REFERENCES


Strevens, P. *Teaching English in International Language*, Pergamon, 1980

Notes


(2) Of all the EST textbooks the "Focus series of OUP seems to be the only textbook series that deals with this aspect of textural cohesion."


CONCLUSION

1. The techniques suggested here are by the means exhaustive nor are they claimed to be the most effective ones.

2. Techniques on “ellipsis” and “substitutions” have been excluded, on the grounds of occurring with low frequenps in EST. Both are characteristics of spoken language.

3. In teaching features of cohesion, teachers of ESP should concentrate not only on the grammatical ways by means of which sentences are linked together but also the rhetorical value of these devices in creating coherent texts.
To exercise an understanding of such devices we may employ the following techniques:

a. Multiple Choice Format:
   In Line (X), Y refers to (i) a, (ii) b, (iii) c where a, b, c are grammatically (but not semantically) possible referents.

b. Direct questions: such as
   (i) What do (es) Y refer (s) to in line/sentence X?

c. Sentence completion
   (i) X in line/sentence X refers to .....  

4.1.2 Lexical cohesion

EST learners’ attention to lexically equivalent expressions in a given text can be exercised by means of rephrasing exercises in which the student is required to substitute another expression from the text for one given in a sentence drawn from the text, or a reworded version of one aims at drawing the learners’ attention to such overt markers of equivalent as “i.e.”, “that is to say”, “or”... etc. as well as synonymic and hyponymic expressions; or studying words in context.

4.2 On Discourse Markers Level:
A graded series of stages are suggested in the following technique for teaching/learning discourse markers:

4.2.1 The first stage involves “Insertion”. Texts written by a d for native speakers frequently omit these markers of discourse without too seriously affecting the flow intoligibility for a native speaker since he is aware of their communicative Value. Understanding the communicative value of these markers by Iraq learners of science is an essential skill to be mastered.

4.2.2 The second stage which involves “substitution” could be adopted next. Discourse markers such as those expressing “addition” “contrast and “logical sequence” which might be expressed by “moreover”, “however” and “therefore” respectively can be replaced by ones such as “and”, “but” and “so.”

4.2.3 A further important stage in the graded technique suggested above, is to ask the learners to reorder a jumbled set of sentences using their knowledge of connectives. It is also reasonable at this stage of learning to present a paragraph structure indicate the connectives.
concerned with the rhetorical coherence of discourse rather than the grammatical cohesion of text. The following table might clarify the function of some of the most frequently used connectives in EST writings (10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhetorical Value of Function</th>
<th>Connectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enumeration</td>
<td>first, second;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listing</td>
<td>in the beginning, next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time sequence</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>moreover, furthermore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcing</td>
<td>so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>overall, thus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical sequence</td>
<td>consequently, as a result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summarizing</td>
<td>therefore, hence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result/Consequence</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductive/Inductive</td>
<td>in other words, that is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explication</td>
<td>for example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustration</td>
<td>in other words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast substitution</td>
<td>alternatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>conversely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antitetic</td>
<td>however, nevertheless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although these words may not be omitted from traditional EST textbooks; if they are taught, their grammatical/structural function is generally stressed and their communicative, i.e. rhetorical value as markers of discourses has not received adequate attention (11).

4. SOME PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS
4.1 On Textual Cohesion Level:
4.1.1 Syntactic cohesion:
As stated earlier, anaphoric and cataphoric devices are the most frequent features of textual cohesion used in EST writings. Yet they were not given their due importance in textbooks and EST materials. The reason for this is, possibly that their meaning appears so obvious. This is quite true for native speakers of English. For Iraqi students as foreign learners of English, the situation is altogether different (12). Failure to select the correct referent causes serious misinterpretation of what scientific writers say or intend to explain. This is quite apparent when the referent is not a close antecedent or it refers to large stretches of text.
Consider the following example where the flower motif is sustained by the collocation of flower with garden, smell, nectar, bee honey, butterfly, pollen etc.

"We have only to watch the flowers in a garden to see that various kinds of insects visit flowers. As a general rule, the flowers which are visited by insects are brightly colored and have a sweet smell. Insects, however, do not visit flowers because they like bright colours, but because they know that such flowers contain the sugary liquid called nectar. Many insects, and some birds feed on nectar, while bees convert it into honey. Bees collect pollen, which they mix with honey to feed the young bees during the first few days of their life (8).

3. DISCOURSE MARKERS

Markers of discourse, i.e. connectives have been well described by Greenbaum (1969) and Winter (1971) and which can provide us with a frame work upon which to base teaching materials.

Connection can occur intra-sententially (within sentence units) or inter-sententially (across sentence boundaries). The latter is not only concerned with cohesion as a grammatical feature, but also as markers of rhetorical value in discourse, i.e. how sentence are used by the writer. Inter-sentential relationships have to do with the way in which sentences and groups of sentences combine to form units of discourse (9). The communicative value of such units may be explicitly marked by means of a connective or there may be no such explicit markers. Consider the following example:

1. The pollution by chemical waste of our seas is increasing daily.
2. If pollution reaches a certain concentration, marine life will cease to exist.
3. Therefore, it is essential that legislation be passed banning the dumping of toxic chemicals in rivers, waterways and in the open sea.

The semantic value of "therefore" introducing sentence (3) is to make the final sentence function (or act) as a logical conclusion or deduction based upon the information presented in sentence (1) and (2). Thus it is
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2.1.2 Substitution: IN EST
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"Plants grow this way, respond even more rapidly to poor growing conditions than they do to good ones" (5).

Cohesion is the label given to the various devices which link the parts of a written or spoken text. Such links can be made within a single clause or between adjacent clauses, between adjacent sentences or even between sentences which are some distance apart in the text. Cohesion can be achieved by means of lexical or (in a spoken text) phonological means. The latter will be ignored in the present treatment as we are mainly concerned with written discourse. The other types will be sufficiently considered in due course.

2.1.2.1 Synonyms

In some cases, rather than substitute a pronoun for a previously mentioned noun, the writer (in written discourse) may be permitted to supply the relevant information by reference to the preceding linguistic context.

2.1.2.2 Lexical Cohesion

Cohesion is also achieved in text through the patterned use of, vocabulary items. This is of two types: those of "chain" and "Choice". The first above-mentioned students proceeding from the hypothesis that the difficulty type which is referred to as systematic cohesion choice could be achieved by a repetition of a lexical item or its synonyms or co-occurring items, for the fact that the students have not yet mastered the connective devices and their communicative value as markers of discourse that help build a cohesive context (6). Since the notion of patterned text is a brief and precise function of the linking devices may not be as explicit as in other types of text; it is a problem for any student to understand how the various stretches of writing are linked, they are exposed to patterns in initial reading. If the problem gets even worse, if the student uses the wrong linking device, the text will distort the meaning of the whole text. Textbook designers, writing scientific books, seem to presuppose that students can easily cope with these many patterns. But cohesion is also a cohesional device. Patterning in language can also be imposed to text by use of teaching which collects as frequently as possible items which are most frequently to be expected at the end of the paper for EST teachers to test their validity whether in teaching cohesive devices or markers of discourse.
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1. INTRODUCTION

2.4.1.1 Ellipsis

Students of science and technology for whom English is not the mother tongue, seem to be facing special difficulties with cohesive devices which link the various parts of written discourse.