants in this story of humanity. Further, this narrator refers to someone putting a seed in the grass; again there is no introduction of who he is. Example (38) provides only a couple of examples of pronoun problems concerning no presupposed item. Of the problems with presupposition,

pronoun usage represents the majority of problems.

Number

Problems with number represented problems in only two narratives. Examples (39) and (40) provide examples of this problem:

(39) So the people was afraid by that because she didn't understand why this man eat the watermelon like that (Narr.14, L.4, S.7).

(40) ...the people are afraid because he saw something he didn't know it was (Narr.7, L.2, S.1)

The problems are obvious here. These narrators only make the error once, however, so they cannot be regarded as consistent problems in these narratives.

4.1.7. SUMMARY OF REFERENCE

The patterns exhibited in the L2 narratives indicate a developmental trend towards native speaker usage and in the process there are some interesting strategies at work. There are a number of referential devices available in English to make a narrative cohesive, and it has been well documented that native speakers draw heavily on them. Clancy (1980), for example, shows that native speakers in the majority of cases generally use full noun phrases to introduce new information and pronouns to indicate "old

information". She maintains that "it appears that in English repeated nominal reference is generally felt to be unnecessary in establishing a new character as 'old information' eligible for pronominalization" (1980:155). While this is the case for native speakers, from the limited data here, it seems not to be the case until the nonnative speakers reach a high level of proficiency. In order to make it very clear who and what is being talked about, the less proficient speaker uses repeated nominal forms with the definite article or demonstrative this to indicate old information. This strategy enables even the least proficient speaker to maintain clear reference. That novice speakers in other languages maintain reference is illustrated by Fakhri (1984) who demonstrates that a beginning speaker of Moroccan Arabic uses strategies to keep referents straight in narratives by using discourse features to govern pronoun use. While Fakhri's subject's pronoun use is often grammatically incorrect, it is clear who she is talking about. Advanced L2 speakers, in the present study, more closely approximate native speaker use as the increase in pronominal reference (Table 1.) indicates.

While this is generally used in a similar way to the throughout the present narratives, that is used in a variety of ways that is consistent across levels. Unlike

this, that is never used with a following noun phrase but is used instead as anaphoric reference referring either to something specific or an extended section of text. In many cases, it appears that it would be more appropriate than that; however, in order to corroborate this, a comparative study between L1 and L2 would have to be done. That also has a formulaic use in the narratives, particularly as a coda.

Comparative reference across levels, although indicating no quantitative tendency, is interesting from the point of view of strategic language use. At the lower levels, the narrators tend to use the common comparative other to make the general comparison and establish the qualitative comparison later while the more advanced narrators are able to establish the qualitative comparison initially.

Repairs across levels demonstrate the strategic use of reference on the part of the narrators. Most of the repairs are referential at all levels and so show that speakers are aware of the necessity of maintaining clear reference. At the early levels, the speakers show that they are aware of the need to specify given and new information. For example, the definite article is corrected to the indefinite when introducing a new item into the narrative. Another type of repair at the lower levels reinforces the

observation that beginner L2 English speakers prefer nominal reference; pronouns are replaced by a full noun phrase. At the advanced levels, the repairs are generally pronoun repairs where the number is corrected.

While ambiguity of reference is the exception rather than the rule, there are certain problems in the narratives. In some cases, the narrators use either the definite article with a noun phrase or a pronoun with no presupposed item. This leads to obvious problems. The other noticeable problem is with number; for example, the third person singular pronoun might be used where it should be the plural form.

In summary, the subjects' use of reference across seven levels of proficiency provides a wealth of information for understanding how second language speakers build up a textually cohesive text. Although the data is limited by both the number of subjects and the fact that only one language group is represented, it seems that there is a systematic way ESL speakers convey information through referential choice.

4.2. SUBSTITUTION

First Language Use

Substitution, like reference, is primarily anaphoric in nature. However, it is a relation in the wording rather

than in meaning; it is a grammatical relation rather than a semantic one. Halliday and Hasan (1976) see substitution as a "sort of counter" which is used instead of repeating a particular item, and as a general rule, it has the same structural function. Halliday and Hasan's (1976:89-90) examples repeated here as (41) - (43) illustrate this:

(41) My axe is too blunt. I must get a sharper one.

(42) You think Joan already knows? - I think everybody does.

(43) Has Barbara left? - I think so.

In each of these examples it would be entirely possible to replace the underlined substitute with what it refers to. Further, (41)-(43) are examples of the three types of substitution; (41) is nominal substitution, (42) verbal and (43) clausal.

Second Language Use

Substitution, with one exception, is never used in the narratives. The only instance in the entire corpus is nominal substitution:

(44) A man came and was a strong one (Narr.3, L.1, S.11).

If one looks at examples from L1 discourse, this phenomenon might be explained. Both (42) and (43) are examples from

conversations, not oral narratives, which might explain the omission of substitutions in the L2 data.

4.3. ELLIPSIS

First Language Use

Ellipsis, in Halliday and Hasan's (1976) terms, is much the same as substitution in that it is merely substitution by zero. Ellipsis refers specifically to sentences, clauses and words in which some preceding item is presupposed, and so is the source of the missing information. Halliday and Hasan (1976:143) say:

An elliptical item is one in which, as it were, leaves specific structural slots to be filled from elsewhere. This is exactly the same as presupposition by substitution, except that in substitution an explicit 'counter' is used, eg: one or do, as a place-marker for what is presupposed, whereas in ellipsis nothing is inserted into the slot. That is why we say that ellipsis is substitution by zero.

Second Language Use

Ellipsis is never used in the L2 oral narratives. Looking at the cases of ellipsis in the sample L1 texts provided by Halliday and Hasan ellipsis, as in the case of substitution, only occurs in conversation and not in narratives.

4.3.1. SUBSTITUTION AND ELLIPSIS

The observation that substitution and ellipsis occur

more often in conversation than in other types of discourse requires further research to be substantiated. In the sample texts that Halliday and Hasan provide, however, there are very few cases of substitution, and all are primarily in conversation or interactional language. Ellipsis is more common in Halliday and Hasan's sample narratives, but also always occurs in interaction. The following is a list of the type of sample texts Halliday and Hasan (1976:340-355) include in their book and the number of times substitution and ellipsis occur in each text:

Type	<u>Substitution</u>	<u>Ellipsis</u>
1. narrative	0	0
2. conversation	1	6
3. sonnet	0	0
4. narrative	1	0
5. dialogue	3	12
6. interview(adults)	1	1
7. interview (child/adult)	3	7

As can be seen from this list, with the exception of the fourth text, all cases of substitution and ellipsis occur in interactional language rather than in cases where only one speaker is involved. In the case of the fourth text, the only instance of substitution is in the author's

response to a rhetorical question he asks of himself. This example, taken from W.B. Yeats' Autobiography (quoted in Halliday and Hasan, 1976:346), is as follows, " Was there an impassable barrier between those scratches and the trampled fields of rice? It would seem so. . . ." In this case, then, the narrator is essentially "conversing" with himself.

Widdowson(1978:25) provides some insight into the use of substitution and particularly ellipsis with his explanation of cohesion and propositional development. He maintains that "sentences are contextually appropriate when they express propositions in such a way as to fit into the propositional development of the discourse as a whole." He asks the reader to consider the following (1978:25), restated here as (45):

- (45) C: Well, did you talk to her?
 B: Yes, I did (talk to her)
 C: When did she say the parcel would be returned?
 B: (She said the parcel would be returned) tomorrow.
 C: Good, I'll meet her at the shop.
 B: She said that her husband would return it.

C's questions indicate what he needs to know and B's responses provide the needed information only. According to Widdowson (1978:25), "the propositions expressed by C are linked up with those expressed by B to form a

continuous propositional development." In Widdowson's (1978:25) terms, the forms of these utterances are "contextually appropriate"; that is, "they express propositions in such a way as to fit into the propositional development as a whole." The formulation of cohesion as Widdowson sees it, then, involves propositional development. He maintains that sentences used communicatively in discourse have a value only in relation to other propositions expressed in other sentences. Indeed, unnecessary repetition of known information may reduce communicative effectiveness because the new information does not have the salience it should. Consider this example from Widdowson (1978:26):

- (46) A: What happened to the crops?
 B: The crops were destroyed by the rain.
 A: When were the crops destroyed by the rain?
 B: The crops were destroyed by the rain last week.

Because each sentence represents an independent expression of the proposition, it is unnatural and filled with redundancies so that the propositional development is not carried forward effectively. Widdowson (1978:27) says:

We may say that a discourse is cohesive to the extent that it allows for effective propositional development and we may say that sentences are appropriate in form to the extent that they allow for this development. Further, this appropriacy will often require sentences

not to express complete propositions.

Widdowson's examples include only ellipsis and only examples from conversations. It seems from these examples, as from Halliday and Hasan's, that ellipsis is most common in conversation. This can perhaps be extended to substitution as well.

If it is true that both substitution and ellipsis occur more commonly in conversation than in oral narratives, then it is inappropriate to expect the use of these cohesive devices in the narratives.

4.4. CONJUNCTION

Conjunction, referred to by Williams (1983) as "discourse markers" and by Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1983) as "logical connectors", functions differently from the other types of cohesive ties that Halliday and Hasan (1976) refer to. Unlike reference, substitution and ellipsis, conjunctive elements are "not primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding (or following) text" (1976:226). Rather they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse. Connectives supply "a specification of the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before" (1976:227). They act as cues to the reader or listener. For example, the

additive furthermore indicates that the discourse is continuing in the same direction while the adversative however indicates that what is to follow will be contrary to expectation. Stein and Nezworski (1978), in looking at the organization of categories in stories note that there are several factors which alert the listener or reader to the fact that one category has ended and another begun, including temporal markers such as finally.

The following text illustrates the function of each type of connector (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:238-9):

(47) For the whole day he climbed up the steep mountainside, almost without stopping.

- a. And in all this time he met no one.
(additive)
- b. Yet he was hardly aware of being tired.
(adversative)
- c. So by night time the valley was far below him.
(causal)
- d. Then, as dusk fell, he sat down to rest.
(temporal)

The additive and in (47a) indicates that information has been added; in (47b) the adversative yet alerts the listener or reader to the fact that what is to come will be unexpected; the causal conjunction so of (47c) indicates that what will follow is a result of the first clause, and finally the temporal marker then indicates the sequence of events.

In the present study of L2 narratives, all forms of conjunction usage occurred. The following examples are taken from the narratives under study:

(48) Ok in the st in the begin the start you see
 ..ehh.. the sunset
After we see a a bird to fly
And ..ehh.. we see flower and tree to come tall
 (Narr.12, L.3, S.2-3).

(49) When he cut the watermelon we see umm ..ehh..
 red liki. liquid
 And this red liquid it's like a blood
So ..ehh.. the peoples are hungry angry about that
 (Narr.20, L.5, S.28-30).

(50) A tough guy or a strong guy tried to to impress
 them by showing them how to do that
But he did not .eh. manage to teach them how to to
 handle that new plant or ... (Narr.25, L.7, S. 12-13)

Example (48) contains both temporal and additive conjunctions. The narrator marks the beginning of the events by making it very clear that at the beginning of the film there is a sunset; subsequently, marked by the temporal conjunction after, he sees birds. The narrator then adds information to the narrative marking this by the conjunction and. In (49), the narrator notes that the people's anger is a direct result of the fact that the liquid is blood-like; she successfully shows this by using the causal conjunction so. Finally in (50) the narrator explains that although the "tough guy" tried to teach the people, he was not successful. The narrator uses the adversative conjunction but in his explanation.

While all four types of conjunction are used in the narratives, some are used more frequently than others. Furthermore, the results indicate a developmental trend with certain connectors as proficiency increases. Additive conjunction is the most frequently used, but the results also indicate a significant decrease as proficiency increases. The subjects make limited use of adversative conjunctions across levels. The use of causal conjunctions increases slightly and consistently across levels, but this increase is not significant. The use of temporal conjunctions shows a significant decrease from levels 1-5 and a significant increase from levels 5-6. The results indicate some important strategies at work. First, the use of and shows that the speakers recognize the need to form a cohesive narrative. However, connecting a narrative with and is not critical to its cohesiveness, so as proficiency increases the speakers no longer need to rely on this "default conjunction", as de Beaugrande(1980) calls it. Second, the decrease in the most commonly used temporal conjunction, after, also indicates that the speakers are more adept at indicating relations of time sequence without this interlanguage form. At level 6, after is still used, but a greater variety of temporal conjunctions is used to express temporal relations. Table 9 shows the incidence of the four types of conjunction used:

TABLE 9. Conjunction: Number and Percentage to number of sentences per Level.

LEVELS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
NO. OF SENT	46	70	60	80	106	76	101
ADD. #	31	47	38	46	54	41	43
%	67	67	63	57	50	54	43
ADV. #	0	5	4	3	2	4	7
%	0	7	7	4	2	5	7
CAUS.#	1	4	3	4	5	9	12
%	2	6	5	5	5	12	12
TEMP.#	13	19	12	14	11	18	18
%	28	27	20	18	10	24	18

A Z-test for difference between proportions was performed to identify significant results.

Additive: Levels 1-7; 2-7 show a significant decrease in use at $p < .01$ (2.58)

Levels 3-7; 4-7 show a significant decrease in use at $p < .05$ (1.96).

The decrease in additive conjunction use, then, is significant from the early levels to the highest proficiency level.

Adversative: no significant difference.

Causal: no significant increase (level 1-7 is 1.18).

Temporal: From level 1-5 and 2-5 the decrease is significant at $p < .01$ and the difference between levels 5-6 is significant at $p < .05$.

The decrease in temporal conjunction use, then, is significant from levels 1-5 but shows a significant increase in use at level 6.

4.4.1. ADDITIVE CONJUNCTION

First language use

some observations from L1 research provide insight into the use of additive conjunction by L2 users. And is the most widely used conjunction in native speech and also the earliest in language development. The flow of discourse is maintained with what really becomes a multi-purpose conjunction or, as de Beaugrande calls it, a "default junction". Examples from native speech demonstrate this. For example, Hawkins (1969, cited in de Beaugrande 1980:160) elicited protocols from children in which an extreme of the additive conjunction and is used. Example (50), from Hawkins, illustrates this:

(50) Three boys are playing football and one boy kicks the ball and it goes through the window and the ball breaks the window and the boys are looking at it and a man comes out (etc.).

In this narrative the conjunction and shows simple addition of events in a causal and temporal sequence. De Beaugrande (1980:160) says that since these relations are "recoverable from content, the junctive expression 'and' is dispensable, or replaceable with subordinatives". For example, (de Beaugrande, 1980:160):

(51) Three boys are playing football. One boy kicks the ball. It goes through the window. etc.

(52) Three boys are playing football when one boy kicks the ball so that it goes through the window. etc.

It is this non-committal nature of and which, according to de Beaugrande, makes it the default junction. He maintains further that children might use and as an indication of incompleteness in order to maintain their speaking turn. It can also be used as a filler so that subsequent discourse may be planned.

Anderson, Brown, Shillcock and Yule (1984) also demonstrate how prevalent the use of and is in native adult speech. They note that for a particular narrative task, the events simply need to be recounted in the right chronological order for the story to be effective; in other

words the story does not depend on complex temporal shifts. A common strategy among their subjects was to use simple clauses strung together by and and then. They provide the following example (1984:89):

(52) +she goes up to her room. and falls on the bed and starts crying + then the man gets his coat on and starts to walk out the door ++ the man goes to his girlfriend's house ++ and the girlfriend's arm round + the neck.

Anderson et al. remark that it is possible to achieve the same effect by using few connectives and presenting the story as a string of simple sentences. Example (53) is taken from Anderson et al. (1984:89):

(53) there's a man and his wife sitting in the living room + man just gets bored + has a look out the window + decides he wants to go out + gets ready to go to this pub disco + shakes hands with the bar-man + gets up starts dancing + sits down beside this girl ++ back in the house he phones her + his wife comes in the door + his wife sits down.

They remark that this strategy, however, contributes to a stilted, formal style.

Second Language Use

What de Beaugrande (1980) says about and and Anderson's et al. (1984) observations concerning it have a great deal of relevance to the present investigation. In looking at the present narratives it seems that the flow of

discourse is maintained with and while at the same time it gives the speaker time to consider what he will say next. This is particularly noticeable at the early levels. Consider the following example, one of many such cases:

(54) And after this tree grow
 And they ..ehh.. (h)ate apple
 And after they found a watermillon
 And they ..ehh.. wonder what what what what was that
 And they ..ehh.. look for a man
 And the man eat the watermelon
 And they ..ehh.. were afraid (Narr. 8, L.2, S.2-8).

This portion of an early narrative demonstrates a plethora of and; in fact, of the eleven sentences in this narrative, nine begin with and. The narrator adds up the story with the conjunction and. Just as in Hawkins' example, the default function of the conjunction can be seen. Although the temporality of the events is marked with after, the events are still held together with and. Sentences 5 and 6 indicate cause and effect, but the relationship is not made explicit; instead, the narrator binds the two sentences additively. To show causality, the speaker could have said:

(55) And they wonder what was that
 So they look for a man to explain it

As indicated in Table 9, causal relationships are overtly expressed more often as proficiency increases.

There is also evidence in the narratives that and is used as a filler. The subjects often use an and ..ehh.. sequence. This is noticeable in (56):

(56) And ..ehh.. it it was before the agriculture
 And ..ehh.. I saw the first ..ehh.. the first time
 when ..ehh.. a person plant a tree to ..ehh.. to
 obtain some ..ehh.. some fruits
 And ..ehh.. I think it was the the first step of the
 agri.agriculture the beginning of the agriculture
 (Narr.13 ,L.4, S. 2-4).

While and is used in a conjunctive sense, it also seems to be used as a filler. For instance, commenting on the first scene of the film, the speaker observes that the film depicts the beginning of agriculture. The and ..ehh.. enables the speaker to construct this thought.

As the speakers' proficiency increases, they draw less and less on the "multi-purpose" and.

4.4.2. ADVERSATIVE CONJUNCTION

First Language Use

Although there are numerous adversative conjunctions, the only one used in the L2 narratives is but, so it is the only one which will be considered. It should be noted that but is less common than the additive conjunction and in L1 speech even though it is the most common adversative. Anderson et al. (1984) remark on this in contrasting the narratives with and, no connectives and

but. They remark that the less common connective but creates a less stilted and informal style than those narratives with no connectives. Compare (53) with the following (Anderson et al., 1984:89):

(57) then they are lying on the settee with their arms around each other but the girl seems to be in the huff+ .

Second Language Use

In the L2 narratives, adversative conjunction is more difficult to explain than either additive or causal conjunction because it does not show any particular development across levels as the other types of conjunction do. Though not widely used, when it is used, the only form is but. This, however, is not unexpected given that it is the most common adversative in L1 usage. Also, when but is used, it is always correct; it always marks an upcoming contrast, something unexpected in the discourse. For example, the following excerpt shows the first use of but in the narratives:

(58) And ..ehh.. after I remember ..ehh..ehh.. a girl look ..ehh.. in the recolte and saw a a melon But she don't she don't know what is it what is that what is this what is that (Narr.5,L.2, S.7-8).

The listener is alerted to the fact that there is something unusual about this melon by the adversative but. The

narrator signals that what is to follow will be contrary to expectation. Again, at level 4 the appropriate use of the adversative but is demonstrated:

(59) And they they thought the watermelon was ..ehh.. was bluding
But it wasn't it was it ..ehh.. juice (Narr.15, L.4, S.8-9).

Just as in (58), the narrator of (59) prepares the listener for a shift in direction. What the people think is blood is in actuality juice and the listener expects such a shift having been alerted to it by but.

Finally, at the most proficient level, the narrators do not really exhibit a better use of adversatives. For example, just as in (58) and (59), the speaker of (60) shows a good understanding of this form:

(60) A tough guy or a strong guy tried to to impress them by showing them how to do that
But he did not .eh. manage to teach them how to to handle that new plant (Narr. 25,L.7, S.12-13).

It is difficult to draw any conclusions with respect to the use of the adversative but. It is not used often, but when it is, it is in an appropriate context. With this in mind, it might be that its function is a particularly salient one. Although L2 speakers do not draw on it often, because its role is well understood at all levels, it is used appropriately in all cases.

4.4.3. CAUSAL CONJUNCTION

First Language Use

Causal conjunctions are not as commonly used as additives are. That this is the case in native speech is attested to by Anderson, et al., (1984). Recall again examples (52) and (53). Other subjects used causal conjunctions for the same story, but they were uncommon. Anderson et al. use the following example, from their corpus to illustrate, in contrast to (53), an extract which appears less stilted and formal (Anderson et al., 1984:89):

(61) the man was bored + so he + walked up and he was looking out the window+.

Second Language Use

Causal conjunction increases slightly in the second language narratives although, as the Z-test shows, insignificantly with proficiency. However, the subjects overtly mark cause-effect relationships slightly more with increased language proficiency. For instance at level 7, there are examples such as the following:

(62) There was a fear because it was the first time for them that they saw that
So umm. they were screaming (Narr.25, L.7, S.7-8).

This narrator makes it explicit that the reason the people are afraid is because it is the first time they have ever

seen a watermelon. Furthermore, the screaming is also explained as a result of their fear.

Causal conjunction does occur at the lower levels, although it is relatively rare. In certain instances it is used in rather an ad hoc way so cannot really be considered to function in the true sense of a causal conjunction. For example:

(63) And the other man ..le .. there ..ehh.. (snaps fingers)
So the .. no no ..my dictionary...(Narr.2; L.1, S.7-8)

This example demonstrates the use of so more as a filler than anything else.

In another early narrative, already quoted in (54), the narrator uses so once as a causal conjunction amidst many instances of the additive and. She says:

(64) And the man eat the watermelon
 And they ..ehh.. were afraid
So they went see another man (Narr.8,L.2,S.8-9).

What is interesting here is that so is used only once but is used at an important juncture in the narrative. It marks another episode, and by marking it in this way, the narrator makes it clear why this event is to take place.

Although the increase in causal conjunction is statistically insignificant, there is an increase of 10%

from level 1 to level 7; 12% of all conjunctions at levels 6 and 7 are causal conjunction, generally so and in a few cases because. Some examples of causal conjunctions at levels 6 and 7 are:

(65) The first time they are ..ehh..ehh.. cultivate their fields

So it's new for them

...

And it's first time they seen this

So they don't know if it's something you can eat or

(Narr 22, L.6,S.3-4;6-7).

(66) And umm the person cuts the melon and start to eat it

...

And they don't know what it is

So they think that he did a wrong thing

So they're mad at him (Narr. 23,L.6, S.12;14-16).

(67) But they umm they find that he he's only there to ..ehh.. to show himself not to help them

So they get rid of him (Narr.27, L.7,S.23-24).

(68) And he she show him he show them that it's good And you should not be afraid of tasting watermelon

So everybody aa taste it (Narr. 28, L.7, S.17-19).

Examples (65) to (68) all have examples of cause and effect explicitly marked with the causal connector so.

4.4.4. TEMPORAL CONJUNCTION

First Language Use

The final type of conjunction that speakers draw on is temporal conjunction. It is expressed in its simplest form

by then, indicating that one event is subsequent to another. Halliday and Hasan (1976:261) cite an example from Alice in Wonderland :

(69) (Alice) began by taking the little golden key, and unlocking the door that led into the garden. Then she set to work nibbling at the mushroom ... till she was about a foot high: then she walked down the little passage: and then - she found herself at last in the beautiful garden.

There are also other connectors to express 'sequential relationships: next, afterwards, after that etc. The temporal relationship can also be made more explicit; for example, one might want to say five minutes later. Indeed there are many temporal relations that one may express. In certain cases it is imperative that these relations be expressed. Anderson, et al., (1984) cite examples in which temporal relations are not expressed, subsequently rendering the content confusing. As they point out, one of the necessary conventions in recounting a series of events is marking a significant change in time. In example (70), (1984:58) the speaker fails to mark both a temporal and locational shift:

(70) then he goes to this pub or cafe + has a pint + and he starts dancing with this woman + and he starts talking to the woman + he starts to like her + and the wife hears him phoning her on the phone

Between the two underlined events, a temporal and

locational shift should be marked. In a successful recounting from the same corpus, a narrator inserts the phrase, after that the man went home. This, obviously, makes a vast difference to the narrative and provides correct information. Whereas in (70) the two events seem to be occurring simultaneously, the insertion of the phrase just mentioned rectifies the problem. These examples show both the importance of marking time relations in certain cases and also indicate that even native speakers can have problems with this.

Second Language Use

In the narratives in the present study temporal relations are well marked at all levels, generally with simple temporal conjunctions. Certainly the narrative task did not demand that the subjects use anything else. It is interesting to note that marking of temporal conjunctions decreases steadily until level five and increases at level six and seven (See Table 9). In addition a Z-Test for the difference between proportions indicates that between levels 1 and 5 and 2 and 5, there is a significant decrease in use at $p < .01$. From level 5 to 6 there is a significant increase at $p < .05$. This can be explained partially by the types of temporal conjunctions used at the lower levels and the strategies employed by the speakers.

The most common temporal conjunction at the lower levels is after, usually following the additive and. The use of after in these cases is much like the more common then in native speech. In any case, after is the most common temporal conjunction. For example:

(71) The sun set
And ..umm.. a lot of tree was growing
And after we saw people (Narr.9, L.3, S.3-5).

(72) After another man comes . came (Narr.14, L.4, S.10).

Example (72) further shows where after is used. It is often the case that the subjects mark the coming of the second man with the temporal connector. Also, from level 1-5, the connector most commonly used is after.

It is interesting to note that the use of temporal conjunctions decreases from levels 1-5, and it is particularly noteworthy that it is a decrease in the use of after. For instance, the use of after forms 70% of all temporal conjunctions used while at level 5 the use of it is only 36%. The use of after decreases and so the overall use of temporal conjunctions decreases. This decrease suggests a similar pattern to that exhibited by and. Recall that it is not necessary to connect sentences with and, but at the lower levels the narrators seem to feel the necessity to connect sentences. The same can be said of

after. Again it is not critical to the understanding of the narrative to mark sequence with after; much of this is understood by the simple fact that one sentence follows another, and so the addressee presumes a sequential order. However, at the lower levels, just as the narrators do with and, they seem to feel the necessity to mark temporality overtly; this necessity decreases with increased language proficiency.

The increased use of temporal conjunction at level 6, seems, at first glance, to contradict this trend. This is not inconsistent, however, when the temporal conjunctions are analyzed in detail; after constitutes only 39% of temporal conjunctions while there is a marked increase in variety. From levels 1-5, generally the only other temporal conjunctions used to mark the beginning of the narrative, first, at the beginning, at first, etc. The other temporal conjunctions used show more variety. At level 6, the narratives show more subtlety in the conjunctions used. Some of the temporal conjunctions used in addition to after and in the beginning are: a while later, finally, from now on, then, before and now.

While the temporal conjunctions at level 6 show more variety as well as an increase from level 5, those at level 7 show a decrease from level 6. The change is insignificant from level 5 to 7. This is difficult to explain; there is

less variety than at level 6. What is interesting at this level is that it is the first time that the common native temporal conjunction then is used with any consistency. It is used only once at level 6 and is not used at all in any of the earlier levels, but it is used six times at level 7. The use of after rather than then at the earlier levels might be explained if one considers that the L2 speakers seem to find it necessary to mark temporal relations and to be as clear as possible. Considering these two points, by using after rather than then, which the L2 speakers might not know or are unsure of, they are able to mark clearly the temporal relationship with a word that has clear semantic reference.

4.4.5. SUMMARY OF CONJUNCTION

The patterns of conjunction in the present narratives provide some worthwhile insights into the use of conjunction by speakers learning English as a second language. All four types of connectors are used although with varying frequency. The additive conjunction and is the most widely used, and as in L1 speech serves as both a default conjunction and a filler. Speakers are able to maintain the flow of discourse with and and also consider what they will say next by using the filler and ..ehh.. . However, as the speakers' facility with English increases,

they use this default conjunction less. The only adversative used in the narratives is but. It is not used often and shows no particular trend in use. When it is used, it is always used appropriately; it always marks an upcoming contrast. Causal conjunction is relatively uncommon in L1 speech and proves to be so as well in the present L2 narratives. There is a slight but insignificant increase in use as proficiency increases. In L1 English, the most common temporal conjunction is then; in the present narratives it is after. This temporal conjunction is used often at the lower levels and less and less as proficiency increases. At level 6, the use of temporal conjunctions increases. While after is still used to some extent, there is a greater variety of temporal conjunctions used which explains the increase. What is used with some consistency at level 7 is the common conjunction used by native English speakers, then.

4.5. LEXICAL COHESION

The final type of cohesion Halliday and Hasan (1976) describe is lexical cohesion, the cohesive effect achieved by vocabulary selection. Halliday and Hasan distinguish between reiteration, a lexical item referring back to another, and collocation, association of lexical items that regularly co-occur. The present investigation examines

only reiteration. The following example from Halliday and Hasan (1976:279) indicates the continuum or "cline", as Halliday and Hasan put it, of reiteration:

- (73) I turned to the ascent of the peak
- a. The ascent is perfectly easy
 - b. The climb is perfectly easy
 - c. The task is perfectly easy
 - d. The thing is perfectly easy
 - e. It is perfectly easy.

Example (73a) is an example of repetition since ascent of (73) is repeated; in (73b) climb is a synonym of ascent; in (73c) task is a superordinate of ascent; in (73d) thing is a general noun, and finally in (73e) it is a personal reference item. The examples in (73), then, illustrate the continuum from specific to general and also show the thin line between reiteration, from (73a)-(73d) and reference as in (73e).

Native speakers of English have recourse to all types of reiteration, and they exhibit a wide variety of lexical choice. In her analysis of lexical choice in native English narratives elicited after showing the Pear Film, Downing (1980:91) shows how two different speakers choose to describe the same action. While Subject A uses pick frequently throughout her narrative, Subject B uses pick, pluck, drop, get down, dump, pick up, take off, and place, among others to describe the same actions that Subject A handles with a single verb. Although these examples

illustrate the most extreme cases in Downing's corpus, they exemplify the diversity of usage. Downing notes, too, that in terms of concrete objects, once the decision has been made to refer to a particular object, the freedom which the speaker has varies greatly. According to Downing, this freedom depends on the number of lexicalized labels available and on the speaker's familiarity with them. She maintains that "for some entities, there is one standardized label which is sufficient for the purposes of most speakers in most situations" (1980:99). In these cases, the entity is highly codable. For example, in Downing's narratives, ladder was consistently labeled as such, while the pears in the film were labeled in six different ways. In addition, as Downing points out, even though it is considered stylistically infelicitous to use the same term to refer to an entity, her subjects "obstinately stayed with the terms they had originally chosen in referring to most of the entities in the film" (1980:118).

In addition to staying with the same label initially mentioned, the narrators in Downings study also use what Rosch (1976, cited in Downing, 1980) terms basic level names which she claims are most used in actual discourse. For example, most of Downing's subjects used the term bicycle rather than the more abstract superordinate term

vehicle or the more specific subordinate one, ten-speed.

In certain cases these speakers deviated from the basic level category and either used the superordinate or the subordinate. According to Downing, superordinates occur when the object has a poor level of codability. Downing (1980:109) maintains that this is for one of two reasons:

(a) The speaker is unaware of the existence of a conventionalized basic level label for the conceptually well-defined category in question.

(b) The specific referent at issue fits poorly into the conventionalized basic level category with which it is most closely associated. That is, it is a nonprototypical member of the category.

Downing's example refers to the bolo-bat, something many subjects were unfamiliar with. Some subjects referred to it by related basic level categories such as bat and ball while others assigned appropriate superordinate labels to it such as toy or the general noun thing. In certain cases subjects used a subordinate rather than a basic level category. Rosch established bird as the basic level category, but in the Pear Film the only bird is a rooster and is referred to as such. Downing suggests that the use of the subordinate term rooster rather than the basic term bird is because roosters are a well-known and well-defined subset of birds. She claims, in addition, that they are

not particularly good exemplars of the bird category as a whole. From this evidence, Downing proposes that some members of basic level categories are perceived in terms of their lower-level category membership rather than their basic level identity. She posits that this may be because they lack the typical attributes of the members of the basic level category or because they are particularly salient or familiar as lexical items.

Downing's work provides some important implications in considering lexical cohesion. While there are a variety of choices open to native speakers, they seem to prefer using basic level categories and, in cases where they do not, this choice is governed by specific criteria.

Second Language Use

The use of lexical cohesion shows no real developmental trend in the narratives under study. In fact, across all levels, lexical cohesion exhibits the same kind of tendencies as those in Downing's (1980) research. It has already been mentioned that repetition is used extensively at the lower levels and decreases as proficiency increases, replacing the repeated item with a pronoun. While this at first may seem to indicate a development with respect to lexical cohesion it does not; it indicates rather a greater facility with reference.

While repeated items are replaced with pronouns more often as proficiency increases, the variety of lexical items used does not change even though they may be used less at the higher levels. In fact, just as Downing's subjects "obstinately" stay with the terms they originally chose, so too do the present subjects in the majority of cases.

This can be demonstrated by taking the watermelon as an example. It is variously referred to as watermelon/melon, fruit, and thing, although with varying degrees of frequency; watermelon is most frequent, and thing is the least frequent.

That watermelon is the most common lexical choice indicates its familiarity or salience. In eighteen of the twenty-eight narratives, the fruit is referred to as a watermelon. In one case the narrator refers to it as both a watermelon and a melon. In another narrative the fruit is introduced as a watermelon and all subsequent mentions are melon. In three other cases where the watermelon is referred to as such, there is one case in each narrative where a more general term is used. For example:

(74) And they see watermelon
And they all the people scare by the new thing they
see (Narr.11 L.3 S. 2-3).

In example (74), the watermelon is only referred to as a thing when the narrator speaks about it in its most general

sense, that is, as something new to the people. The same is true in the following example:

(75) And everybody in this country didn't know this kind of fruit (Narr.13 L.4 S.6)

Here again, the narrator refers to 'the fruit in its broadest sense rather than referring to the specific fruit of the film. In (76) the narrator refers once to the watermelon as thing:

(76) ... when you sow the little part it can grow up after for the same thing (Narr.19 L.5 S.11)

As in (74) and (75), the narrator refers to the fruit as a general entity, not the fruit in the film. In these three narratives these are the only times the watermelon is referred to as something other than the watermelon. However, as (74)-(76) indicate, they are not references to the watermelon in the film.

In three narratives the watermelon is referred to simply as a melon. Again, once the narrators decide on the term, they tend to stay with that term.

In four cases, the watermelon is referred to by its superordinate, fruit. In these cases, as with the native English examples, the narrators are perhaps unsure of the word. Although the subordinate term, watermelon, seems to be the most salient and well-known term even to the least

proficient L2 speakers, it seems clear that the word is not known to all the speakers. In these cases, the speakers use the appropriate superordinate label.

Use of the general noun thing is extremely rare in the narratives. In one case it is used with some consistency, but when the narrator establishes that the thing is actually a melon, he uses melon throughout the rest of the narrative. He says:

(77) And he take the melon the thing the melon
It was a melon (Narr. 6, L.2, S.18-19)

The narrator does not refer to the thing as a melon until the arrival of the second man, so he is well into the story before he establishes what it is. It is interesting to note how he makes the transition to the more specific term. In (77) the narrator introduces it as a melon, refers to it again with the term he has initially established, thing, and again as melon. With the next sentence, he unequivocally establishes it as a melon with the statement, It was a melon. Subsequent to this, the narrator refers to it as a melon.

The example of the watermelon is indicative of the way lexical cohesion is used throughout the narratives. There is very little use of any type of lexical cohesion other than repetition; this occurs at all levels.

4.5.1 SUMMARY OF LEXICAL COHESION

While native speakers have available the use of repetition, synonyms, superordinates and general nouns to express reiteration, in speech, evidence indicates that they do not use all these devices in a single narrative. Repetition seems to be the general strategy employed. In addition, speakers tend to use a basic level name as their choice. If they do not, Downing (1980) posits some reasons why. Speakers use superordinates or general nouns such as thing if they are unsure of the basic level name or if it does not fit readily into a basic category. Speakers might use a term subordinate to the basic level name if it is very common and thus highly salient or, again, if it does not fit well into the basic level category. The L2 speakers of the present study show the same proclivities as the native speakers. This is illustrated by analyzing the lexical choices used to describe the watermelon. The term watermelon is the most common choice, presumably because it is a common entity. The superordinate fruit, is used in some cases where it seems the narrator does not know the word watermelon. The general noun, thing, is very rare. Again, as in the L1 examples, the L2 speakers stay with one choice once an entity has been introduced into the discourse; repetition, then, is the most common type of lexical cohesion in the present narratives.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS

The goals of this study were to determine how ESL students use cohesive devices to maintain the flow of discourse, to see if there is a difference among the levels of proficiency and, finally, to examine any problems occurring in the use of cohesion. All three questions have been answered to some degree.

Considering the first question, it is clear that the subjects develop definite strategies to maintain the flow of discourse. To some extent, these strategies change according to language proficiency. The subjects in the present study use pronouns across levels. However, at the lower levels, the students make it clear what they are talking about by repeating the item rather than by using a proform. Because of this, use of pronouns increases with proficiency while use of the definite article decreases. At all levels the subjects make it clear that given-new information, that which is recoverable or given as opposed to that which is non-recoverable or new, is critical and use indefinite and definite articles appropriately. Repair types indicate this awareness, and so further the claim

that this is the case. Another strategy for preserving the continuity of the narrative is in the use of conjunction. The additive, and, is the most common conjunction. It is used both as a default conjunction and a filler, particularly at the lower levels. The use of and gives the narrator time to formulate the next thought as well as provide the addressee with the knowledge that more is to follow. Temporal conjunction use also provides some evidence for an understanding of how these subjects mark temporality. The most common temporal conjunction is after, and its use is particularly marked at the lower levels. As in the case of the additive and, these narrators seem to find it necessary to mark temporal relations in this way. Another strategy for making a narrative clear involves lexical cohesion, in this case reiteration. Although speakers might have it within their power to make a narrative stylistically more interesting by using repetitions, synonyms, superordinates and general nouns within the same text, they do not. Once an item is introduced by a particular name, it remains so.

In response to the second issue, there is some developmental trend. This is evident in the use of the pronoun system and in the use of additive and temporal conjunction. However, comparative reference, adversative conjunction and reiteration show no developmental

tendencies. Causal conjunction shows a very slight, statistically insignificant increase, so it is debatable whether one can indeed see it as an increase.

Finally, the only problems that occur are referential. The most critical problem is pronoun use with no antecedent. This obviously affects the coherence of the message. The other problem is with number. For example, a plural noun might subsequently be referred to with a singular pronoun. However, there are surprisingly few problems with reference. It is certainly the case that there might be other problems which simply did not surface in the present study. Avoidance and task type are just two possibilities which might have suppressed other problems.

The results of the present study provide, above all, some useful insights into strategies of language use on the part of L2 speakers. Their ultimate aim seems to be, in keeping with some of Grice's (1975) maxims of conversation incorporated in the cooperative principle: to be informative, avoid obscurity of expression, and avoid ambiguity. In order to be clear and cooperative, L2 speakers at different levels of proficiency draw on different devices. At the lower levels, subjects appear to overcompensate for their limited language proficiency. They use an overabundance of additive conjunction to "tie" the text together. Rather than using the pronominal

system, they use repetition. Following de Beaugrande's (1980) claim that what cohesion does is to render a text efficient, an explanation of the L2 narratives emerges. The use of various cohesive devices reduces redundancies, and in so doing lessens the cognitive load and assists short-term memory, enabling the addressee to process the "largest amounts with the smallest expenditure of resources" (1980:132). An overriding consideration is clarity of text. Part of this clarity is also efficiency, but beginning L2 speakers simply do not have the resources to make a text efficient; it is all they can do to make it clear. To aid in making a text clear, then, speakers draw on the cohesive devices available to them.

Yet despite the tendencies on the part of these speakers, some reminders of the limitations of the study are in order. The corpus is limited in both number of subjects and first language background. More data needs to be collected from a larger group of subjects and from a wider range of language backgrounds to see if these patterns are consistent. Also, it must be remembered that the subjects performed only one task, a narrative one. It might be the case that other tasks demand a different set of cohesive devices. Nevertheless, examination of the use of cohesive devices in second language acquisition

is a productive area of research.

Finally, in second language acquisition research, one often attempts to determine the teaching implications of such research; indeed, this is the case with the present research. While the narrators of the present study seem to have definite strategies for conveying the story, they were taxed by the requirement of organizing a large piece of text. In Anderson, et al. (1984) and Brown and Yule's (1984) terms, these subjects had a "long turn" of speech. These researchers have demonstrated that this can be a difficult task for native speakers, and this is certainly the case with ESL students. Very often in ESL classes students, while they may have ample opportunity to converse, do not necessarily have the chance at extended turns. This research demonstrates that, given the opportunity, they can produce extended narratives, but it also indicates the need for practice at it. There appears to be a developmental trend in textual proficiency and this natural development can be fostered with a variety of tasks. Extended narrative encourages this.

In conclusion, this research provides more evidence to the already large body of data supporting the developmental view of second language acquisition. The view is taken here, and supported by the data, that ESL speakers have definite discourse strategies for conveying information at various levels of proficiency,

and these strategies change as proficiency increases. These findings also have definite implications for ESL pedagogy.

FOOTNOTES

1. All transcriptions are orthographic representations of the interlanguage phonology.
2. The use of that in the L2 student narratives will be handled in a separate section since there is only one case of that + NP used in the entire corpus. The rest are used where a native speaker would use it.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, A., G. Brown, R. Shillcock and G. Yule. 1984. Teaching Talk: Strategies for Production and Assessment. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beaugrande, R. de. 1980. Text, Discourse and Process. Vol. 1V in Advances in Discourse Processes, R.O. Freedle (Ed.), Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corp.
- Beaugrande, R. de and B. Colby. 1979. Narrative Models of Action and Interaction. Cognitive Science 3: 43-66.
- Beaugrande, R. de and W. Dressler. 1981. Introduction to Text Linguistics. London: Longman.
- Brown, G. and G. Yule. 1983. Discourse Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, G. and G. Yule. 1984. Teaching the Spoken Language. Cambridge University Press.
- Carrell, P. 1982. Cohesion is not coherence. TESOL Quarterly 16: 479-488.
- Carrell, P. 1984. Interactive Text Processing: Implications for ESL Reading Classrooms. Paper presented at the Midwest Regional TESOL Meeting, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Celce-Murcia, M. and D. Larsen-Freeman. 1983. The Grammar Book: An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Chafe, W. (Ed.) 1980. The Pear Stories. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Chapman, L.J. and A. Stokes. 1979. Confirming children's use of cohesive ties in text: pronouns. The Reading Teacher 13: 317-322.
- Clancy, P. 1980. Referential choice in English and Japanese narrative discourse. In Wallace Chafe (Ed.) The Pear Stories. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Cohen, A., H. Glasman, P.R. Rosenbaum-Cohen, J. Ferrara, J. Fine. 1979. Reading English for specialized purposes: discourse analysis and the use of student informants. TESOL Quarterly 13: 551-564.
- Downing, P. 1980. Factors influencing lexical choice in narrative. In Wallace Chafe (ed.) The Pear Stories. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

- Faerch, C. 1979. Research in foreign language pedagogy. The PIF Project. Anglica et Americana No.7. Copenhagen: Dept of English, University of Copenhagen.
- Faerch, C. and G. Kasper. 1984. Two ways of defining communication strategies. Language Learning 34: 45-63.
- Fakhri, A. 1984. The use of communicative strategies in narrative discourse: a case study of a learner of Moroccan Arabic as a second language. Language Learning 34: 15-37.
- Freebody, P. and R.C. Anderson. 1981. Effects on Vocabulary Difficulty, Text Cohesion, and Schema Availability on Reading Comprehension (Technical Report No.225). Champaign: University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading.
- Freedle, R. (Ed.). 1979. New Directions in Discourse Processing. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Garrod, S. and A. Sanford. 1977. Interpreting anaphoric relations: the integration of semantic information while reading. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior 16: 77-90.
- Godfrey, D.L. 1980. A discourse analysis of tense in adult ESL monologues. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.) Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 92-110.
- Grimes, J. 1978. Papers on Discourse. Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Grice, H.P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and J.L. Morgan (Eds.) Syntax and Semantics (Vol.3). New York: Academic Press, 41-58.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1967. Notes on transitivity and theme in English. Journal of Linguistics 3: 199-244.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1979. Development of texture in child language. In T. Myers (Ed.) The Development of Conversation and Discourse. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and R. Hasan. 1976. Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

- Hasan, R. 1968. Grammatical Cohesion in Spoken and Written English. London: Longman.
- Hawkins, J. 1978. Definiteness and Indefiniteness: A Study in Reference and Grammaticality Prediction. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press.
- Keller-Cohen, D. 1979. Repetition in the non-native acquisition of discourse: its relation to text unification and conversational structure. In R.O. Freedle (Ed.) New Directions in Discourse Processing. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corp., 245-271.
- Kintsch, W. and T.A. van Dijk. 1978. Toward a model of text comprehension and production. Psychological Review 85: 363-394.
- Labov, W. and J. Waletzky. 1967. Narrative analysis: oral versions of personal experience. In June Helm (Ed.) Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts. Proceedings of the 1966 Annual spring meeting of the American Ethnological Society,, Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 12-24.
- McCutchen, D. and C.A. Perfetti. 1982. Coherence and connectedness in the development of discourse production. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh. (ERIC reproduction service No. ED 233 336).
- Morgan, J.L. and M.B. Sellner. 1980. Discourse and linguistic theory. In R.J. Spiro, B.C. Bertram and W. F. Brewer (Eds.) Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 165-200.
- Prince, E. 1981. On the inferencing of indefinite - this NPs. In A. Joshi, B. Webber, and I. Sag (Eds.) Elements of Discourse Understanding. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richek, M.A. 1977. Reading comprehension of anaphoric forms in varying linguistic contexts. Reading Research Quarterly 12: 145-165.
- Schwartz, J. 1980. The negotiation for meaning: repair in conversations between second language learners of English. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.) Discourse Analysis in Second Language Research. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 138-153.

- Shegloff, E. and G. Jefferson, and H. Sacks. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. Language 53: 361-382.
- Stein, N. and T. Nezworski. 1978. The effects of organization and instructional set on memory. Discourse Processes 1: 177-193.
- Stoodt, B.D. 1972. The relationship between understanding grammatical conjunctions and reading comprehension. Elementary English 49: 502-504.
- Sunday, B. R. 1982. Cohesive Characteristics of Sample Texts Produced by Bilingual Students. Paper presented at the Conference of the Ohio TESOL-Association for Bilingual/Multicultural Education. (ERIC reproduction service No. ED 222 084.
- Tannen, D. 1980. A comparative analysis of oral narrative strategies: Athenian Greek and American English. In Wallace Chafe (Ed.) The Pear Stories. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Cor., 51-87.
- Tannen, D. 1982. Oral and literate strategies in spoken and written narratives. Language 58: 1-21.
- Searle, J.R. 1969. Speech Acts. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.
- Steffensen, M.S. 1981. Register, Cohesion and Cross-Cultural Reading Comprehension. Technical Report No.220. Champaign: University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading.
- Tierney, R.J. and J.H. Mosenthal. 1983. Cohesion: Problems with Talking about Text: A Brief Commentary Technical Report No.298. Cambridge, Mass.: Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc., University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading. (ERIC reproduction service No. ED 236 566).
- Tierney, R.J. and J. H. Mosenthal. 1983. Cohesion and textual coherence. Research in the Teaching of English 17:215-229.
- van Dijk, T.A. 1977. Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse. New York: Longman Group Ltd.
- van Dijk, T.A. and W, Kintsch. 1983. Strategies of Discourse Comprehension. New York.: Academic Press.

- Wald, B. 1983. Referents and topic within and across discourse units: observations from current vernacular English. In F. Klein-Andrew (Ed.) Discourse: Perspectives on Syntax. N.Y.: Academic Press, 91-116.
- Widdowson, H.G. 1978. Teaching Language as Communication. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H.G. 1979. Rules and procedures in discourse analysis. In T. Myers (ed.) The Development of Conversation and Discourse. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Williams, R. 1983. Teaching the recognition of cohesive ties in reading a foreign language. Reading in a Foreign Language 1: 35-52.

Appendix

TRANSCRIPTS OF ESL STUDENT NARRATIVES

Narrative 1: Level 1

First the the sun .. eh .. wake up

And after .. eh .. eh .. ok . the the birds .. eh .. go up go up and .. eh the

I saw .. eh .. many many .. eh .. people work work .. eh .. the for the crop ([krop]).

And .. eh .. he .. eh .. they work work .. eh .. long time

And after .. eh .. after that the a new .. eh .. a new fruit for for them .. eh .. arrive

And .. eh .. eh .. and they they .. eh .. they don't .. eh .. they didn't .. eh .. know .. eh .. mmm .. they didn't know (laughs) .. eh .. what is the the the fruit

And the a man .. eh .. very .. eh .. very .. eh .. very big and .. eh .. strong .. eh .. arrive

And .. eh .. he .. eh .. cut the the the fruit with with a a big .. eh .. knife

And .. eh .. he .. eh .. and .. eh .. all the people .. eh .. test..ta.taste .. eh .. this fruit

And after I don't know

Eh .. I think he .. eh .. the the people .. eh .. the people didn't like this fruit

And after .. eh .. an.and after the the this .. eh .. this .. eh .. big man .. eh .. left

And another man arrive

And .. eh .. he .. eh .. this man show .. eh .. show show show us .. no .. show them .. eh .. this fruit and this .. eh .. and the the pepin ... I don't know ...

And .. eh .. he said he said them it's a very .. eh .. a very .. eh .. good fruit

And .. eh .. eh .. you can can .. eh .. eh .. to make a rake a crop with fruit with .. eh .. I don't know this word ...

And after .. ehh .. many people .. ehh .. crop ([krop]) ..
ehh .. cro ...

Ehh .. ehh .. many people .. ehh .. put in the the ground
.. ehh .. and ..ehh.. I don't know ..ehh.. That's it

Narrative 2: Level 1

Ehh .. Ehh .. the they many people .. ehh.. saw the the sun
 ([sin]) .. ehh.. ... in the see see (inaudible)

Ehh.. in the big ..ehh.. big ..ehh.. (laughs)
 ...wat.watermelon watermelon ..ehh..

And ..ehh.. they ..ehh.. they can't believe it ...et...

And the the men ..ehh.. enter the the ... c'est ...
 (laughs) enter in the big mascarade

Et and ..ehh.. and the.they many people in ..ehh..in
 ..ehh.. (laughs) '....(pause) ... put off put put no pas
 put ..ehh..get off get off the man ..ehh..

And the other man ...le.. there ..ehh.. (snaps fingers)

So the ... no,no ... my my dictionary (researcher,'no,no,
 it's o.k.')

demontrer..c'est quoi? ... explication (researcher,'mhhh,o.k. that's fine ... sure')

for the the the the watermelon

And the many people is very happy .. is very happy

That's all

Narrative 3: Level 1

O.k. ..ehh.. first ..umm.. ..ehh..many people ..ehh.. make a crop ([krop]) o.k.?

And ..ehh.. Suddently a a melont is born (laughs) o.k.

And ..ehh.. a people .. a person ..ehh.. come back near the melon and ..ehh.. cut with aggressivity the melont

And ..ehh.. other person don't understand what he make what he do

And ..ehh.. they ..ehh..ehh..ehh.. rejet don't like this persont

And after another persont another persont come come near the of the same melon and ..ehh.. explain ..ehh.. to the other persont ..ehh.. what is that

And ..ehh.. the the the the ..ehh.. and after ..ehh.. he explain to ..ehh..umm..umm.. what the melont ..ehh.. can can be ..ehh..ehh.. come

That's it.

Narrative 4: Level 1

Mmm I ..ehh.. like the .ehh.. presentation of the film..
the ..ehh.. the ..ehh..ehh.. personages ..ehh.. the people
in the film

And ..ehh.. I think ..ehh.. it's the beginning of the
..ehh..

To found ..ehh..ehh.. a watermelon

And ..ehh.. all the all the people was scared

And ..ehh.. a strong man a muscular man come

And he cut the melon the watermelon

All the all the people was surprised

And he after he ..ehh.. he found the ..ehh.. he showed to
the people all to ...forget the word...ehh.. (pause) how
watermelon grew wit ..ehh.. little piece ..ehh.. (pause)

That's it.

Narrative 5: Level 2

Ehh.. o.k. ..ehh.. at the first .. at the beginning you see the birth going ..ehh.. out

It's the winter to coming ..come in

And ..ehh.. you saw.. I saw the the people ..ehh.. on on the little town

I don't say that it the town

But I think because it's ..ehh..ehh.. farmer and ..ehh.. and ..ehh.. (laughs)

The winter pass

And ..ehh.. after I remember ..ehh..ehh.. a girl look ..ehh.. look ..ehh.. in the recolte and saw a a melon

But she don't she don't know what is it what is that what is this what is that

And ..ehh.. she's ..ehh.. she's ..ehh.. really afraid

And everybody's afraid .. too

Ehh.. and a man came and was a strong one and ..ehh.. not aggressive but ..ehh.. yes aggressive.. in a sense yes..ehh and take the melon and ..ehh.. cut the melon and eat

And everybody think ..ehh.. it's a blot I think blo..blo red

And ..ehh.. she eat she ate eat ate that

And ..ehh.. at first the the people are afraid

But after ..ehh.. decide to ..ehh.. chase no ..ehh.. chase the man and ..ehh..ehh.. take a stone and ..ehh.. everything (? thenher have in her hand) and pitch

And the man going out

After another man came but he's ..ehh.. gentle .. and ..ehh.. more ..ehh..

He tried to ..ehh.. speak to have a contact with the people the people and ..ehh.. explain to it's not dangerous

It's just a food

And it's good for you

And ..ehh.. it's easy to ..ehh.. to ..ehh.. to ..ehh.. put on the ground

And ..ehh.. you put the ...the little ..ehh.. (laughs) pot on the melon on the ground

And ..ehh.. the years after you have you have a a good recolte and ..ehh.. a lot of food and everybody understand that

And the years after you have a lot of melon to ..ehh.. eat

Everybody is happy

Everybody is happy

Narrative 6: Level 2

OK ..ehh.. we saw some ..ehh.. people who ..ehh.. prepare and seed ..ehh.. the ground

And ..ehh.. after the the seed are growing

The seed grow

And ..ehh.. thi..they had some ..ehh..

They recolte some apple

They are with some apple

They ate some apple

And ..ehh.. after they see another another time I don't know I think...

And they ..ehh.. they saw ..ehh.. a strange ..ehh.. thing in the centre of the seed

And ..ehh.. they didn't know what it was

And ..ehh.. one day a a big tall man arrive

And ..ehh.. he cut .. the thing in the centre..and ate that in front of everybody

Everybody was afraid

And ..ehh.. they thought that it was a coeur I don't know a coeur I don't know

And after they ..ehh.. tro some ..ehh.. block of piece of rock

And ..ehh.. the man ..ehh.. ehh.. gone go go in the doorway another place went to another place

And after there was a.another guy ..ehh.. short shorter and ..ehh.. thinnér

And he ..ehh.. he take the melon the thing the melon it was a melon and eat that and offre.offer that to ..ehh.. the other people

and the other people like it liked it

He show he show he showed them how to to ..ehh.. seed a melon

And after they they seed many melons

And ..ehh.. That's that's the end.

Narrative 7: Level 2

The part that I remember the most its ..ehh.. when the people are afraid because he saw somethinmg he didn't know it was

And after a man come came and cut ..ehh.. melonwater

And the people wanted to get out the man because it's supposed to be ..umm.. ?divera? something like that because he ate eat melon wa.watermelon

And after the man come back

And they he tried ... to... taste... it

He do taste to the other people

And the people .. like that

And after .ehh.. he learn how to grow ..ehh.. watermelon

And all people wanted to agran (?agrandir?) for watermelon

And the end of the movie it's ..umm.. the planet was full of watermelon

That's all

Narrative 8: Level 2

Emm.. mai..it's begin ..ehh.. he dug a hole for ..umm.. a tree

And after this tree grow

And they ..ehh.. (h)ate apple

And after they they found a watermilon

And they ..ehh.. wonder what what what what was that

And they ..ehh.. look for a man

And the man eat the watermelon

And they ..ehh.. they were afraid

So they went see another man

And the other man said to us that was good to eat

And they eat the watermelon

And ..ehh.. now they know what is a watermelon

Narrative 9: Level 3

Ok

At the beginning we saw ..umm.. watermelon watermelon
(barely audible)

Ahh ok the sun set the sun set o.k.?

The sun set

And ..umm.. a lot of tree was growing

And after we saw people

And I don't remember what they do

But (laughs) no we saw a lot of people

And ..umm.. mmm.. (laughs) they during the film ..emm..
melon is growing

And ..emm.. everybody is afraid because I think I think
they(?) didn't see that before

So a man arrive and cut the melon in two parts

And ..ehh.. for the other people it's like ..ehh..
blood I think

And he eat ate that

And everybody want to kill him

Ehh.. I don't know why

But he run ..ehh.. run

I don't know the word

In French it's run after him

But I don't know in English

And ..umm.. after that the man go away

And another man arrive and ..ehh.. taste the melon
?alelemon? the melon?

And ..ehh.. everybody do like him and ..ehh.. like it
and ..ehh.. makes ..ehh.. melon too with the pepin..pip

I don't know the words

And that's the end I think

Narrative 10: Level 3

Ehh.. in the beginning we can see the ..ehh.. beginning of the world I think

When the o.k. the with the trees and the birds

And after the trees we we saw the faith of the people and ..ehh.. o.k.

The were ..ehh.. become bigger a lot of people

And after we saw the ..ehh.. watermelon ..ehh.. just one

And o.k. they ..ehh.. they were afraid about that

And after they taste it

And it was good

They o.k. they ..ehh.. find the umm.. they can have more if they put that in the ground

Ehh.. eh..At on the end everybody was ..umm.. happy and they like it liked it

Narrative 11: Level 3

A long time ago ..ehh.. the people ..ehh.. plant trees and
.. fruit ahh no not fruit

And (laughs)...

And ahh they they see watermelon

And they all the people scare by the the new thing they see
..

And ..ehh.. somebody come .. and cut the watermelon

And ... all the people see ..ehh.. like a blood

They think is .. they he make ..ehh.. something not good

And they ... hurt him . no. hurt or ..

And after another . person come

And ..ehh.. to and he le no he learn to the people what is
a watermelon is good for eat

And he can reproduce watermelon ..ehh.. with the grain

And the that's it

Narrative 12: Level 3

Ok in the st in the begin the start you see ..ehh.. the sunset

After we see a a bird to fly .

And ..ehh.. we see flower and tree to come tall

And ..ehh.. we see ..ehh.. people who ..ehh.. put in the harth in the earth . ground

And we come tall

And ..ehh.. we see ..ehh.. watermelon

When he see the the watermelon he shsh ..ehh.. the people was afraid ..

And a . a man come and ..ehh.. cut the watermelon

And ..ehh.. when the juice ..ehh.. go outside he ..ehh.. the people was afraid because he think its a blood ..

But it's only juice

And he want to kill the the .. the man because he think he kill someting

And ..ehh.. when another man come he explain what is the juice and ..ehh.. the watermelon

Ehh.. he . he ..ehh.. the people try the watermelon and like it

And now ..ehh.. the man explain ..ehh.. how ..ehh.. make other one

And ..ehh.. the people ..ehh.. make other one

And ..it's finish

Narrative 13: Level 4

Eh.. first of all we saw ..ehh.. people on the in the country I think

And ..ehh.. it it was before the agriculture

And ..ehh.. I saw the the first ..ehh.. the first time when ..ehh.. a person plant a tree to ..ehh.. to obtain some ..ehh.. some fruits

And ..ehh.. I think it was the the first step of the agri.agriculture the beginning of the agriculture

And ..ehh.. after I don't know why but ..ehh.. we we I saw the water watermelon

And everybody in this country ..ehh.. didn't didn't know ..ehh.. this ..ehh.. this kind of fruit I think because they yelled

And ..ehh.. a man a man come to a and cut cut this ..ehh.. watermelon

And he ate a piece of watermelon

And ..ehh.. everybody was ..ehh.. very scary (inaudible) scary

Ehh.. and ..ehh.. the the next the next man who came ..ehh.. ate ..ehh.. the watermelon and give some piece of the other people

And they ..ehh.. they like they liked it

And after he he show the the seeds the seeds in the watermelon

And he show to the people how to ..ehh.. to seed ..ehh.. to to put in the ground to obtain se many other watermelons

And it's the the beginning a again.of the agriculture

Narrative 14: level 4

I understood the movie like ..ehh.. the poor a poor population who ..ehh.. who work for a ..for their life

And ..ehh.. .. they don't know they don't know an .. enough .mmm. ...vegevegetation who who can .. who can grows

And ..ehh.. .. they ..ehh.. I don't know the name for the . watermelon. like that? (researcher : mmhmm) watermelon ..ehh.. ...

It's ..ehh.. ripe and ..ehh.. the the all the population was very afraid by that because they they they don't they don't know what is it

And a man arrive

The man . an ..ehh.. he he don't explain what is this and cut cut the watermelon and ..ehh.. . eat without explication

So the people was was was afraid by that because she didn't understand why why this man . eat ..ehh.. the watermelon like that

So ..ehh.. they.. they go out

They go out the man because it's a a bad man

After another man comes .. came and the the pop the population accept this man because he explain what is this an how how to eat that..

And after the . when the people know. know the the watermelon they like it and ..ehh.. want to ..ehh.. cultivate . this ..ehh.. this watermelon

Narrative 15: Level 4

Ehh.. In the beginning I saw the the sun rise..

And after it was ..ehh.. we saw umm a man who who work ..ehh.. in who work in with with the the eart

And ..ehh.. he put some . some ..ehh.. turners(?) in the in the in the eart ..

Wha and when they they they discovered the watermelon aa.everybody was was surprised

And no ..ehh.. nobody ..ehh.. know what what they can do wi with with thi that

And one day a a man . came

And he the the watermelon in in two parts

And they they thought the watermelon was ..ehh.. was bluding? .

But it wasn't it was ? it? ..ehh.. juice ..

And they they pitch some some stone to .to to ..ehh.. the man

And and the man left

And ..ehh.. some sometime after ano another man came

And he ta and he tell them that they can eat it ..ehh.. this fruit

And everybody taste

After that he he pass some ..ehh.. ke kernels to each ..ehh.. body

And and ..ehh.. they put in in the eart

And after in the end we can see the ?
watermelon

?

Narrative 16: Level 4

I think the the film ..ehh.. raconte in a raconte rac rac
in French we say raconte but he ..ehh..

That's a story that's the story of the of the world of the
human.story ..ehh.. all the the human ..ehh..

At the beginning we see we saw the pe the the world the
creation of the world

And ..ehh.. they live in a country

They they live with the culture ? o.k.

They culture something

They culti ..ehh..ehh.. I think ..ehh..

And wheat . they ..ehh.. they .. they learn to culture
something

And ..ehh.. once upon a time he's put ..ehh.. something
in a grass ..ehh.. un grain c'est un . green c'est
green (barely audible)

shed sheed I think in in a grass

And ..ehh.. they ..ehh.. they they found ..ehh.. a fruit

They don't know where they they come

And someone arrive

He take the fruit

And he he ..ehh.. give it for her for him

And ..ehh.. everybody have afraid of ..ehh.. of the
something new

When something is new evre everybody have afr afraid of the
. of the the something we don't know o.k.

And ..ehh.. After ..ehh.. and ..ehh.. someone keep the the
new fruit for him

And everybody have afraid are scare of him

And after another one come

And he they ..ehh.. explain to others. wach is what is that
and how to and .ehh..ehh.. what's what's that and all what
to do with with with it

And ..ehh..`after everybody ..ehh.. shell . snee see seed
seed the fruit and ..ehh.. eat the fruit

I think that's the history

But I think th this history is ..ehh.. is ..ehh..ehh.. is
..ehh.. one moment

I think this history is ..ehh.. analogy o.k.

With the .. with the people

Everybody when we saw something new o.k

We are we are sc we have afraid

Don't have afraid

It I think the story says don't if we if we seed ..ehh..
cacombre you recolte the cacombre o.k.

And ..ehh.. when we saw something new don't be don't be
afraid of it but ..ehh.. let ..ehh..

Try to understand what it is

And when we see what is when we know what it is perhaps
you'll like it

That's the same thing for the life

Don't say the life it's no good

Learn about it and ..ehh.. try de es try to do something

After you you'll lovt you'll love it you'll like it

I think that's ..ehh.. the story

Narrative 17: Level 5

O.k. I ..ehh.. thought ..ehh.. a lot of thing about this story

There are ..ehh.. many fences

And ..ehh.. First I think ..ehh.. I thought that's ..ehh.. the evolution of the man a little bit

At the f: In the beginning of the film we ..ehh.. we saw ..ehh.. the nnn the environment the the nature

And ..ehh.. after the man arrive arrived.will arrive

And ..ehh.. the mm...oh I don't know this word in English . the the plants and the.. vegetable and ..ehh.. all these thing

And ..ehh.. I'm really surprise when I saw the.. fruit

I don't know the word for this ..ehh.. fruit in English

And I I don't really understand what does it mean all this ..ehh.. this mise en scene (laughs)

And maybe I don't know really maybe ..ehh.. at at one at one times I think its ..ehh.. . a stranger thing who arrive in the country

And the people are afraid about that

They don't know ..ehh.. what is it

And . they have we have ..ehh..a respect about this thing

And ..ehh.. ?

?

And and ..ehh.. they are ..ehh.. after they are able to ..ehh.. to understand this this thing and ..ehh.. to to laiv with that

Narrative 18: Level 5

O.K. at the first you have the.. sunrise on on ..ehh.. nice country

It's in ..ehh..ehh.. rural country

Ehh.. and ..ehh.. they are a lot of people

And they...

Suddenly they are afraid of something

We don't see it ..ehh.. immediately

It's a it's a big fruit

It's like a.. watermelon

inaudible

And ..ehh.. they turn arou around the melon .and look

They they don't ..ehh..

I'm sure that they don't know what's that ..ehh.. fruit

Ehh.. suddenly ..ummm.. a man was a special clothes ..ehh.. get go out of two doors with ..ehh.. big knife

And this man knows what's tha what's that what's this fruit

And he.. tried to show at ..ehh..ehh.. to the peoples what's ..ehh.. what we can do with this fruit

And then he. cut the melon ..ehh.. in two parts

And you can see the red ..ehh.. juice of melon ..ehh.. oh split on the eart

And ..ehh.. the peoples are not really ..ehh.. agree wh with what he just do

And ..ehh.. it seemed to be ..ehh.. pushed away

The man was pushed away

And ..ehh.. ehh.. a little bit of time that he came he came back ..ehh.. near the the fruit

And ..ehh.. ah before he ate some ..ehh.. some parts of fruit

And he do the same thing

He he he ate the fruits and show ..ehh.. to the peoples what ..ehh.. what's look like what's oh.(laughs)what's ..ehh.. what's the taste

And ..ehh.. ehh.. everybody took a parts of the fruit and and taste ..ehh..this fruit

And ..ehh..ehh.. the man show to the people how you can ..ehh.. sew the fruit with ..ehh.. the part (laughs)

And ..ehh.. ehh.. the it's finished when you saw the country with many many plants of of watermelon ..ehh.. growing

And the sun ..ehh..ehh.. the sun set

It's the sunset

That's all

Narrative 19: Level 5

The first impression I had it's at the beginning of the light on the earth the world

Ehh.. the first man they ..ehh.. discovered little by little ..ehh.. ch for the vegetables the fruit and everything

The trees were grow up

And ..ehh.. there's a man who who learned them to ..ehh.. sew when you sew ..ehh.. a grain

I don't know if it's the word- is it grain no? (R that's o.k.)

Umm It's grow up

And you can have a garden with that

Ehh.. and they were very excited

Andehh.. Yes they discovered that they eat it that they can eat it

There was a crowd a crowd of people

Umm. there were surprised to see that ..ehh.. the watermelon ..ehh.. when you sew sew the little part it can grow up after for ..ehh.. the same thing

And ..ehh.. just no not only for that for the trees

And ..ehh.. we saw that for the trees

I don't remember other things

Narrative 20: Level 5

Ahh it's a Sufi Tale

Ehh.. o.k. the movie begin

You have a a field a cloud and a sun

No there's not sun

And ..ehh.. you have a fly of birds and they climb in the clouds

So the fly and the clouds became a tree

After we can see some mans

The mans began to take ..ehh.. some fruit on the trees. on the tree

And they put the tree in the basket

After the man decide to sewing the field (?)

And they ..ehh.. put some seed on the on the field

And they begin to have ..ehh.. a witt a wheat

I think maybe not that but a wheat

And ..ehh.. they take a walk on the wheat

And one man open ..ehh.. open the wheat like if it was a ..ehh.. drapery

And he looks and see a watermelon

But we don't see the watermelon again

And he looks the watermelon and he begin to not cry but .. begin to umm cry if I can tell

And ..ehh.. so some person arrive maybe because he cry

And they looks and they see also the watermelon

And they begin to cry

And ..ehh.. they don't know what to do with that

And we see ..ehh.. like ..ehh.. a bush

And a strong man a arrive in the bush open the.. pass through the bush and see the watermelon

He take his big knife

And all the people looks this man like if he was a a god

And he took his knife and cut the watermelon

When he cut the watermelon we see umm ..ehh.. red liki. liquid

And this red liquid it's like a blood

So ..ehh.. the peoples are hungry angry about that

And they ..ehh.. they see him

No they when they see the the the the the likid the liquid red the the man take also a piece of the watermelon and taste

And he find it's very good

But the people becomas

Now the peoples became angry

And they ..ehh.. began to trow up so trow him some pebbles

And the man ..ehh.. run away

So ..ehh.. another man came and he looks the the watermelon

He decide to take a piece and to taste and he find it's very good

So the other peoples

An and he show at the other peoples that there is some se seeds in the watermelon

And he try to put on the. on the sand

And after we see ..ehh.. a watermelon ..ehh.. became to grow up

And ..ehh.. all the people make the same thing and we see a
feed with many many many watermelon

That's all

Narrative 21: Level 6

I think I think it talks about a part is about umm the man evolution

At the beginning he doesn't have any instrument

And ..ehh.. a while later a wh in the in the film we see that he has a a sabre

It's akind of evolution

And also we he learn that if he take so some seeds from a fruit or something like that he put it in the soil it t it makes a lot of ..ehh..trees that produce the the fruit

That's it

(R: O.k. that's generally what happened but what about the events.... story)

At the beginning ..ehh.. he he ate a part of a fruit

And all the people around seemed..ehh.. angry

And they they finally decided to taste the fruit

And they were happy

Th th They discovered th th the taste probably how how it an be good

Narrative 22: Level 6

Ahh. I think that it's about ..ehh.. from undeveloped ..ehh.. country

That there is their first time they're making a crops

The first time they are ..ehh..ehh.. cultivate their fields

So it's new for them

And after when I think it's watermelon

And it's first time they seen this

So they don't know if it's something you can eat or

And after ..ehh.. you are surprised

And I think they will ..ehh.. from now they will continue to make others(?_)

And and they thinks that it's ..ehh.. a thing to survive

And they will ..ehh.. su ..ehh.. live ..ehh.. better health healthy

And that's what I understand about the film,

(R: O.K. What happened in the film ? What were the events in the film?)

Well at first they they make the harvest

They cultivate

And ..ehh.. after when they saw the watermelon they were all scared

They didn't know what what was about

And when they saw the the one man starting to cut it and eating it they they start screaming

They thought it was a maybe poison or something

And after they start ea each one start to taste it

And after they were all like laughing and happy

So I think that.. maybe at first they didn't know what it is but now from now they will ..ehh.. eat it more often (laughs)

That that's the only thing I...

Narrative 23: Level 6

Ehh..ehh we see the sun rise

And then ..ehh.. you know it's not only a day

But it means umm generation or something like that

Time lapse o.k.

And you see that the people who are leaving .living in this country are near from the nature because from the beginning for two or three minutes you see only the mountains ..ehh.. and the skies , the sun and the rivers if there's some

And after you see that the people are dealing with nature to stay alive for a living

And they . they make some crops

And someone dis discover something they had never see seen

Umm it's a watermelon

And so ..ehh.. someone come

And probably it's a foreigner someone from outside who knows what it is

And umm the person cuts the melon and start to eat it

But people ..ehh.. always afraid about the things they don't understand

And they don't know what it is

So they think that he did a wrong thing

So they're mad at him

And they chase him

And he goes away

And someone else come and explain it what the other person before didn't

So now they can understand

And they they use the melon

And they like it

And after they they umm plant grains in in the soil

And a lot of melons are growing because now they know what what a melon ..ehh.. has to do with life

And for it's for eating

And that's all

Narrative 24: Level 6

At the beginning we saw some people

like a community of people

Ahh they seems to like earth and what she's giving to what
its giving to them the the fruit and all and the the
respect the earth eart yeah

And ..ehh.. they ..ehh.. they they they plant some ..ehh..
some some plants for ..ehh..

And ..ehh.. they want it to grow and to eat it

But they they respect it ? ?

So when they saw the watermelon they don't know what is
that

And they saw a red thing

Maybe when I saw it I thought what they thought it was a
blood

And they don't want to eat it

So when they see they saw the guy eat eat the watermelon
they they get angry

And they chased him

And after that wha another guy came came in and ..ehh..
showed to them that they they can eat that

And it's good

And they he showed to them to the the the seeds

You can plant it and have some some watermelon

Narrative 25: Level 7

Umm First ..ehh.. we could see that they were using ..ehh.. primitive ways of umm. in agriculture

O ..ehh.. to grow plants and different ways rather primitive

Then ..ehh.. we saw ..ehh.. a new for them it seemed to be a new plant

And so they were kind of,

They saw the I think it's a watermelon

And umm they were kind of

There was a fear because it was the first time for them that they saw that

So umm .they were screaming

And everyone got involved in that

And they did not know exactly what to do

So umm ..umm. how could I say ..

A tough guy or a strong guy tried to to impress them by showing them how to do that

But he did not .eh. manage to. teach them how to . to handle that new plant or

So he got umm. . I don't know how to do how to say that ..

There's been thrown out of the of the ? ? I don't know

Then after emm a smarter guy came

And he used .eh. more scientific way to teach them how to handle that

And they manage to enjoy the new crop

And they he teaches them how to use the seeds to grow more watermelons

So..I think that's all

Narrative 26: Level 7

O.k at the beginning we can see only ..ehh.. natural things without . human being in the beginning of the movie

And after we s wha the beginning we saw some birds and some some trees some vegetation

And ..ehh.. after human human beings ..ehh.. enter in the movie

And I think it's a kind of ..ehh.. reproduction of the the the history of the the the humanity the humanity

You have . you some human some primitive human beings who gather some fruits and some ..ehh.. some other natural natural things

And after they begin to . . to to make their own culture

They begin very primitively

Once again with small ..ehh.. small culture

After they they begin agriculture some kind of agriculture

And after you . I don't know

I didn't really unders to understand what happened

A lot of people seem to be very afraid

And I don't

Maybe it's because of the the other

After after this we saw a kind of ..ehh.. of melon

I can't say exactly what it was

Melon is it a word ? Melon

I It look it looked it looked like a melon

And I people were were afraid about this kind of ..ehh.. of I don't know a fruit

And ..ehh.. so a man decided to cut it and taste it

And he found it good

And other people tried it

They found it good too

So..and after .. ahh it's I don't remember anymore I think

So you can interpret this story in a lot of ways

Only some. maybe it's always like that when something new arrives

Something new happens

You are afraid of this

But after you taste it

And you like it

And you're not afraid anymore

That's it

Narrative 27: Level 7

I sa I saw it in two different ways

Umm first' if you if you take it ..ehh.. more ..ehh.. in the world of adults let's say you could say that it's ..ehh.. a primitive village who ..ehh..

no

It's a people who don't know about that thing'

And then they discover a new a new material or anything

And then ..ehh.. someone who knows how to use it shows emm shows it to the people

But he gets all the advantage

And ..emm but the people .. umm get umm people ..ehh.. on that's stupid

so they notice that there's a change

Or they know that someone is taking advantage.of them

But then they then another person comes in to show them again how you use it

But it's umm it's a good who comes

And he shows them how to use it to their advantage

You can use that in every in every situation when you don't know something

And ..ehh.. you can take it also'.. umm let's say it as a child who sees this is um.. a primitive a primitive village who finds ..ehh.. a watermelon

And they don't know what it is

And ..ehh..as how do you say someone who discovers a discovery man or something comes in

And he he sees this

It's a primitive village

And he wants to show himself and to be the chief maybe

And he he knows how to use a watermelon

It's good to eat

But they umm they find that he he's only there to ..ehh.. .
to show himself not to help them

So they get rid rid of him

And then a missionary or something comes in

And they show he shows them ..ehh.. how to use it how to
eat it

And that's it That's what I thought

Narrative 28: Level 7

The Sufi Tale A Sufi Tale is a black and white film

And there's a lot of ? ? a lot

It remind me of a like the ? ? of an Indian savages

It's a group of people who umm lives together

And théy plant ..ehh.. I don't know a seed seeds ?

And umm . umm. so a watermelon grew up

And they look very surprise an' astonished dumfounded to see that to see that

And they don't know what it is

And one of them taste it

And like it's it's not normal for them

It's like the water

For me the watermelon represent like a stranger in in a town

And everybody looks at him and don't know what to do about him

They don't want to umm to know him because he looks I don't know pecuriar

And so umm I think a farmer he comes

And he tastes it

And he show him he show them that it's good

And you should not be afraid of tasting watermelon'

So everybody aa taste it

And they found it very good

And it's like being friendly with, with som with a stranger with somebody new

I guess that's it

VITA.

Surname: WEST Given Names: ELIZABETH NORAH

Place of Birth: Victoria, B.C. Date of Birth: May 13, 1952

Educational Institutions Attended:

<u>UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, VICTORIA</u>	<u>1971</u> TO <u>1972</u>
<u>UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, VICTORIA</u>	<u>1974</u> TO <u>1981</u>
<u>UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA, VICTORIA</u>	<u>1982</u> TO <u>1985</u>

Degrees, Diplomas, Etc.

<u>B.A. (English)</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>University of</u>
<u>Victoria, Victoria</u>		
<u>Diploma in Applied Linguistics</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>University of</u>
<u>Victoria, Victoria.</u>		

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis or dissertation (the title of which is shown below) to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the Library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Dissertation

TEXTUAL COHESION; AN ANALYSIS OF ESL STUDENTS' ORAL
NARRATIVES

Author



ELIZABETH NORAH WEST

Aug 8, 1985
(Date)