

UNIVERZITA PALACKÉHO V OLOMOUCI

Pedagogická fakulta

Katedra anglického jazyka

LENKA PELÍŠKOVÁ

II. ročník – prezenční studium

Obor: Učitelství anglického jazyka pro 2. stupeň základních škol –
Učitelství českého jazyka pro 2. stupeň základních škol

TEACHING COHESION AND COHESIVE DEVICES

Diplomová práce

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Jana Kořínková, Ph. D.

OLOMOUC 2014

Prohlašuji, že jsem závěrečnou práci vypracovala samostatně a použila jsem jen uvedených pramenů a literatury.

V Nové Cerekvi 22. 6. 2014

.....

Lenka Pelíšková

I would like to thank Mgr. Jana Kořínková, Ph. D. for her support and valuable comments on the content and style of my final project.

CONTENTS	Page
ABSTRACT	
INTRODUCTION	11
THEORETICAL PART	
1. Text	12
1.1. Standards of Textuality	13
2. Cohesion	15
2.1. The Relationship between Cohesion and Coherence	17
2.2. Limits of Cohesion	17
2.3. Types of Cohesion	18
2.3.1. Reference	20
2.3.1.1. Exophora, Anaphora and Cataphora	21
2.3.1.2. Personal Reference	23
2.3.1.3. Demonstrative Reference	23
2.3.1.4. Comparative Reference	24
2.3.2. Substitution	25
2.3.2.1. Nominal Substitution	27
2.3.2.2. Verbal Substitution	27
2.3.2.3. Clausal Substitution	28
2.3.3. Ellipsis	28
2.3.3.1. Nominal Ellipsis	29
2.3.3.2. Verbal Ellipsis	29
2.3.3.3. Clausal Ellipsis	30
2.3.4. Conjunction	31
2.3.4.1. Punctuation	32
2.3.5. Lexical Cohesion	33
2.3.5.1. Reiteration	33
2.3.5.2. Collocation	34
3. Teaching of Cohesion	36
3.1. Teaching of Cohesion at Czech Schools	36
3.1.1. Czech Terminology	37
3.2. Cohesion in Reading	38
3.3. Cohesion in Writing	39
3.3.1. Suitable Types of Exercises	41

Conclusion of the Theoretical Part	43
--	----

PRACTICAL PART

Introduction to the Practical Part	44
1. Choice of Textbooks	46
2.1. Analysis of Reference	46
2.1.1. Reference in Headway	47
2.1.2. Reference in Maturita Solutions	48
2.1.3. Reference in New English File	49
2.1.4. Summary of Reference	50
2.2. Analysis of Substitution	51
2.3. Analysis of Ellipsis	51
2.3.1. Ellipsis in Headway	52
2.3.2. Ellipsis in Maturita Solutions	53
2.3.3. Ellipsis in New English File	54
2.3.4. Summary of Ellipsis	55
2.4. Analysis of Conjunction	56
2.4.1. Conjunction in Headway	56
2.5.2. Conjunction in Maturita Solutions	58
2.4.3. Conjunction in New English File	58
2.4.4. Summary of Conjunction	59
2.5. Analysis of Complex Exercises	60
2.5.1. Complex Exercises in Headway	60
2.5.2. Complex Exercises in Maturita Solutions	62
2.5.3. Complex Exercises in New English File	63
2.5.4. Summary of Complex Exercises	63
2.6. Summary of the Textbook Analysis	64
3. Suggested Supplementation	66
3.1. Supplements to Reference	66
3.2. Supplements to Substitution	70
3.3. Supplements to Ellipsis	75
Conclusion	77

THE LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: The number of exercises related to reference	47
Table 2: The number of exercises related to ellipsis	52
Table 3: The number of exercises related to conjunction	56
Table 4: The number of complex exercises	60
Table 5: The number of all exercises related to cohesion	64

ABSTRACT

Cohesion is an inherent feature of written and spoken text. In mother tongue, it is used automatically, but it has to be taught to the students of English as a foreign language. In this project, I analysed three textbooks of English for upper-secondary schools in order to find whether they provide a sufficient resource of exercises centred at teaching cohesion. The analysis showed that Headway, Maturita Solutions and New English File are at the same level regarding teaching reference and ellipsis, however, Headway is a significantly better resource for teaching conjunction and text composition than the two other books.

Introduction

Teaching cohesion is, or at least should be, becoming more and more relevant at Czech secondary schools, because the new concept of education pursued by the recent school reform puts more emphasis on writing, reading, speaking and listening skills. What these four skills have in common is that they are always related to texts, either written or spoken. And what all kinds of texts have in common is that they cannot exist without cohesion. Therefore, it is almost impossible to communicate in English or to pass the Maturita Exam without using any cohesive means. For that reason, I have chosen cohesion as the topic of my project. My aim is to research into the ways, in which cohesion is treated in the textbooks, since textbooks are the most accessible resources for the Czech teachers. I will try to find out, if the most popular textbooks provide the students with such exercises and activities, which would help them to learn to write and speak as cohesively as it is necessary for successful passing the Maturita Exam.

The first chapter of my project will contain a discussion on the definition of a text and its standards, as the text is the essential environment in which cohesion can exist. In the second chapter, I will compare the views, which various authors have on cohesion and on its categorization. Its individual categories will be described in detail in this chapter, too. The third chapter will deal with the ways of teaching cohesion at schools, with special focus on the Czech educational system. The project will therefore progress from abstract concepts to the concrete methods and exercises, which can be used in a classroom. This effort will continue in the practical part, which will consist of analysis of English textbooks and of their supplementation with additional exercises that might increase the effectiveness of teaching cohesion at upper secondary schools and help to prepare the students for the Maturita Exam.

1. Text

Before saying what cohesion is, it might be useful to say what a text is. According to de Beaugrand and Dressler, the traditional linguistics did not use to deal with units larger than sentences. The study of phonemes, words and sentences employs different tools and approaches than the study of texts. Smaller units of language can be exhaustively analyzed and it is possible to explore and describe the rules, which regulate them in the particular language. At the lower levels of language, we can use these rules to judge whether a certain structure, e.g. word, phrase, clause or sentence is correct. (de Beaugrand and Dressler, 1988).

However, there is no such an easy and direct method applicable to evaluation of texts (de Beaugrand and Dressler, 1988). Halliday and Hasan emphasize that a text cannot be viewed as *“a large grammatical unit, something of the same kind as a sentence but differing from it in size – a sort of supersentence”* (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 293). Even though the text is not a structural unit, we should not consider it to be the extreme opposite of structure – a cluster of unrelated sentences. There is indeed a kind of unity in text, however, this unity is not structural, but semantic. Halliday and Hasan define the text in the following way *“A text is a unit of language in use.”* (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 1) or *“The unity that it has is a unity of meaning in context”* (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 293), Östman says that text is *“...constituting some kind of ‘rational totality’ which the speaker tries to transmit - for one reason or another - to a listener...”* (Östman, 1978, p. 103) All the definitions stress two important aspects of a text. Firstly, its purpose is transmission of information between people, in other words communication. Secondly, it does not take place in vacuum, but in a specific context.

1.1. Standards of Textuality

Considering the dependence of text on the people participating in its creation, it is obvious that the decision what a text is involve a certain amount of subjectivity. Nevertheless, de Beaugrand and Dressler list seven parameters, which can be used for evaluation of texts. The parameters relate both to the properties of the text and to its relationships with the producer and recipient. (de Beaugrand and Dressler, 1988).

The first property is cohesion, which is defined by de Beaugrand and Dressler as “the ways in which the components of surface text, i.e. the actual words we hear or see, are mutually connected within a sequence.” (de Beaugrand and Dressler, 1988, p. 3). The topic of cohesion will be discussed in detail in the following chapters. The second property of texts is coherence. A text is coherent if the ideas expressed by it are related to each other in a meaningful way. (de Beaugrand and Dressler, 1988). Östman states that coherence occurs when the message represented by words is successfully transferred from a producer to a recipient (Östman, 1978). De Beaugrand and Dressler classify cohesion and coherence as text-centred characteristics, whereas the remaining five are user-centred. The third standard is called intentionality, which means that the text was produced for some purpose. The fourth standard, acceptability, denotes that the text must be accepted by its recipient. In order to meet the fifth standard, informativity, the text needs to contain at least some information that is perceived as new or unexpected by the recipient. The sixth standard, situationality, concerns with the relation between the text and situation in which it is set. For example, a road sign needs to be placed near road to function as a text. The last standard is intertextuality, which is a relationship between texts. Not all the information in the text has to be explicit, because the recipient is able to supply the missing information from his experience with similar kind of text (de Beaugrand and Dressler, 1988).

While de Beaugrand and Dressler assert that a text has to possess all seven standards in order to be perceived as a text (de Beaugrand and Dressler, 1988), some disagree. Enkvist argues that a text can be coherent even though it lacks surface cohesion. Moreover, there are even special types of texts, such as absurd drama, which are neither cohesive nor coherent, but they keep the textual function, because they were deliberately constructed to communicate a message about misunderstanding and problems in relationships between people. (Enkvist, 1978) Brown and Yule do not rely on any formal criteria of textuality, saying that “*Texts are what hearers and readers treat as texts.*” (Brown and Yule, 1983, p. 199).

Although the criteria for assessing textuality might seem complicated, it is important to mention that, according to Halliday and Hasan, they are a matter of linguistic analysis rather than a part of everyday life. Native speakers automatically recognize whether they have encountered a text or a non-text. Moreover, pure non-texts are extremely rare in normal life, people may more likely encounter texts in which the degree of textuality is lowered. A typical example of such situation is a teacher assessing students’ essays. (Halliday and Hasan, 1994)

To sum it up, text is a means of human communication and therefore it is used and assessed intuitively in real life situations. As a result, it is difficult to set a rigid system of rules to determine what a proper text is. Even if some criteria were suggested, they can be successfully used only if a text is evaluated with regard to its context and the people who are using it in their communication.

2. Cohesion

It has been already mentioned that cohesion is formed by ties between visible or audible elements of a text. Therefore, according to Hoey, it is an objective and measurable feature of a text, unlike coherence, which is subjective and dependent on reader's or hearer's interpretation (Hoey, 1996).

In accordance with Hoey's view, Halliday and Hasan state the cohesive links in a text can be identified, counted and categorized. Textual cohesion is created by words which cannot be properly understood or interpreted in isolation. The word "them" in isolation does not provide any useful information. A reader does not know to whom "them" refers. But such word is easily interpretable if it is a part of a text like: "*Wash and core six cooking apples. Put them into a fireproof dish.*" (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 2).

According to Halliday and Hasan, some words prompt the recipient to find their meaning elsewhere. If a reader or hearer encounters a word such as "them" in a text, he supposes that the identity of "them" is revealed in another part of the text. This principle is called presupposition by Halliday and Hasan. The reader or hearer can search through the text to find out that "them" refers to "apples" in another sentence. This is the second principle, which is necessary for cohesion. The meaning of the presupposing item must be obtainable from the text, in other words, the presupposition must be satisfied. Both presupposition and its satisfaction assure the reader or hearer that he is dealing with a semantically unified whole - with a text. Therefore, the cohesion is what holds the text together. When there is no cohesion between two sentences, they can be considered to be two separate texts (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

De Beaugrand and Dressler explain the same process from a different angle. They view the text as an outcome of processes that take place in

our mind. If a person decides to communicate through text and not through non-verbal means, he starts with the overall plan or goal that he wants to achieve. Then he has to choose suitable ideas from the knowledge stored in his mind. As the last step, he needs to select appropriate verbal means from his mental storage of language and to organize them according to the rules of the language he is using (de Beaugrand and Dressler, 1988). Östman says in metaphoric terms that the ideas need to be dressed in language (Östman, 1978).

De Beaugrand and Dressler states that the described process proceeds in reverse way when the recipient deciphers the verbal message. He starts with the words, which activate ideas and concepts stored in his mind. Then the concepts are combined to reconstruct the overall plan of the producer. De Beaugrand and Dressler explain that it is technically impossible for human brain to search through the whole mental storage while reconstructing texts. They write that *“Materials are placed in active storage, a ‘working memory’ where processing resources are distributed among elements of a presentation according to their importance. There appears to be a very short-lived imprint of visually or acoustically perceived materials upon which some provisional organization must be rapidly imposed.”* (de Beaugrand and Dressler, 1988, p. 48). De Beaugrand and Dressler suggest that the organization inside sentences is created by syntax. For larger units of language the organization is provided by cohesion. Cohesion is a tool that enables the producer to work with the active storage of the intended recipient. Thanks to cohesion, the producer can direct the recipient to recall some recently encountered structures from his active storage and work with them again (de Beaugrand and Dressler, 1988).

The two presented views describe the same phenomenon from two different perspectives. Halliday and Hasan concentrate more on text as a product whereas de Beaugrand and Dressler concentrate more on the processes that occur in human mind while constructing and reconstructing texts. Both views agree that cohesion enables the reader

or hearer to connect meanings of two sentences together, even if the sentences are not structurally (grammatically, syntactically) connected.

2.1. The Relationship between Cohesion and Coherence

According to Enkvist, despite the fact that cohesion is very important for proper function of texts, it is not all-powerful. Mere presence of cohesive ties is not a sufficient criterion to judge what a text is or is not. Enkvist demonstrates with the following example that it is possible to construct a “text” which is very cohesive, nonetheless, there is no semantic continuity in it:

“I bought a Ford. The car in which President Wilson rode down the Champs Elysées was black. Black English has been widely discussed. The discussions between the presidents ended last week. A week has seven days. Every day I feed my cat. Cats have four legs. The cat is on the mat. Mat has three letters.” (Enkvist, 1978, p. 111).

Enkvist states that while this example is cohesive, but not coherent, we can also find examples of texts which do not contain any formal cohesive links, but which are properly coherent and meaningful. He concludes that cohesion is not the only way of connecting sentences into texts, the other option is to connect them “*through underlying semantic coherence.*” (Enkvist, 1978, p. 111).

2.2. Limits of Cohesion

Halliday and Hasan state that the same type of tie can occur either inside one sentence or between two sentences. Although Halliday and Hasan admit that cohesive ties are not dependent on sentence borders, they decided to exclude from cohesion the links within a sentence, because they can be easily explained with regard to syntactic rules and it would be redundant to describe them again in terms of text linguistics (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

2.3. Types of Cohesion

Halliday and Hasan state that cohesion is realized by both vocabulary and grammar. While they admit that these two cannot often be clearly separated, they suggest dividing cohesion into lexical and grammatical. Lexical cohesion is defined as “*the cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 274). Lexical relationships between certain words, for example synonyms or antonyms, function as a cohesive force that pulls the text together. (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

According to Halliday and Hasan, the grammatical cohesion is compounded of four diverse grammatical relations: reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction. Each of these categories is expressed by specific grammatical words. Reference uses demonstrative pronouns, some adverbs, personal pronouns and the definite article. Substitution is the use of *one*, *some*, *do* and *so* to replace lexical words. Ellipsis means the omission of noun, verb or clause and conjunction is the usage of conjunctions and conjuncts to connect meanings of two or more sentences which are separated by full stop (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

Some other authors do not share Halliday’s and Hasan’s opinion. De Beaugrand and Dressler give a list of cohesive devices without trying to systemize them. They distinguish between recurrence, partial recurrence, parallelism, paraphrase, pro-forms, ellipsis, tense, aspect, junction, functional sentence perspective and intonation. Only ellipsis and junction (conjunction) correspond to Halliday’s and Hasan’s categories. Pro-forms include both pronouns (reference) and substitutes (substitution). Recurrence is a repetition of a word, while partial recurrence is co-occurrence of words derived from the same root. Paraphrase means the usage of synonyms. These three categories could be included in Halliday’s and Hasan’s lexical cohesion, but they still do not cover it completely. Additionally, de Beaugrand and Dressler

incorporate into cohesive devices repetitive use of some grammatical (tense, aspect) and syntactic (parallelism) structures. Finally, cohesion in de Beaugrand's and Dressler's opinion includes intonation and function sentence perspective, which relate to organization of information according to its significance or speaker's attitude (de Beaugrand and Dressler, 1988).

Similarly to de Beaugrand and Dressler, Tárnyiková includes into cohesion more means than Halliday and Hasan, but unlike them, she tries to make a system. She divides cohesion into four categories: reference, as an independent category, grammatical, lexical and lexico-grammatical cohesion. Her conception of lexical cohesion is roughly similar to Halliday's and Hasan's, but her concept of grammatical cohesion is different. For her, grammatical cohesion means repetitive use of the same verbal categories, such as tense, mood and voice, or repetition of same sentence patterns, which are also treated as cohesive by de Beaugrand and Dressler. She also included junction (conjunction) into grammatical cohesion. Lexico-grammatical cohesion is formed by repetitive use of negation or modal words. Ellipsis is not included into any category, but it is called "*an implicit signal of cohesion*" (Tárnyiková, 2002, p. 50). Ellipsis in her view is a broader category than Halliday's and Hasan's (Tárnyiková, 2002).

This brief comparison of three different sources shows that there is no universal categorization of cohesive devices and even the same terms may be treated differently by various linguists. In this piece of work, I will use the terminology of Halliday and Hasan, because their work is considered as the most detailed and exhaustive account of cohesion by other authors, namely by Hoey (Hoey, 1996) and Brown and Yule (Brown and Yule, 1983).

2.3.1. Reference

Halliday and Hasan divided reference into three groups: personal reference, which is formed by personal pronouns, demonstrative reference and comparative reference (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

According to Halliday and Hasan, “*reference is a relation between meanings*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 89). It means that the referring item always refers to the meaning of the presupposed word and not to its syntactic function. Therefore, the meaning which is presupposed by the referring word does not have to just one word, but it can be a fact, it means a clause, a sentence or even a longer piece of text. For example: “*They broke a Chinese vase. That was careless.*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 66).

Halliday and Hasan also explain that “In reference there is a total referential identity between the reference item and that which it presupposed; nothing is to be added to the definition.” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 95). Reference is therefore a very useful tool which helps us to avoid ambiguity. If we read a piece of text like this one: “John took Mary to the dance. John was left all alone.” (Halliday, Hasan, 1994, p.281), we cannot decide if the text is about one or two John’s. On the other hand, if we replace the proper noun with pronoun “he”, we make it clear that we speak about the same person (Halliday, Hasan, 1994). Brown and Yule state that Halliday’s and Hasan’s assertion about the “total identity” of reference cannot be taken literally. They argue that whereas the identity of the referent might be maintained, some of its features might change. An example might be: “Kill an active, plump chicken. Prepare it for the oven, cut it into four pieces and roast it with thyme for 1 hour.” (Brown and Yule, 1983, p. 202). In a similar way, a novel protagonist’s personality and physical appearance may change throughout the book (Brown and Yule, 1983).

2.3.1.1. Exophora, Anaphora and Cataphora

According to Halliday and Hasan, there is another division of reference, which is not related to the previous division into personal, demonstrative and comparative reference. This classification is based on the location of the presupposed element. It can be found either in the text or outside it, in the context of situation. (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

Halliday and Hasan distinguish between exophora and endophora. Exophora occurs when the presupposed element is not present in the text. If somebody hears an instruction like “*Leave that there and come here!*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 58), he needs to complete the sentence with non-verbal information from the context. Halliday and Hasan do not include such links into cohesion. The reason is that although such links are undoubtedly important for textuality, they do not meet the criterion of connected two structurally unrelated parts of text together (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

According to Halliday and Hasan, all the reference words can be used either for exophoric or endophoric reference. These reference words are not inherently endophoric or exophoric, but any of them can be used in both ways (Halliday and Hasan, 1994). Since exophora is not considered cohesive, it will not be further discussed in this piece of work.

According to Halliday and Hasan, if both the presupposing element and its interpretation is present in the text, we speak about endophora, which has two sub-types: anaphora and cataphora. Anaphora occurs when we have to return to the previous part of the text to find the interpretation. Cataphora is the opposite of anaphora – we first encounter the reference word and only after that we find its meaning. Because anaphora is more natural than cataphora, cataphora is less frequent and it is typically used to highlight some information

(Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

According to Tárnyiková, both anaphoric and cataphoric reference occur in texts. Cataphora can be found mostly in newspapers or in fiction, where it is employed in order to create so called “communicative tension”, which forces the reader to continue reading until he comes across the referent (Tárnyiková, 2002). De Beaugrande and Dressler describe an experiment which proved the impact of cataphoric reference on readers’ attention. Two groups of readers were given the same technical text organized in two different ways:

In the original version the sentences were linked by anaphoric reference: “*A great black and yellow V-2 rocket 46 feet long stood in a New Mexico desert. Empty it weighed five tons. For fuel it carried eight tons of alcohol and liquid oxygen.*” (de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1988, p. 195).

The text presented to the second group was reorganized, so that it contained cataphoric reference. “*Empty it weighed five tons. For fuel it carried eight tons of alcohol and liquid oxygen. There it stood in a New Mexico desert: a great black and yellow V-2 rocket 46 feet long...*” (de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1988, p. 61).

When the readers were asked to recall information from the text, 80% of those who read the cataphorically organized text remembered both kind of rocket’s fuel, in comparison with the readers of the original text, where only 30% were able to do so. This demonstrates how cataphoric reference can be used to draw readers’ attention to certain elements of text which the writer wants to emphasize. (de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1988).

2.3.1.2. Personal Reference

Halliday and Hasan suggest dividing the personal pronouns according to a role in a speech process that they signal (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

They distinguish between speech roles and other roles. The speech roles are roles of speaker and addressee. The pronouns, which belong to speaker - *I, me, mine, my, we, us, our, ours* and to addressee - *you, your, yours* (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p.44) refers to the people involved in the conversation and therefore form an exophoric reference (Halliday and Hasan, 1994). Tárnyiková even states that speech roles are “*inherently exophoric*” (Tárnyiková, 2002, p.31). Nevertheless, according to Halliday and Hasan, speech roles are not excluded from endophoric use. They typically create cohesion in the direct speech, such as: “*There was a brief note from Susan. She just said, “I am coming home this weekend.”*”(Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p.49). Outside written texts, this usage of speech role is typically found in jokes and gossiping (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

According to Halliday and Hasan, the large group called “other roles” includes all people and things that may be talked about, but that are distinct from speaker and addressee. In English this group is represented by pronouns - *he, him, his, she, her, hers, it, its, they, them, their, theirs, one* and *one’s*. These pronouns are primarily used for endophoric reference, usually an anaphora (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

2.3.1.3. Demonstrative Reference

Halliday and Hasan call demonstrative reference “*a form of verbal pointing*”. (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p.57). This pointing is realized by a limited number of special words from different word classes. The word classes include adverbs *here, there, now* and *then* (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p.57); determiners *this, that, these* and *those* (Halliday

and Hasan, 1994, p.59) and the definite article *the*. All of them, except for the definite article, form pairs on basis of opposition: near versus far. Halliday and Hasan call this “*a scale of proximity*” (Halliday, Hasan, 1994, p.57). Proximity in their concept does not mean only the physical distance in space or in time, but also some kind of connection with the speaker. For this usage, Halliday and Hasan give the following example, “*I like the lions, and I like the polar bears. These are my favourites. – Those are my favourites too.*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p.60). The first speaker uses “these”, because the objects were mentioned by him, therefore they are, according to Halliday and Hasan, “textually speaking near him”. (Halliday, Hasan, 1994, p.60).

Halliday and Hasan include the definite article into the demonstrative reference, because, they say: “*the, like the demonstratives, is a specifying agent, serving to identify a particular individual or subclass within the class designated by the noun...*” (Halliday, Hasan, 1994, p.70). Its task is to tell the reader that “the item in question is specific and identifiable” (Halliday, Hasan, 1994, p.71). The information needed for its identification are obtainable either from the context or from the surrounding text. As long as we can gain the necessary information from the text, *the* contributes to cohesion (Halliday, Hasan, 1994).

2.3.1.4. Comparative Reference

Halliday and Hasan include comparison in reference, because they say that we cannot compare just one thing, but at least two. Therefore the comparison always represents a certain relation. This relation can be indicated, according to Halliday and Hasan, not only by comparative forms of adjectives, but also by words such as *same, equal, identical, similar, other, different* etc., which also include an element of comparison (Halliday, Hasan, 1994, p.77).

According to Halliday and Hasan, comparison occurs not only within a sentence, but also between sentences. They give an example in which comparison is used in cohesive way: “*Gerald Middleton was a man of*

mildly but persistently depressive temperament. Such men are not at their best at breakfast.”(Halliday, Hasan, 1994, p.79).

2.3.2. Substitution

According to Halliday and Hasan, substitution is a kind of cohesive link that lies on a different linguistic level than reference. It has been already mentioned that reference is a semantic relation, a form of “pointing” to the presupposed meaning. Substitution, in contrast, “*is a relation in the wording rather than in meaning*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 3). It means that unlike reference, substitution does not replace the fact represented by the presupposed word, but the word itself. This fact is obvious from examples such as, “*My axe is too blunt. I must get a sharper one.*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 89). The sentence clearly speaks about two different metal objects and the substitute is used because both of them can be labelled by the word “axe”, which would occur twice in two consecutive sentences. In such situations, the second occurrence of the same word can be replaced by a substitute. The substitute is put in the position in the sentence structure, which cannot be left empty, because the grammatical rules of the language prevent this. As a result, the grammatical function of the substitute is always the same as that of the replaced word (Halliday, Hasan, 1994). Brown and Yule point out that this rule is not without exception. The following quotation contains a substitute that does not match grammatically with anything from the preceding text: “*The child may set the pace. Since the literature is mostly anecdotal, we don't mind offering one of our own...*” (Brown and Yule, 1983, p. 203).

Similarly to Brown and Yule, De Beaugrande and Dressler disagree with the view that substitution is dependent only on the sentence structure. Sometimes, the structure alone does not provide enough clues for identification of the presupposed element, but it is necessary to consider the meaning of the sentence, too. Following short conversation can serve as an example: “*Next morning he gets up, has a fire lit,*

orders in three shillings' worth o' crumpets, toasts 'em all, and blows his brains out." – "*What did he do that for?*" inquired Mr Pickwick abruptly." (de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1988, p. 65). The substitute "do" can stand for any verbs from the first sentence, if the interpretation depended only on the structure. The reason why "do that" is automatically understood as "blows his brains out" is that this action is the most problematic one and there is a "*tendency to prefer problematic knowledge as discourse material.*" (de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1988, p. 82).

From a more practical point of view, Quirk says that the reason for using substitution is an effort to be economic or witty. Nevertheless, sometimes people overuse it to such extent that the text becomes unclear. This usually happens when the meaning is carried over for too long distance (Quirk, 1992).

According to Halliday and Hasan, we can see another substantial difference between the occurrence of reference and substitution. In case of reference, the reference item and the presupposed one are perfectly identical with respect to meaning. On the other hand, substitution represents something that is characterised by Halliday and Hasan as "*continuity in the environment of contrast*". (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 122). The contrast is caused by so called repudiation. It means that a certain part of information which was presented by the original item is rejected (repudiated) while a new piece of information is added. This principle can be illustrated by the following example: "*These biscuits are stale. – Get some fresh ones.*" (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p.92) In this text the feature of being stale is repudiated, whereas the feature of being fresh is added. The concept of repudiation explains why we must always use modifiers with substitute, while we can never use them with reference words. The reason for this rule is that the modifiers add the new features and repudiate those from the previous sentence. (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

According to Halliday and Hasan, substitution can be further divided into three types according to the grammatical functions of the substitutes. These types are nominal, verbal and clausal substitution. (Halliday, Hasan, 1994).

2.3.2.1. Nominal Substitution

According to Halliday and Hasan, the nominal substitution is realized by substitutes one and some. One can replace only a head of nominal group and it also holds this position itself. This substitute must be always joined by a modifier different from the modifier of the presupposed word. The modifier is what provides the contrast in case of nominal substitution, for example: “*Did you light fires?*” – “*Only wood ones.*” (Halliday, Hasan, 1994, p. 94).

According to Halliday and Hasan, the nominal substitute same behaves differently than one. It does not substitute only the head of nominal group, but the whole group, as in this sequence: “*The neighbours grow yellow chrysanthemums. I could grow the same.*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 110). The contrast is not created by its modifiers, but by the other elements in the clause. In the quoted example the contrast arises between “neighbours” and “I”. (Halliday, Hasan, 1994).

2.3.2.2. Verbal Substitution

According to Halliday and Hasan, verbal substitution is realized by verbal substitute do. Its function and usage and function resemble the nominal substitute one in certain aspects. Do always functions as a head of verbal group, similarly as one, which is always a head of nominal group. Additionally, do as well as one always expresses some contrast. There are, however, also some differences between do and one. One can create the contrast only by attaching new modifiers, do can express contrast by changing some of its categories, such as tense, polarity or modality, for example: “*John is smoking more now than he*

used to do.” (Halliday, Hasan, 1994, p. 115).

2.3.2.3. Clausal Substitution

According to Halliday and Hasan, *so* and *not* are the only words that can replace a whole clause in English. However, not every clause can be substituted. There are only three situations in which substitutes can be used. Halliday and Hasan define them as report, condition and modality. An example of report is: “*Is there going to be an earthquake?*” – “*It says so.*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 130). Condition is expressed in this text: “*Everyone seems to think he’s guilty. If so, no doubt he’ll offer to resign.*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 134). Modality is included in this dialog: “*Would you like cats if you were me?*” – “*Well, perhaps not.*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 134) These three instances share two common features. Firstly, all of them are hypotactic and, secondly, all of them involve a certain level of hypothesis (Halliday, Hasan, 1994).

2.3.3. Ellipsis

Halliday and Hasan suggest that “*substitution and ellipsis are different manifestations of the same underlying relation*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p.114), explaining that “*ellipsis can be interpreted as that form of substitution in which the item is replaced by nothing*”. (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 88). Since ellipsis is a special case of substitution, the basic characteristics of substitution are valid for ellipsis, too. (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

According to Halliday and Hasan, not just any missing information can be considered an ellipsis. We can speak about ellipsis when there are “*specific structural slots to be filled from elsewhere.*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 143). It means that a sentence such as: ‘Hardly anyone left the country before the war.’ (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 142) is not an example of ellipsis, because its structure is complete. The fact,

that we do not know which country and war is mentioned in the sentence, does not mean that the sentence is elliptical, but rather that the writer relies on some general knowledge of the intended reader. On the contrary, the text: “*This is a fine hall you have here. I’ve never lectured in a finer.*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 146) is an instance of ellipsis, because the position of the head of nominal group was left empty (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

2.3.3.1. Nominal Ellipsis

According to Halliday and Hasan, the use of ellipsis in nominal group is more restricted than the use of substitution. The reason is that if the head of the group is left out, one of its modifiers has to play its function. However, not all modifiers are capable of it. Halliday and Hasan explain the limits by analysing the structure of the nominal group. In the following phrase: “*The two high stone walls along the roadside*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 40), *the* is a Deictic, *two* is a Numerative, *high* is an Epithet, *stone* is a Classifier, *walls* is a Thing and *along the roadside* is a Qualifier. According to this division, only a Deictic, a Numerative and occasionally an Epithet may take over the function of the head of a nominal group, as in this example: “*Here are my two white silk scarves.*” – “*I used to have three.*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 150). The Classifiers and Qualifiers are typically expressed by nouns, so they would cause confusion in an elliptical sentence. To provide an example; “*a tall brick chimney*” cannot be replaced by “*a tall brick*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 148). In instances like this, substitution by *one* is normally used (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

2.3.3.2. Verbal Ellipsis

Halliday and Hasan point out that the verbal ellipsis is different from the nominal ellipsis, because of differences between the structures of verbal and nominal group. While, in nominal group, every element

modifies the meaning of head in a specific way, in the verbal group, the head is the only word that has a lexical meaning and the other elements only incorporate the verb within the verbal systems, such as mood, voice etc. Therefore, we distinguish between two types of verbal ellipsis. Lexical ellipsis is the ellipsis of the lexical verb and possibly of some more elements from the verbal group. Only the first element must not be omitted. An example of this type of ellipsis may be the following dialog: “*Have you been swimming?*” – “*Yes, I have.*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 167).

On the contrary, operator ellipsis omits everything except the lexical verb. An example of this kind of ellipsis can be found in a dialog such as: “*What have you been doing?*” – “*Swimming.*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 167). In such cases, all verbal categories have to be carried over from the previous sentences. Therefore, this kind of ellipsis can occur only in sentences, which belong to each other, a typical example is a question and an answer to it (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

2.3.3.3. Clausal Ellipsis

According to Halliday and Hasan, ellipsis of whole clause is typically used when there is some kind of interaction, either direct or mediated. The first situation in which clausal ellipsis occurs is an answer to a wh- question. This situation is represented by dialogues like this: “*What did I hit?*” – “*A root.*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 210). The question is aimed to find out some specific information, so only the information is provided and the rest of the clause is omitted. Additionally, the clausal ellipsis can be found if a comment or supplementary question follows a statement. Halliday and Hasan provide the following example: “*England won the cup.*” – “*Who told you?*” or “*I wonder if it’ll rain on the day of the picnic*” – “*Probably*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 219).

Beaugrande and Dressler state that the use of ellipsis should be

balanced. On the one hand, using ellipsis saves time and energy, because fewer words are produced. On the other hand, its over-use has exactly the opposite effect, because more time and energy is spent on retrieving the meaning of fragmented sentences (de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1988).

2.3.4. Conjunction

Halliday and Hasan state that both conjunction and reference are semantic relations, while substitution and ellipsis are textual relations. Although reference and conjunction belong to the same category, the relations that they express are of completely different kinds. Reference directs us to a piece of information that is obtainable from the surrounding text. On the other hand, conjunction is used to indicate a relation between two pieces of information, or more specifically, processes or states which follow each other. Moreover, conjunction is not only capable of showing that there is some relation, but it also defines what type of relation it is (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

Halliday and Hasan point out that even if the number of meanings expressed by conjunction is limited, there is no unambiguous way of sorting these subtle meaning nuances into broader categories. Halliday and Hasan decided to distinguish between four types of conjunction – additive, adversative, causal and temporal (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

Apart from this division, it is also possible to sort conjunctions according to different criteria. Halliday and Hasan suggest distinguishing between external and internal conjunctive relations. External relations indicate how events, processes and states which are talked about followed one another and what relationship was between them. For example *so* in this example indicates what the cause of someone's behaviour was. "*She was never really happy here. So she's leaving.*" (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 241). On the contrary, internal relations show relationships between speaker's or writer's thoughts.

With the help of internal conjunction, the speaker or writer can better organize his text. The conjuncts *first* and *second* in the following text do not refer to the sequence of arguments with respect to time, but to the order in which the speaker mentions them. *“There’s no sort of use in knocking,” said the Footman, “and that for two reasons. First, because I’m on the same side of the door as you are; secondly, because they’re making such a noise inside, no one could possibly hear you.”* (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 264). This division between internal and external conjunction can be applied to all four types of conjunction (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

Beaugrande and Dressler do not divide the conjunction into internal and external, but they emphasize the internal aspect of conjunction on the whole. They state that the producer of the text can use conjunctions to control how the text is constructed in readers’ or hearers’ minds (de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1988).

2.3.4.1. Punctuation

In connection with the use of conjunction, Halliday and Hasan point out that the definition of sentence as beginning by capital letter and ending with a full stop is sometimes unsatisfactory. They state that the criterion for cohesion is that it must exceed the sentence boundary. However, there are many instances where colon or semicolon is used between two structurally unrelated constructions, which would be considered separate sentences in spoken language. Therefore, there are many instances of conjunctions, which behave cohesively in sense of connecting structurally unrelated pieces of text, nevertheless, they cannot be classified as cohesive (Halliday and Hasan, 1994). Battistella in Tárnyiková offers an alternative view on the role of punctuation. He does not perceive the punctuation as something that prevents cohesion, but she rather considers it to be another cohesive device. He calls coma and full stop separators, while colon and semicolon are called integrators. The integrative function of colon is shown in this example:

“One thing at least I share with Charlotte: I lost my child.”
(Tárnyiková, 2002, p. 43).

2.3.5. Lexical Cohesion

According to Halliday and Hasan, lexical cohesion exists *‘between any pair of lexical items that stand to each other in some recognizable lexicosemantic (word meaning) relation.’* (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 285). Unlike the grammatical cohesion, which concerns only with certain grammatical words (substitutes, conjunctions, etc.), any word can create a link with any other word, which is related to it by its meaning (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

Hoey states that lexical links typically group into cohesive chains. The chain is a series of cohesive links between at least three words. In a chain of three words, the first one is connected with the second, the second is connected with the third, but the third does not have to be related to the first. The chains can be further divided to chains of identity and chains of similarity (Hoey, 1996). Halliday and Hasan divided the lexical cohesion into reiteration, which corresponds to Hoey’s chains of identity and collocation, which corresponds to chains of similarity. (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

2.3.5.1. Reiteration

As Hoey’s term chains of identity suggests, this type of cohesion occurs, when two words refer to an identical fact (Hoey, 1996). Halliday and Hasan point out that this chains of identity, or reiteration, as they call it, function according to exactly the same principle as reference (Halliday and Hasan, 1994). This fact causes some disagreement between linguists. Halliday and Hasan admit that reiteration borders with reference, but they still insist it should be included into lexical cohesion (Halliday and Hasan, 1994). On the other hand, Tárnyiková views reiteration as a type of reference. In her

opinion, whenever “*alternative expressions in a text are used to refer to the same entity, the process is termed co-reference.*” (Tárnyiková, 2002, p. 31).

Halliday and Hasan state that there are many kinds of reiteration. The most basic form is a simple repetition of the word. Alternatively, the word is replaced by its synonym, near-synonym or superordinate word, which enables the writer to avoid repetition (Halliday and Hasan, 1994). Quirk points out that not all lexical links are accessible to everybody. Sometimes, a certain level of general knowledge is needed in order to understand that there is a relationship between some expressions. Quirk illustrates his statement by following extract: “*In the 1960s the Beatles seemed a tightly knit group. The quartet developed a style of popular music that was not merely original but which was a product of their close relationship. Yet within a few years, the Liverpool lads had gone their separate ways.*” (Quirk, 1992, p. 1440).

Tárnyiková describes some effects that replacement can have. The most obvious is to avoid being tedious, but replacement can be also used to make the reader look at the subject from a different perspective or to highlight some of its attributes, for example “*Montreal – the northern city*” (Tárnyiková, 2002, p. 45). Tárnyiková further points out that even though the repetition of the same word is usually avoided, there are still certain contexts or genres in which it is desirable. A typical example of such environment is an advertisement, where the multiple repetition of the name of the product, causes the word to “*flash out*” (Tárnyiková, 2002, p. 46).

2.3.5.2. Collocation

Halliday and Hasan state that while there are still some common features which connect reiteration with grammatical cohesion, collocation operates according to completely different principle. The

basis of grammatical cohesion – the presupposition and its satisfaction – is not to be found in collocation. If two words collocate, they do not presuppose each other, but they occur next to each other. The cohesion is created only by the related meanings of the words (Halliday and Hasan, 1994).

There are many relationships, which can create a cohesive link between two words. The words can be synonyms, near synonyms, opposites or pair of words from either ordered series (Tuesday, Thursday) or unordered lexical sets (basement, roof) (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p.285). The words do not have to be at the same level, one of them can be superordinated or subordinated to the other. Sometimes, there is no term for the relationship between some words, but they are perceived as belonging together, for example *laugh* and *joke*. Halliday and Hasan explain that “*In general, any two lexical items having similar patterns of collocation – that is, tending to appear in similar contexts – will generate a cohesive force if they occur in adjacent sentences.*” (Halliday and Hasan, 1994, p. 286).

Hoey states that two cohesive chains can interlock, if they share a common element. In fact, a text usually does not contain only two, but a lot of mutually interlocked cohesive chains, which form a whole network. This is true even for text which forms a whole book. Hoey formulates a hypothesis that while a single cohesive chain is a sign of cohesion, it is the network made by interwoven chains that makes a text coherent (Hoey, 1996). If this statement is right, then lexical cohesion would blur the division between cohesion and coherence.

3. Teaching of Cohesion

According to Byrne, cohesion is one of the components of successful English teaching, especially in connection to writing skills. Foreign students without proper guidance do not realize how important and useful cohesive devices are for organization of an English text. It is the task of the teacher to draw students' attention to these devices and to teach them how they can use both grammatical and lexical cohesion effectively. This is especially important if the students' mother tongue employ the devices in a different way (Byrne, 1991).

3.1. Teaching of Cohesion in Czech Schools

In the Czech educational setting, teaching cohesion is also very important, because the new educational framework puts a strong emphasis on the students' ability to construct texts, considering grammatical accuracy not as the aim of language education, but only as one of the elements, which comprise the students' communicative competence.

The new curricular document, called Educational Framework (its Czech abbreviation is RVP) states that the aim of foreign language teaching at high schools is *“gradual mastering of spoken and written language and formation of complex communicative competence.”* (VÚP, 2007, p.12). With regard to written production, the students should be able *“to compose a coherent text on a wide range of topics and to express their opinion.”*, *“to formulate their opinion in comprehensible, grammatically accurate, spontaneous and fluent way.”* and *“to structure logically and clearly their formal or informal piece of writing in various styles.”* (VÚP, 2007, p.17). These quotations confirm that the emphasis in foreign language teaching should be put on communicative competences rather than on grammar. With regard to teaching writing, it indicates that it is not enough to teach the students to write grammatically perfect sentences, but also to teach them how to connect

sentences in cohesive and coherent way, so that they would be able to express their ideas clearly. Cohesion is a vital part of such skills.

Moreover, teaching these writing skills is not only recommended, but it is also necessary, because students are tested from unguided writing in the Maturita Exam. According to the official assessment handbook (CERMAT, 2014), the written part of Maturita Exam consists of composition of two short texts. Each of them is specified in terms of length, content and genre. The first text has to be 120 to 150 words long and the second one should contain 60 to 70 words. The genres that the student is supposed to master are formal or informal letter, characterization of a person, story, article, description, report, announcement or instruction (CERMAT, 2014).

According to CERMAT, students' writing is assessed in four areas. The first criterion is adherence to task and appropriateness of content. The second is text organization and cohesion. The third criterion includes accuracy and sufficient range of vocabulary together with proper spelling. The last criterion is accuracy and wide range of grammar and syntactic structures (CERMAT, 2014). The fact that a quarter of the final score is given for proper cohesion and coherence shows that these writing skills have become important in Czech school system. In accordance with Byrne's views, this fact implies that cohesion should be purposefully taught in Czech schools as an important part of English lessons.

3.1.1. Czech Terminology

In connection with Czech educational setting, it is important to point out some discrepancies between Czech and English terminology. While the assessment handbook lists cohesion as one of the criteria, its definition differs from Halliday's and Hasan's one. The Czech handbook works with the term "*Prostředky textové návaznosti*" (CERMAT, 2014), abbreviated to PTN, which covers wider range of

devices than the English term cohesive devices. In contrast with Halliday's and Hasan's cohesion, PTN include also those links, mostly conjunctions, which occur inside compound and complex sentences (CERMAT, 2014).

3.2. Cohesion in Reading

According to Byrne, writing should be always preceded by reading. Students first need to familiarize themselves with suitable texts, which they can later use as models for their own writing (Byrne, 1991). While Byrne treats reading only as preparation for writing, Cunningsworth states that the students should also study cohesion in order to improve their reading skills. The students need to learn to interpret pronoun reference correctly, because this is the issue which causes them the biggest problems in reading (Cunningsworth, 1995).

Regarding the fact that the texts which students read are also supposed to be models for their first writing attempts, there is the question whether the cohesion in textbooks is not deformed by the simplification and the students are not tempted into writing non-cohesive texts. Lisa Lautamatti researched into cohesive ties in simplified texts, designed for foreign learners of English. By comparing the simplified version with the original text, she found out that the density of cohesive ties is approximately the same, however, there are some differences in their type and distribution. In simplified texts there are more grammatical ties and less lexical cohesion than in the original. In addition, the proportion of repetition and synonymy shifted in favour of repetition during the process of simplification. The last difference is that the simplified texts contain more pronouns than the original ones (Lautamatti, 1978).

Jeremy Harmer writes that a compromise between authentic and simplified texts has to be made. Although authentic materials might be very useful, the students also need some texts, which are

comprehensible, which usually denotes certain degree of simplification. Jeremy Harmer advises that whenever it is possible, the teachers should bring some authentic material, such as menus or timetables, but otherwise they should not hesitate to use simplified texts (Harmer, 2001). According to Cunningsworth, the teachers should consciously look for a textbook which offers a good sample of authentic discourse. Even if the texts need to be simplified, they should have all properties of authentic language, including cohesion and coherence (Cunningsworth, 1995).

The conclusion is that even a simplified text can provide a good model of cohesive writing, but, as Jeremy Harmer recommends, some authentic material should be also used in language lesson.

3.3. Cohesion in Writing

Debra Tannen writes that one does not have to master only the grammar and vocabulary of the target language to be able to write in it. It is equally necessary to learn to connect sentences into a meaningful whole. She claims that the devices used in written discourse significantly differ from spoken production. Producing a written text, writers cannot rely on immediate feedback from the recipients, nor can they employ non-verbal means of communication (Tannen, 1986). Byrne adds that the teacher cannot rely on the premise that students' writing competence will be automatically carried from their mother tongues to English. He states that the students are in a completely different situation than they were when they learnt to write in their mother tongue. First of all, when they write in a foreign language, they still cannot use all the resources of the language, because they still know relatively few words and grammatical structures. Furthermore, the students are older and more intelligent, so they realize how restricted their language ability is and this fact can inhibit them from writing. These facts indicate that the teacher should systematically teach the students how they can use the cohesive devices of the target language

(Byrne, 1991).

Byrne suggests that teaching of writing should be centred on a text as the basic unit of communication. At any level of language proficiency, the students should read meaningful texts as a preparation for their own writing task and every writing activity should lead to production of complete texts. Not even the beginners should be restricted to constructing individual sentences only (Byrne, 1991).

Byrne states that reading and studying adequate text types is vital for acquisition of writing skills. The teacher should provide his students with the same text type that he wants them to produce. He should guide them in analysing the text in its communicative context. In the analysis they should proceed from the overall purpose of the piece of writing to the concrete linguistic features that were used to achieve it. Firstly, the students should be able to understand that every genre has a different purpose, that there is a different relationship between the writer and reader and that the writer can use only some linguistic resources, which are suitable for the genre. The students could be asked to change one genre into another, for example a piece of writing into conversation, in order to realize that the genres are organised with the help of different devices. It is also a good idea to highlight the cohesive elements in the text and to draw the cohesive links in the form of arrows (Byrne, 1991).

Byrne states that while it is certainly helpful for the students to know all cohesive devices, the teacher should avoid overwhelming the students with long lists. The devices should be introduced to students gradually and always as a part of concrete text. On the other hand, the teacher does not have to teach each category of cohesion separately, but he can deal with those devices which he encounters in the text that is being studied in the lesson. Then, the students should practice the devices which have been presented to them. The first stage of the practice can be done with isolated sentences, but such exercises should be thought of as a preparation and not as a goal. After this practice,

students should always use the newly acquired cohesive devices in composition of their own texts. Cohesion should be taught step-by-step, together with teaching new genres. As the students progress to higher levels of language proficiency, they should enlarge the stock of cohesive devices, especially conjunctions, which they actively use (Byrne, 1991).

3.3.1. Suitable Types of Exercises

As Byrne states, teaching cohesion consisted of more steps or stages (Byrne, 1991). At every stage the teacher can use a different kind of exercises, which focus either on introduction of some cohesive device or on practicing and reinforcing its usage.

Bedford and Matthews provide some examples of exercises, which can help the students to realize the existence of cohesive devices. The first way is to do a listening exercise. The students get a list of cohesive devices from the text they are listening to and their task is to number the devices in the order they appear. Another way, which is suitable for students who have already been taught cohesion, is to let the students highlight the cohesive devices in a printed text (Bedford and Matthews, 2010). Thornbury states that another good way of introducing cohesion to students is to ask them to assemble a text which was cut into pieces (Thornbury).

Byrne states that after this receptive stage, the students should proceed to their own production. He suggests that students can start with connecting separated sentences into pairs. Then, they can complete a gapped text. There are two variations of gap filling. In the easier modification, the cohesive words are missing and the students have to supply them. In the more advanced version, everything except for the linking words is deleted and the students have to supply given sentences between the linking words (Byrne, 1991). An alternative to gap filling is to rewrite a text, which is written without blanks, but

which is incohesive on purpose (Bedford and Matthews, 2010)

On the other hand, Byrne warns that it is not effective to teach beginners to write according to pictures. He claims that the visual support tempts the students into describing the individual pictures instead of composing interlinked text. The students can acquire a bad habit of writing without cohesive devices and conjunctions (Byrne, 1991).

To sum it up, the successful teaching of cohesion demands a lot of systematic work with texts under the purposeful guidance of teacher. The process of teaching can be divided into three stages. The first of them is to analyze a text and to notice the cohesive means that it contains. The second stage is to practice the cohesive means in a series of exercises. The last stage is to let the students use the means in their own piece of work.

Conclusion of the Theoretical Part

Cohesion is a net that helps to hold a text together. It is built by links between words that extend beyond sentence boundaries. A cohesive link appears when the meaning of a word can be decoded only by inserting the meaning of another word.

There are two types of cohesion: lexical and grammatical. Lexical cohesion originates if at least two words from the same lexical field occurs in one text. The grammatical cohesion can be further divided into reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction. Reference is realized by demonstrative pronouns and adverbs, by the definite article, by personal and possessive pronouns and by comparison. Substitution is realized by nominal substitute *one* and *ones*, by verbal substitute *do* and by clausal substitute *so*. While reference is used to replace the fact represented by the presupposed word, substitution is used to replace the word itself. Ellipsis, which is the omission of a word, has the same function as substitution. The conjunction denotes the type of relation between the meanings of two or more sentences.

All the types of cohesion are necessary for the text to fulfil its function. Therefore, it is important for students of English as a foreign language to master the usage of cohesive means. The use of cohesion is not transferred from the mother tongue of the students, so it must be taught systematically. The proper teaching of cohesion requires a careful choice of texts, their analysis and a sufficient number of both guided and unguided writing tasks.

THE PRACTICAL PART

Introduction to the Practical Part

The aim of the practical part is to analyse and compare three textbooks of English, which are widely used in Czech upper-secondary schools, from the point of teaching cohesive means. I will use the outcomes of the theoretical part, particularly chapter 3, as the standpoint for the analysis. Consequently, I will choose the textbook that corresponds best to the requirements of the theoretical part and I will suggest suitable supplements for those areas of cohesion which may be covered inadequately in the book. The practical part will therefore have two parts.

In the first part, the outcomes of the textbook analysis will be presented. The analysis will be done separately for each category of cohesion as defined by Halliday and Hasan, however, I will not include lexical cohesion into the analysis, because any exercise that expands the vocabulary is, in fact, teaching lexical cohesion. The categories of reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction will be understood in accordance with Halliday's and Hasan's (1994) definition, which was given in the theoretical part. Nevertheless, for the purpose of textbook analysis, I will also include the exercises which practice the concrete means only at sentence level. In my opinion, while it is important to distinguish between cohesive and non-cohesive usage of certain structures at the theoretical level, it is impossible to make such strict distinction in language teaching, because learning certain grammatical structures at sentence level can be an important step towards mastering them at textual level.

The analysis of each category will be done in three steps. Firstly, I will count the number of exercises related to the specific category in each book and I will present the results in a table. Secondly, I will comment on each book separately, highlighting its strengths and weaknesses.

Thirdly, I will summarize the category and compare all the three books. This section of the practical part will be concluded by an overall summary, in which I will decide which book is the most appropriate.

In the second and last section, I will provide some exercises, which, in my opinion, should be added to the chosen book. I will take the exercises from both electronic and printed sources or I will create them myself.

1. Choice of Textbooks

The main criterion for the choice of textbooks for analysis was to choose some books that are well-known and widely used in Czech upper secondary schools. Ludmila Kolářková questioned 111 Czech upper secondary school teachers of English about the books they use in their lesson. The results of her research showed that 43.5% of the questioned teachers use Headway, 14.8% use Maturita Solutions and 10% use English Files. Time to Talk is used by 8.7% of teachers, Opportunities and Total English are used by 5% of teachers each (Kolářková).

Because of the results of the survey I have chosen the following books for the analysis:

New Headway Intermediate, 4th edition, published by OUP in 2009

Maturita Solutions Intermediate, 1st edition, published by OUP in 2008

New English File Intermediate, 1st edition, published by OUP in 2006

I have chosen the intermediate level, because this level is typically used in the last grades of Czech grammar schools, as documented by the websites of some of them (Gymnázium Jana Blahoslava, Gymnázium Zábřeh).

2.1. Analysis of Reference

The number of exercises related to demonstrative reference, personal reference and comparison in all the three books is presented in the following table.

Table 1: The number of exercises related to reference

Type of reference	Headway	Maturita Solutions	New English File
Demonstrative reference	5	-	6
Personal reference	3	1	-
Comparison	-	9	7
Total	8	10	13

2.1.1. Reference in Headway

Headway contains 5 exercises dealing with demonstrative reference and 3 exercises dealing with personal reference. The only type of demonstrative reference which is taught in this book is the articles. The five exercises dealing with this topic form a two-page block, located in Unit 10. At first, the students are asked to find a definite and an indefinite article as a pre-reading task. After reading a magazine article, the students are asked to formulate the rules of the correct usage of articles based on the extract they have read. Then, two gap-filling exercises and a speaking exercise follow. One of these exercises is in form of a text and the other is in form of unrelated sentences. With regard to teaching cohesion, it is very good that the introduction of articles is done in an inductive way with the help of a text and that the students fill gaps in a consistent text.

Teaching personal reference concentrates mainly on possessive pronouns. The exercises related to this topic are placed in Unit 10, just behind the exercises related to articles. The authors of the book demand that the students are able to distinguish between a possessive pronoun and a possessive adjective, including the respective

terminology. This is the core of the first exercise in which students should just classify the highlighted pronouns. The two following exercises are based on multiple choice. In the first of them, the students should choose the right pronoun that fit into the sentence and in the second exercise, they should listen to recorded sentences and decide what pronoun they hear. The cohesive potential of personal reference is not developed in this book. The exercises do not include any text, which would show the students how pronouns can contribute to cohesion.

2.1.2. Reference in Maturita Solutions

Maturita Solutions contains 1 exercise for teaching personal reference and 9 exercises for teaching comparison. The exercise on page 81, which focuses on comparison, is particularly useful for developing students' understanding of cohesion. The students are taught to distinguish between two types of *it* – that they call “introductory *it*” and “normal pronoun” - in the grammar section of the book. Then they are instructed to classify all instances of *it* in two informal letters. This type of exercises helps to improve student's reading skills, because it teaches them to recognize cohesive links between pronouns and nouns. It is also very good that this exercise is immediately followed by a writing task, so it is likely that the students will concentrate on the proper usage of pronouns in their piece of writing. The disadvantage is that this is the only such exercise in the book.

The book contains 9 exercises which deal with comparison, which is quite a high number. The exercises are located partly as a part of Unit 7 and partly in the grammar section at the end of the book. The book provides a wide range of exercise types and some of the exercises are connected with reading or speaking activities, which is very good. What is also very useful is that the book does not teach only simple construction such as: “*X is more talkative than Y*”, but it also introduce more sophisticated structures such as: “*She's less talkative than she*

used to be.” (Maturita Solutions, 2008, p.65). While it is not cohesion according to its strict interpretation, this structure is very helpful in increasing students’ writing competence. It is a pity that this construction is practised only in two out of nine exercises.

2.1.3. Reference in New English File

New English File contains 6 exercises for practicing demonstrative reference and 7 exercises for practicing comparison. All the exercises which fall into the category of demonstrative reference are aimed at teaching definite and indefinite articles. Three of them are included in Unit 5 and two are placed in the grammar section (Grammar Box) at the end of the book. Two of them are listening exercises which focus on practising the pronunciation of the definite article. The remaining ones are gap-filling or multiple choice exercises, which consist of isolated sentences or pairs of sentences. The exercises have two weak points. Firstly, they are not connected with any text, so the students miss any authentic example of usage of the articles in the real language. Secondly, the students only complete the exercises and there is no task including some productive skills, neither writing nor speaking.

This book also contains a significant number of exercises that are focused on comparative and superlative form of adjectives. Similarly as with the previous topic, five exercises are placed in Unit 2 and two in the grammar section. The exercises within the unit are related to a text, but the focus is directed rather at the content than at the cohesive means in the text. The students are asked to look for specific facts in the text and to contrast or compare them. There is a speaking exercise, two reading comprehension exercises, an error correcting exercise and the last one is again a speaking exercise. Both exercises in the grammar section are gap-filling exercises. A good point is that, unlike the exercises related to articles, these exercises have more diverse task types. With regard to teaching cohesion, it is important that the exercises contain some speaking tasks, because spoken discourse is also

a type of text and it needs to be cohesive as well as written text. Nevertheless, the authors missed the opportunity to connect the topic with writing, although this book includes two writing tasks – description of a person and description of a house – in which comparison could easily be incorporated.

2.1.4. Summary of Reference

All the textbooks contain some exercises which focus on practice of reference. The books differ in the number of exercises, but the differences are not significant. There are also some differences in the type of exercises and in the type of reference which is taught. None of the books includes all the three types of reference described by Halliday and Hasan. All the books cover two of the types, but each of them in a different combination. I cannot judge which combination is the best for two following reasons. Firstly, it would be subjective to say that, for example, articles are more important than personal pronouns, because both of them are vital for the language and all the parts of a language are meaningful only when they are put together. Secondly, all the books belong to some series of textbooks and I would have to study the whole series in order to be able to decide whether all the basic elements of language were covered sufficiently and proportionally. From this point of view I can only notice that there is a considerable disproportion between the types of reference in Maturita Solution, because it contains 9 exercises dealing with comparison and only 1 exercise dealing with personal reference.

Regarding the quality of the exercises, I can say that all the books are approximately on the same level. All of them concentrate more on the grammatical aspect of the referential words that on their incorporation into text. Next, all the books include some exercises which are connected to text, but also a lot of exercises which consist of disconnected sentences. All of them also involve some integration of skills with grammar. With respect to productive skills, it seems that all

the books prefer speaking tasks to writing. All of them contain at least one speaking task, however, only Maturita Solution incorporated a writing task connected to reference, specifically to pronouns.

We can say that the cohesive potential of reference is neglected in all these books, but a good teacher can use the exercises in order to introduce the cohesive elements and to reinforce their proper usage, while he can add some exercises which focus more on cohesion.

2.2. Analysis of Substitution

For unknown reasons, none of the books contains any exercises which introduce or practice any type of substitution.

2.3. Analysis of Ellipsis

The numbers of exercises related to ellipsis are presented in the following table. Since, all the textbooks practice only verbal ellipsis and only its lexical sub-type, which means omission of the lexical verb, it would be pointless to arrange the table according to Halliday's and Hasan's classification. The table is therefore organized according to the types of constructions which occur in the books and they are called by the names that are used in the books.

Table 2: The number of exercises related to ellipsis

Type	Headway	Maturita Solutions	New English File
Question tags	-	5	4
Short answers	4	1	-
Reduced infinitive	3	-	-
Total	7	6	4

2.3.1. Ellipsis in Headway

The authors of Headway do not introduce ellipsis as a cohesive feature, but they present some elliptic constructions as elements that can enhance students' spoken English and help them sound more natural. Therefore, the two kinds of elliptic constructions which the book contains are located in two different units, in both cases in a box called "Spoken English". The first construction is a short answer, such as: "*Yes. I did.*", which is practiced by 4 exercises. The second is so called "reduced infinitive", which means a construction such as "*Don't forget to.*" It is practiced by 2 exercises.

The short answers are introduced in a recorded conversation. The students are asked to listen to the conversation and to fill blank gaps, which makes them pay attention. Then, the students should decide which speaker sounded more polite. At this point, the students are presented with the short answers and are taught how to compose them. They can practise the proper composition in the next exercise and after that they should return to the original conversation. In the following

exercises they are asked to rewrite the impolite lines to sound more polite and to compare the two versions of the conversation. The final task is to act the conversations in groups. At the first sight, this exercise looks like a speaking exercise, but, in fact, it is not so, because the students do not speak in their own words.

The second type of ellipsis, “reduced infinitive”, is taught in the same way. The teaching process proceeds from listening to conversation through work with a tapescript to oral performance, which is again not a real speaking task. On the other hand, there is a speaking task on this page, but it does not seem to be connected to this topic.

The way in which ellipsis is practiced in Headway is almost in accord with the methodology suggested by the theoretical part. The students work with texts under the guidance of the teacher, they make their own conclusions, they practice the grammar in exercises, but the last step is missing, because the students do not make their own dialogues, only read aloud the tapescripts. While it is certainly wrong that the textbook does not include any productive exercise, the teacher can easily prepare a speaking activity inspired by the conversations in the textbook.

2.3.2. Ellipsis in Maturita Solutions

Maturita Solutions dedicates a lot of space to teaching question tags. The book contains 5 exercises dealing with this topic. Four exercises form the core of a lesson called “Making Conversation”, which is a part of “Everyday English” section. At first, the learners should read and listen to an informal conversation between two students, which contains the question tags. Then the grammar rules and tips for usage are presented to the learners and they are asked to find some question tags in the conversation. In the following two exercises, the students have to add question tags to given sentences and to complete gapped sentences according to a recording. The last exercise is a speaking activity. The students should prepare and perform a conversation, which follows the

prescribed rules. The students have to use “phrases from exercise 6”, which include question tags. Then, there is another exercise in the revision section at the end of the book. Its task is to add question tags to the sentences. The question tags are presented in a very good way in this book. The subject is presented in an inductive way, which is preferred by Byrne (1991). The number and structure of the exercises seem to be sufficient and they progress from guided to almost independent. Considering the fact that Maturita Solutions is made specifically for Czech students, it would be useful if the question tags were revised in another speaking exercise further in the book, because Czech learners can find it very difficult to use the question tags spontaneously as there is no equivalent to them in Czech.

Apart from the question tags, the book also contains one exercise that practices short answers such as “*Yes. I have.*” The exercise is a speaking activity, in which the students should ask each other questions such as: “*Have you ever had your hearing checked?*” (Maturita Solutions, rok, p. 85). Therefore, the main aim of the exercise is to practice the construction “to have something done”, but the short answers are demanded as a proper answer to the questions. The exercise does not contain any explanation about the reason for the usage of such answers. We can only suppose that this explanation was already done in the previous book of this series.

2.3.3. Ellipsis in New English File

New English File does not teach any type of ellipsis except for question tags. The four exercises related to the topic are placed in three different sections of the book, but they are meant to be done at once, as a part of a topic called Murder Mysteries. As the name of the unit suggests, question tags are introduced in connection with police interviews. The method is very similar to that used in Headway and Maturita Solutions. The grammatical construction is introduced in a recorded conversation and the students are asked to complete gapped

sentences with the exact words from the recording. What is missing in the sentences is the question tag. This exercise is followed by the explanation of grammar rules and by two gap-filling exercises; one of them without any support and the other with the help of recorded police interview. The last task is a role play. The students are supposed to play the roles of a policeman and a suspect according to the clues in the Communication section. The policeman is supposed to interview the suspect and then to check the answers using question tags.

The way of teaching question tags is very similar to Maturita Solutions, but there is a slight difference. Although the question tags were presented appropriately from the methodological point of view, it is questionable whether the chosen topic and the speaking task are realistic enough, which is important from the point of communicative approach. It is not very likely that the students will ever find themselves in the role of policeman or suspect and they will need to use English in this situation. The fact that a construction atypical for Czech language is combined with unrealistic topic will not help the students to acquire question tags as a part of everyday speech.

2.3.4. Summary of Ellipsis

While there are some differences in the type of elliptical structures taught in the books, all of the authors choose the same approach. All of them present such elliptical sentences that are typical for spoken interaction and therefore the books do not contain any writing exercises. Concerning the cohesion of spoken language, the presentation of ellipsis is done in a systematic and interesting way. Headway and Maturita Solutions try to present samples of authentic everyday speech, whereas New English File appeals to students' fantasy. The new grammar is always presented inductively and it is followed by a wide range of exercises. On the other hand, the number of exercises on the higher levels of Bloom's taxonomy is considerably low in comparison with the number of exercises on its lower levels.

Maturita and New English File provide only one speaking exercise to each subject and the so called speaking exercises in Headway are, in fact, only pronunciation exercises.

2.4. Analysis of Conjunction

The number of exercises related to conjunction in all the three books is presented in the following table.

Table 3: The number of exercises related to conjunction

	Headway	Maturita Solutions	New English File
Number of exercises	12	3	4

2.4.1. Conjunction in Headway

Headway contains 12 exercises for practicing the use of conjunctions, which is significantly more than in the other books. Except for two exercises, all of them are located in the separate writing section at the end of the book. The two exercises which are placed on page 93 inside Unit 11 are aimed at disjuncts for expressing attitude. The students can familiarize themselves with the disjuncts in a reading and listening exercise. Then, in the first exercise, there is a letter, which is in certain places interrupted by two conjuncts or disjuncts inside brackets and the students should choose the right one. In the following exercise, the students should create their own sentences beginning with given conjunct or disjuncts. According to method suggested by Byrne, the next step should be to let the students write their own text, but this stage is missing in Headway. The exercises are connected to page 116, which is dedicated to teaching “Linking ideas”, nevertheless, this page also lacks any writing task.

The writing section contains twelve sub-sections. Five of them contain at least one exercise which practices conjunctions. Furthermore, one lesson is completely targeted at teaching cohesion and contains some text composition exercises. Some form of conjunction is practiced in connection with a story (narrative), a talk, an essay and an informative article. All of the exercises are related to some model text and most of them are followed by students' own production. In Unit 3, concerned with storytelling, there is one exercise in which the students should complete blank spaces with conjunctions and conjuncts from a box. The following task is to write down some fairy tale that the students know. In Unit 5, related to preparing a talk, the students are presented a sample talk and they are asked to underline the expressions which introduce new paragraph. Then they progress to guided writing. They are offered a set of expressions that can help them organize their paragraphs. In Unit 9, focused on essay writing, the students should replace underlined linking expression with different ones from a box. In another exercise, they should produce their own sentences starting with a given conjunct. As the final task, the students are instructed to use these expressions in their own essay. Unit 10 contains two exercises focused on conjunctions. In the first of them, the students should find given expressions in a popular article about New York and discuss their meaning and usage. In the second exercise, they should insert these expressions into gapped sentences. This unit is also concluded by a writing task. Finally, there is Unit 11, which is connected to the two exercises on page 93, which were already described. Unit 11 expands students' stock of conjuncts and give them another opportunity to practice those that they have already learnt. The unit is comprised of three exercises. In the first exercise the students have to connect pairs of sentences, in the second, they have to finish sentences, which begin with conjuncts, and in the third, they have to choose the right conjunct out of two options.

It is obvious that the authors of Headway paid much attention to

teaching conjunction and writing skills on the whole. The students are given enough opportunities to understand the role and the meaning of various conjunctions in different genres. They can also practice the proper usage of conjunction in both guided and unguided tasks. The book does not require any supplement in this area.

2.4.2. Conjunction in Maturita Solutions

Maturita Solutions provides only 3 exercises which deal with conjunction. All of them are located in writing sections. Two exercises are placed on page 21, whose topic is story writing. Some conjunctions are presented as a “writing tip”, together with examples of usage. The task of the first exercise is to find the conjunction from the list in a sample story printed on the page. The next step is to complete these conjunctions into gapped sentences. This is followed by a writing task, in which the students can practice the conjunctions in story writing. Then, there is an isolated exercise on page 107, in a section called “Get ready for B2 exams”. The students are given a set of conjunct, other than the conjunctions from page 21 and they are supposed to write them in gapped text (an essay). This exercise is also followed by a writing task. The students are supposed to write an essay to the given topic.

The number of exercises is surprisingly low, especially if we consider the fact that this book is supposed to serve as a kind of preparation for Czech Maturita Exam. There are two sets of conjunction in this book and each of them is practiced only by one or two exercises and afterwards by a writing task. While it is good that both sets are followed by writing tasks, the subject of conjunctions seems to be insufficiently covered in comparison with the requirements of the theoretical part and with Headway.

2.4.3. Conjunction in New English File

New English File contains 4 exercises aimed at practicing and learning

conjunctions. The exercises are distributed throughout the book in writing, reading and speaking section. One exercise is placed in the writing section and it is a gap-filling exercise. It is the only exercise, which is followed by a writing task. The next two exercises, which are placed in the reading section, are logically connected with each other. The first task is to look at highlighted phrases in an article and to sort them according to their meaning. The learners can put them into one of four given categories, such as “*to compare or contrast two facts or opinions*” or “*to introduce some extra information*”. The following exercise expands the first one. The students should fill the conjuncts from the previous exercise in gapped sentences. These exercises are not followed by any productive task, neither writing nor speaking. The last exercise in this book, which is located in the Communication section on pages 117 and 120, aims at using conjuncts in speech. The students are instructed to ask questions in pairs and answer them using *personally* and *in my opinion*. This exercise is linked with part of Unit 5, which is focused on expressing opinion. Besides these exercises, there are also some conjuncts presented in “Useful language” box on page 113, but there is no exercise connected with it, which is quite strange from the methodological point of view.

The authors seem to have attempted to introduce the conjunction into all areas of language competence, but, in my opinion, the number of exercises is insufficient and the conjunctions are not practiced enough. Conjuncts such as *whereas*, *however*, or *on the other hand*, which are necessary in formal writing, are only introduced and categorized, but they are not practiced by essay writing. Instead, the writing task in this unit deals with CV and application letter, in which these conjuncts cannot be used.

2.4.4. Summary of Conjunction

While the previous categories of cohesion were treated in all the books approximately on the same level, the quality of teaching conjunction is

much more diverse. We can see a remarkable difference between Maturita Solutions and New English File on the one hand and Headway on the other. Headway provides a good range of exercises, which are organized in a systematic way and whose layout and structure correspond well with the approach proposed by the theoretical part. On the contrary, both Maturita Solutions and New English File offer only a few exercises which are scattered throughout the whole book and which are not always linked to writing practice. While these exercises are not wrong or uninteresting, their amount and mutual connection seems to be insufficient for proper acquisition of conjunction as a cohesive means.

2.5. Analysis of Complex Exercises

Apart from the exercises which concentrate exclusively at one type of cohesion and thus can be easily put into adequate category, there are also exercises, which integrates more types of cohesion and they usually concentrate at text composition as a skill. Each of the analysed books contains some exercises of this kind. I call them “complex exercises”, because they practice cohesion in its complexity. The number of complex exercises in all the three books is presented in the following table.

Table 4: The number of complex exercises

	Headway	Maturita Solutions	New English File
Number of exercises	5	4	2

2.5.1. Complex Exercises in Headway

Headway contains 5 exercises, which support students’ understanding of cohesion. Two of them have similar form and task type. They consist of

an article and a set of sentences, which were removed from the article and replaced by blanks. The task is to put the sentences to the places where they belong. The first exercise on page 42 is based on an article about predicting future. The students should first read just the headlines of the individual paragraphs of the article, then, they should read the sentences, which were cut out, and pair them with corresponding paragraph. The students are supposed to make guesses based on connections between the topics of the paragraphs and sentences, therefore the exercise is focused on lexical cohesion, nevertheless, the sentences contain a number of referential words, so the grammatical cohesion is also practised, especially in the final task of the exercise, when the students read the article and check the accuracy of their guesses. The second exercise of this kind is placed on page 105. The students should again complete a short text with some sentences, but the order of the tasks is reversed. They should read the short story first and after that they should read the sentences and put them to the right places. The exercise is very good for understanding of cohesion, because the students have to pay attention not only to the meaning of the sentences but also to their form.

Headway also contains three very useful exercises, which introduce cohesion in very a systematic and meaningful way. These three exercises form a whole unit, which is dedicated to teaching cohesion. The topic of the unit is “A biography”, its sub-topic is “Combining sentences” and it is located on page 106. In the first exercise, the students should look on two paragraphs and compare and discuss them in pairs. The two paragraphs contain exactly the same information, but the first paragraph consists of unconnected single sentences, while the second one consists of properly connected sentences. This exercise makes the students realize that sentences in any text are not just lined up one after another, but that they need to be connected in some way. The following exercise goes one step further. Again, there are two paragraphs organized in the same way as in the previous exercise, but there are some gaps in the cohesive paragraph, which the students have

to complete. The third exercise has the same task and form as the second, but it is slightly more difficult, because it contains more complicated structures. The exercises are connected by a common topic, each exercise contains a piece of autobiography of Mother Teresa, so the students can read her complete biography after finishing all the exercises. Finally, the students should gather the information about another famous person and write his or her biography.

All the described exercises are very useful for the students, because they lead them to integration of their knowledge of grammar and syntax and to exploration of the ways, in which they are interlocked in a text.

2.5.2. Complex Exercises in Maturita Solutions

Maturita Solutions includes 4 exercises of this kind. They belong to the type which includes inserting removed sentences to their original places. They were probably included in this book, because this task type is a part of B2 exam. The first two exercises are designed as regular exercises; the first of them is placed in the writing section and serves as a preparation for writing a letter. The second one is not connected to writing, but it serves as a basis for speaking and listening activities in the culture section. The last two exercises are located in the section called “Get ready for your exam” and therefore they are designed as B2 exam tasks. The second pair of exercises is more difficult than the first pair, the texts are longer and the omitted sentences are longer and more complicated.

While this book does not offer such a sophisticated system of exercises as Headway, it can at least slightly increase students’ awareness of cohesion, especially in reading exercises with this specific task. Nevertheless, the exercises should be expanded by other tasks, for example underlining the cohesive words and drawing the cohesive links.

2.5.3. Complex Exercises in New English File

New English File contains only 2 exercises, which develop the understanding of text formation. They can be found on pages 44 and 53 and they belong to the same type as those in Maturita Solutions and the sentences, which were left out, are relatively short. One of the exercises is a reading comprehension exercise and the other is a part of grammar practice.

The number of exercises is extraordinarily low, so it appears that teaching cohesion or reading and writing skills is not the priority for the book's creators. Although Maturita Solutions does not contain many exercises either, it at least tries to prepare the students systematically for a specific exam task which they may encounter.

2.5.4. Summary of Complex Exercises

The outcome of the analysis is the same as in case of conjunction. Again, Headway provides a number of exercises, which aim at developing writing skill in accordance with the outcomes of the theoretical part. A whole page is devoted to step-by-step text building, which provides the students with useful insight into text structure and gives them inspiration and an opportunity for own writing. Additionally, the book contains several exercises which develop reading skills. On the other hand, Maturita Solutions and New English File include such exercises only marginally. Maturita Solutions includes only one task type and only as a training for B2 exams. New English File contains only two exercises which touch the problem of text building, but the intention behind them does not seem to be a systematic teaching of cohesion.

2.6. Summary of the Textbook Analysis

The following table summarizes all the data already presented and provides the total numbers of all exercises related to cohesion in all the three books.

Table 5: The number of all exercises related to cohesion

Type of cohesion	Headway	Maturita Solutions	New English File
Reference	8	10	13
Substitution	-	-	-
Ellipsis	7	6	4
Conjunction	12	3	4
Complex	5	4	2
Total	32	23	23

Comparing the textbooks, we can notice some differences in the approaches of their authors to the individual cohesive elements. In case of reference, the three books differ in their choice of presented cohesive elements, but not in their approach to them or in the quality of references. All the books present all kinds of reference as grammatical and not textual features. In relation to skills, all of them put more emphasis on speaking than writing. I cannot compare the treatment of substitution, because it is completely missing in all the books. Concerning the ellipsis, all the books show the same attitude. It is taught as a feature of spoken language. All the three books introduce only such kind of elliptical structures that are typical for spoken interaction. The books do not significantly differ in the quantity and quality of exercises.

Regarding reference, substitution and ellipsis, it is difficult to prefer one book to another. All of them have different advantages and disadvantages, since they accent different points.

Unlike by the previous cohesion types, we can see a substantial difference in the treatment of conjunction. The number and quality of exercises in Headway are remarkably higher than in the remaining books. The conjunction is treated by Headway as a cohesive means and as an important feature of written language. The structure and organization of the exercises are in harmony with the methodology presented in the theoretical part. The vast majority of exercises concerning conjunction are placed in the writing section at the end of Headway. Furthermore, Headway also contains significantly more such exercises, which fall into “complex” category and which aimed at cohesion as a whole. These exercises deal usually with reading and writing skills and almost a half of them are also located in the writing section in Headway. The other books do not have special writing section and this type of exercises is diffused in various sections and units.

This fact leads me to the conclusion that it is the presence writing section that improves the quality of teaching cohesion. We can say that some types of cohesion are considered to be part of grammar or of speaking skills and these are treated equally in all the books. Conversely, conjunction is considered to be a feature of writing and the quality of its teaching depends on the space devoted to teaching writing. For that reason, I consider Headway the best of the three books, as far as we are concerned in cohesion. Nevertheless, even this book requires certain supplements in the areas of reference, substitution and ellipsis. Some exercises which might be a suitable supplement will be presented in the next chapter.

3. Suggested Supplementation

The following chapters contain additional exercises that should compensate for the deficits discovered in Headway. The supplements belong to three categories of cohesion. Firstly, there are writing and reading exercises related to personal reference, because there are only gap-filling exercises to this subject in Headway. Secondly, there are a number of exercises which are meant to introduce and practice substitution, since the whole subject is missing in Headway. Finally, there are two exercises related to ellipsis. These exercises are connected to two concrete lessons in Headway, which contain a lot of exercises but no speaking tasks. There are no supplements for the area of conjunction, because, in my opinion, it is sufficiently covered in Headway. Nonetheless, some of the suggested exercises, especially writing ones, demand the use of conjunction as well as other cohesive means.

3.1. Supplements to Reference

EXERCISE 1

The task: The students will read the email. They will identify all the highlighted pronouns and adverbs. They will write down the words which are referred to by the highlighted words.

Hi Sofie!

*How are you? It seems ages since I last saw you – the last time we met I remember you were very busy helping your friend get ready for **her** wedding – I hope **it** went well and the weather stayed fine.*

*Actually, the reason I'm sending you **this** is to tell you about another wedding. My brother Andy and Anushka have finally set a date for **their** wedding – 20th August. We'll send you a proper invitation in a few weeks, but **this** is just to let you know in advance.*

*Anyway, my parents want to celebrate the engagement, so they're having a special lunch on Sunday 3rd May. We're inviting relatives and close friends, so there will be about twenty people **there**. We'd love to see you! **It's** at Martin's Restaurant – do you know **it**? **It's** on the waterfront, so let's hope the weather is good!*

I'm going away for two weeks from tomorrow, but you can phone my parrents to tell them you are coming, or send me an e-mail. I really hope you can come!

Love from Marianne

(Adapted from Cunningham, Moor and Comyns Carr, 2006, p. 40)

The aim of the exercise: The purpose of the exercise is to show the students the cohesive links created by the personal and demonstrative pronouns. The exercise also increases students' reading skills, because according to Cunningsworth the proper recognition of pronoun reference is very important for understanding the meaning of the text (Cunningsworth, 1995).

EXERCISE 2

The task: The students will rewrite these sentences to create a more readable and interesting story.

Farris is 16.

Farris is American.

Farris' parents were born in Baghdad.

Farris studies journalism.

Farris wanted to see Baghdad.

Farris wanted to check how people live in Baghdad nowadays.

Farris wanted to write about Baghdad.

Farris broke his money box.
Farris bought a ticket to Kuwait City.
Farris landed in Kuwait City.
Farris phoned his parents.
Farris parents asked Farris to come back.
Farris tried to cross the border.
Farris hired a taxi.
The taxi driver asked for 250 dollars.
The taxi driver took Farris to Baghdad.
Farris reached Baghdad on Christmas Day.
Farris went to a hotel for Western people.
Farris couldn't speak the language at all.
It was very difficult for Farris to communicate.
Farris decided to go to the Associated Press.
The reporters hears Farris' story.
The reporters were shocked.
The reporters phoned the American Embassy.
Farris was put on plane.
Farris flew back to America.
Farris' parents were angry.
Farris' parents were relieved.

(Taken from TEAM, p.54)

The aim of the exercise: The aim of the exercise is to practice using personal pronouns and possessives to connect sentences into cohesive text. The exercise also requires the use of other cohesive means, especially conjunctions, so it leads to integrated usage of more cohesive elements.

EXERCISE 3

The task: The students will write their stories according to the following topic: *“Alice is 5 years old. She found 100\$ in front of toy shop. She decided to spend them on a trip to Africa.”*

The aim of the exercise: The aim of the exercise is to reinforce the usage of all means of cohesion which are available to the students and to cherish their creativity.

3.2. Supplements to Substitution

EXERCISE 1

The task: The students will read the story and define the meaning of the highlighted *one*.

*Two boys were fishing. One of them had a permit to fish, the other **one** didn't. Suddenly a gamekeeper ran to them from a bush. The boy with the permit cried loudly, dropped his fishing rod, and ran off at top speed. The gamekeeper started to chase him quickly. Then the boy was tired and stopped. The man took him by the arm and said:*

"Have you got a permit to fish?"

"Yes, of course," said the boy quietly.

"Have you? Then show it to me."

The boy drew the permit from his pocket. The man examined it and frowned.

"Why did you run when you had this permit?" he asked.

"To let the other boy get away," was the reply. "He didn't have any."

(Text adapted from B-Books)

The aim of the exercise: The purpose of the exercise is to lead the students to recognition of one in the role of substitute in contrast with the role of numeral.

EXERCISE 2

Task: The students will fill in the gaps with *one* or *ones*.

1. I have got a lot of pullovers in my cupboard, but I only wear the short-sleeved ___ and the two striped ___ .

2. I'm going out tonight. Which dress shall I wear? The red ___ or the blue ___ ? Take this ___ !

3. *Look at all those cars over there! The red ___ is mine and the yellow ___ is Sarah's.*
4. *There are three folders on the floor. A green ___ and two red ___.*
5. *I've put the sweets on the table. The ___ on the left are yours and the ___ on the right are mine.*
6. *I've put the magazines in your room. The ___ on the cupboard are yours and the ___ on your bed is Peter's.*

(Adapted from Jayne Dökel, 2013)

The aim of the exercise: The exercise serves as a guided practice of the proper usage of the nominal substitute *one/ones*.

EXERCISE 3

Task: The students will rewrite the sentences in order to avoid repetition. They should use *one* or *ones*.

1. *She doesn't like the red dress, but she likes the blue dress.*
2. *I need a new bag, because this bag is very old.*
3. *There are lots of clothes shops around here, but City Girl is the cheapest clothes shop.*
4. *Which tomatoes would you like? The yellow tomatoes or the red tomatoes?*
5. *„Have these cakes.“ „ I can't eat both!“ „So také the bigger cake.“*
6. *„Shall we get some mushrooms?“ „These mushrooms look better than those mushrooms.“*

(Adapted from Škola Ámos Kadaň)

The aim of the exercise: The purpose of the exercise is to reinforce the right usage of the nominal substitute *one/ones* in guided writing.

EXERCISE 4

The task: The students should find and circle every *one* in the text. They should decide which ones are substitutes and which ones are numerals.

Get an alarm clock and put it as far away from your bed as you can. If you don't have to get out of bed to turn in off, then it's no good having one, And remember that two is better than one...but set the second clock ten minutes later than the first one, and put it in the same place as the first one!

(Text taken from Cunningham, Moor and Comyns Carr, 2006, p. 25)

The aim of the exercise: The purpose of the exercise is to teach the students to distinguish between the different functions of *one*.

EXERCISE 5

The task: The students will make groups of three. In the groups they will prepare and perform a conversation according to the instructions. They should try to use *one/ones* as many times as possible.

A: *You are a shop assistant in a clothes shop.*

B: *You are a lady who wants to buy some dress (or trousers, shoes etc. – decide for yourself). You can't decide between two pieces.*

C: *You are B's husband. You want your wife to decide and go home quickly.*

The aim of the exercise: The students should practice the use of one in speaking in nearly real-life situation. It also serves to enhance students' speaking abilities.

EXERCISE 6

The task: This letter is written by a student of English. The students should improve the style of the letter by replacing the redundant words.

Dear Mary,

I haven't written for ages, sorry. How are you? Guess what! I've moved to another house. Let me describe the house.

It's quite a large house with a vast garden. There are two floors and nine rooms. If I compare the new house with the old house, I tell you, there is a big difference. The previous house was too dark and this house is bright enough. This is because of big windows and balconies. We have a beautiful kitchen!

Although I like the house so much, there is one thing I dislike. The garden has no trees. You know I love plants and trees and there aren't any plants and trees! Anyway, the house is marvellous.

Enough of all that. I'd like to invite you to the house. It would be great, if you came and stay in the house. I stop writing now, because I am running out of space. Write soon!

Best wishes

Peter

(Adapted from CERMAT, 2014)

The aim of the exercise: The purpose of the exercise is to revise and reinforce the usage of all cohesive means that the students know. The exercise should also improve the style of students' writing.

3.3. Supplements to Ellipsis

EXERCISE 1

The task: The students will work in pairs. Each pair will get a card with their roles. They will make dialogues according to the role description. One student in the pair has to be polite and the other has to be impolite. Two or three pairs will then perform the conversation in front of the others and the rest of the class will guess what characters they perform.

The roles:

1. A teacher + a student apologizing for not having homework
2. A shop assistant + a customer who wants to return something
3. A grandchild + his/her grandmother asking about school
4. A waiter + a customer who has found a fly in his soup
5. A boss + an employee who wants higher salary
6. A doctor + a patient with a strange illness
7. A pop star + a journalist making an interview

The aim of the exercise: This exercise serves as a supplement to Headway, Unit 1, p.8, which lacks speaking exercises for the practice of short answers. The exercise should also develop students' creativity, imagination and speaking skills in general.

EXERCISE 2

Task: Sam/Samantha is going to travel to Africa/India/South Pole (the students can choose) with his/her friends. He/she is departing tomorrow. He/she is announcing his plan to his/her mother or father. The students will act out their conversation in pairs. They should use the reduced infinitives in their conversation.

The aim of the exercise: This exercise serves as a supplement to Headway, Unit 8, p.64, which lacks speaking exercises for the practice of reduced infinitive. The exercise should reinforce the use of reduced infinitive, which was practiced earlier in the lesson.

Conclusion

While comparing three English textbooks - Headway, Maturita Solutions and New English File - I found both some general tendencies and some individual specifics of the books. All the books share the tendency to treat reference and ellipsis as a feature of spoken language and to neglect their importance for fluent writing. Similarly, all the books omit substitution altogether.

Concerning the teaching of conjunction, I found out that all the books consider it to be a feature of written language, but they significantly differ in the amount of space dedicated to teaching conjunction. Maturita Solutions and New English File pay little attention to it, if compared with Headway. Headway provides the teachers with a good range of exercises, which enable them to teach conjunction efficiently. Additionally, it contains a number of exercises related to text composition. Therefore, I have chosen Headway as the most suitable textbook for teaching cohesion and I prepared some exercises to supplement it in the areas other than conjunction.

In my opinion, Headway together with the presented supplementation may be a good resource for teaching cohesion at upper-secondary schools.

RÉSUMÉ

Diplomová práce je zaměřena na výzkum pojetí výuky textové koheze v učebnicích anglického jazyka pro závěrečné ročníky středních škol. K výzkumu byly použity učebnice New Headway Intermediate, Maturita Solutions Intermediate a New English File Intermediate. Analýzou obsahu učebnic byly zjištěny značné podobnosti mezi učebnicemi, zejména v pojetí vyučování reference a elipsy, a zároveň i značné rozdíly, zejména v počtu cvičení týkajících se spojovacích výrazů. Jako nejvhodnější učebnice byla vybrána New Headway Intermediate, právě díky většímu důrazu na výuku spojovacích výrazů. K této učebnici byla vytvořena nebo převzata doplňková cvičení, která vhodným způsobem rozvíjejí vyučování kohezních prostředků.

ANOTACE

Jméno a příjmení:	Lenka Pelíšková
Katedra nebo ústav:	Katedra anglického jazyka
Vedoucí práce:	Mgr. Jana Kořínková, Ph.D.
Rok obhajoby:	2014

Název práce:	Vyučování koheze a kohezních prostředků
Název v angličtině:	Teaching Cohesion and Cohesive Devices
Anotace práce:	Diplomová práce pojednává o pojetí výuky prostředků textové koheze v učebnicích anglického jazyka pro střední školy. V teoretické části jsou na podkladě odborné literatury popsány jednotlivé kohezní prostředky a jejich funkce. Dále je zde rozebrána problematika vhodného metodického přístupu k výuce kohezních prostředků na školách. V praktické části jsou srovnávány tři učebnice anglického jazyka pro střední školy a jsou navržena další doplňková cvičení.
Klíčová slova:	Text, koheze, reference, substituce, elipsa, spojovací výrazy, psaní, čtení, výuka, učebnice, střední škola
Anotace v angličtině:	The diploma project deals with the ways of teaching cohesion in the English textbooks for upper secondary schools. The theoretical part contains the description of individual cohesive devices and their function based on synthesis of academic sources. It also contains a discussion on the methodology of teaching cohesion at schools. The practical part includes an analysis of three English textbooks for upper secondary schools and their suggested supplementation.
Klíčová slova v angličtině:	Text, cohesion, reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, writing, reading, teaching, textbooks, upper secondary school
Přílohy vázané v práci:	Práce neobsahuje přílohy
Rozsah práce:	67 s.
Jazyk práce:	Angličtina

BIBLIOGRAPHY

HALLIDAY, M.A.K. a R. HASAN. *Cohesion in English*. 13. vyd. New York: Longman, 1994. ISBN 0-582-55041-6.

DE BEAUGRANDE, R. a W. DRESSLER. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. 4. vyd. New York: Longman, 1988. ISBN 0-582-55485-3.

ÖSTMAN, J.A. Introduction. In: ÖSTMAN, J.A. *Cohesion and Semantics: Reports on Text Linguistics*. 1. vyd. Abo: Abo Akademi, 1978. ISBN 951-648-447.

LAUTAMATTI, L. Some Observations on Cohesion and Coherence in Simplified Texts. In: ÖSTMAN, J.A. *Cohesion and Semantics: Reports on Text Linguistics*. 1. vyd. Abo: Abo Akademi, 1978. ISBN 951-648-447.

ENKVIST, N. E. Coherence, Pseudo-Coherence and Non-Coherence. In: ÖSTMAN, J.A. *Cohesion and Semantics: Reports on Text Linguistics*. 1. vyd. Abo: Abo Akademi, 1978. ISBN 951-648-447.

BROWN, G. a G. YULE. *Discourse Analysis*. 1. vyd. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. ISBN 0 521 28475 9.

TÁRNYIKOVÁ, Jarmila. *From Text to Texture: An Introduction to Processing Strategies*. 3. vyd. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2002. ISBN 80-244-0438-9.

QUIRK, R. *A Comprehensible Grammar of the English Language*. 10. vyd. New York: Longman, 1992. ISBN 0 582 51734 6.

TANNEN, D. *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse*. 2. vyd. New Jersey: Ablex, 1986. ISBN 0-89391-097-X.

HOEY, M. *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. 4. vyd. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. ISBN 0 19 437142 5.

BYRNE, D. *Teaching Writing Skills*. 5. vyd. Harlow: Longman, 1991. ISBN 0-582-74651-5.

HARMER, J. *How to Teach English*. 7. vyd. Harlow: Longman, 2001. ISBN 0-582-297-96-6.

CUNNINGSWORTH, Alan. *Choosing Your Textbook*. Oxford: Macmillan Heineman, 1995. ISBN 0453 24058 7.

CUNNINGHAM, Sarah, Peter MOOR a Jane COMYNS CARR. *New Cutting Edge: Pre-Intermediate*. 4. vyd. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2006. ISBN 978-0-582-82509-3.

Analyzed textbooks

FALLA, Tim a Paul A. DAVIES. *Maturita Solutions: Intermediate*. 1. vyd. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. ISBN 978 0 19 4551847.

OXENDEN, Clive a Christina LATHAM-KOENIG. *New English File: Intermediate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. ISBN 978 0 19 451800 0.

SOARS, Liz a John SOARS. *New Headway: Intermediate*. 4. vyd. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. ISBN 978 0 19 476864.

Digital sources

CENTRUM PRO ZJIŠŤOVÁNÍ VÝSLEDKŮ VE VZDĚLÁVÁNÍ - CERMAT. *Maturitní zkouška z anglického jazyka: Písemná práce* [online]. 2. upravené. Praha: CERMAT, 2014 [cit. 2014-06-23]. ISBN 978-80-87337-16-5. Dostupné z: <http://www.novamaturita.cz/publikace-k-maturite-2014-1404036219.html>

KOLÁČKOVÁ, Ludmila. *Kritéria, podle nichž učitelé AJ vybírají učebnice: English Teachers' Criteria for Textbooks Choice*. Dostupné z: http://casajc.ff.cuni.cz/Documents/CASAJC_online/1101/111_Kolackova.pdf

VÝZKUMNÝ ÚSTAV PEDAGOGICKÝ V PRAZE. *Rámcový vzdělávací program pro gymnázia* [online]. 1. vyd. Praha: VÚP, 2007 [cit. 2014-06-23]. ISBN 978-80-87000-11-3. Dostupné z: http://www.msmt.cz/file/10427_1_1/

BEDFORD, Jenni a Breda MATTHEWS. *Marine Mammals: Writing Information Texts: Learning Task 3: Cohesive Devices*. [online]., 2010 [cit. 2014-06-23]. Dostupné z: <http://esolonline.tki.org.nz/ESOL-Online/Teacher-needs/Teaching-and-learning-sequences/Marine-mammals-Writing-information-texts-US17144>

THORNBURY, S. *Methodology: Coherence and Cohesion*. In: *One Stop English* [online]. [cit. 2014-06-23]. Dostupné z: <http://www.onestopenglish.com/support/ask-the-experts/methodology-questions/methodology-coherence-and-cohesion/154867.article>

Gymnázium Jana Blahoslava a Střední pedagogická škola. [online]. [cit. 2014-06-23]. Dostupné z: http://www.gjb-spgs.cz/pouzivane-ucebnice-anglicky-jazyk-predmetove-komise-k_38.html

Gymnázium Zábřeh. [online]. [cit. 2014-06-23]. Dostupné z: <http://gyza.cz/storage/U%C4%8Debnice-2014-15-VG.pdf>

B-Books. [online]. 2007 [cit. 2014-06-23]. Dostupné z: <http://www.englishpractice.b-books.cz/easyreading.php>

JAYNE DÖKEL, Nicola. *Kico4U*. [online]. 2013 [cit. 2014-06-23]. Dostupné z: <http://www.kico4u.de/english/uebungen/6klasse/one.htm>

Škola Ámos Kadaň. [online]. [cit. 2014-06-23]. Dostupné z: http://www.skola.amoskadan.cz/s_aj/ajhtm/ag/ag03k00e.htm

TEAM: Training the Educators of Adults in an intercultural Module

[online]. [cit. 2014-06-23]. Dostupné z: <http://www.fenice-eu.org/studen/New%20Booklet-20.09.pdf>

