CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Background

Language is purely confined to humans, i.e. only humans are gifted with this entity. It is the way of expression of desires, feelings and so forth. Language relates the inner world of consciousness to the external world. It is needed in every walks of life, may it be education, sports, medicine etc. All the languages of the world in general and all the language varieties of the world in particular have equal importance. It is estimated that there are well over 6000 languages in the world. According to (Yule 2006, p.183) there are about thirty language families containing at least 4,000, and perhaps as many 6,000 different individual languages. These languages may differ from one another in terms of phonology and grammar but they share some common principles and universal features. They may have varying number of speakers. For example, English is the world's language and has the largest number of speakers, Spanish holds the status of second most widely used language and Chinese comes to the third position. However, this fact does not implicate that these languages are better than other languages of the world in terms of quality. It means to say to rank languages as superior and inferior is just wild goose chase. It is nothing more than futile attempt to regard any language better than other. There is dominance of one thing over others which is a common phenomenon. Hence, language cannot remain aloof from this phenomenon.

To talk of language dominance, English is dominating over other languages mainly in the field of education, trade, communication, etc. We can say that there is a grip of English in education not because English is valued in terms of sophistication but because teaching principles and methodologies originally written in English are being applied to teach language. This language has

expanded its horizons in trade as well. China, Japan, for instance, are resourcefully rich. They can do everything in their own language. The reason why these countries are getting inclined towards English is that they want to extend their business market to the whole world. With the rise of globalization, the status of the English language as the world's language is more justifiably established. The rise of interest and communication technology is contributing to Anglicization of the world. These technologies most preferably use the English language in media discourse and technological discourse. Not only media technology but almost all the spheres of knowledge and human activities employ the English language. For instance, half of the books of world are written in English and many countries are adopting English as an official language and medium of instruction. Hence, there is a need of the English language in our country to keep pace with the fast advancing world.

Similarly, third world country e.g. Nepal is also adopting English as a basic language to cope with the international scenario in terms of various aspects. Not everybody in the world speaks single language. So, to maintain the intelligibility between the interlocutors a common language is needed and English has taken this place. That is to say, English is taken as a lingua franca among the speakers of various languages.

Language learning is an art. It involves both productive and receptive skills. Speaking and writing are productive skills whereas listening and reading are receptive ones. Out of these skills listening is the preliminary one and others follow it. As we know language is a means of expression, it can be done with various modes of communication. Speaking is the oral way of expressing while writing is the concrete manifestation of expression in black and white. Writing makes use of graphic symbols. Logical connectors or cohesive devices play vital role in writing. Thus, to erase the gray areas of learners regarding writing both

exposure and conscious input are of great importance. If learners are efficient in writing, they can learn to express their ideas explicitly. Furthermore, writing attracts special importance because "reading maketh a full man, conference a ready man and writing an exact man" (http:/www.galenberg.org/files/575/575-h/575-h htm).

Undoubtedly, writing is the most difficult skill for L2 learners. The difficulty lies mostly on generating and organizing ideas for which cohesive devices are of paramount importance.

1.1.1 Stages in Writing Skill

Language is deeply structured in the subconscious mind and our mind works out and employs the rules and structures of the language almost unconsciously. So, learning a second language is always difficult and demands rigorous practice on the structure of the second language. On the face of it, writing skill seems to be considerably simpler. Yet, it is not haphazard and prompt. It is the matter of system. It is the process which has certain order; then only one can be skilled in writing. Similarly, writing is a complex and very powerful tool. One needs to be trained in its use. This power comes from its potential as an effective means of communication; the power is derived from order and clarity. For this, cohesion is pivotal.

Writing involves using letters and symbols to represent sounds and words of language such as "I like writing letters to my friends."
Writing can change your life. It is true that some people learn to write more easily than others. Because they have a certain aptitude for it or because they have been encouraged by parents or good teachers. But to a large extent it is a skill that can be learned by anyone who is willing to take the trouble.(Miller and Webb, 1992, p.1).

Garner and Johnson (1997) say that writing is a fluid process created by writers as they work. Accomplished writers move back and forth between the stages of the process, both consciously and unconsciously. Young writers, however, benefit from the structure and security of writing process in their writing, http/www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/methods).

The writing stages according to Garner and Johnson are explained below:

1.1.1.1 Pre-Writing

Pre-writing is the first stage of the writing process, typically followed by drafting, revision, editing and publishing. In other words, elements of pre-writing may include planning, research, outlining, diagramming, storyboarding or clustering . It is like hatching an egg from conception, incubation to hatching the plot. This is the stage of generating ideas for writing. Pre-writing helps us to get our ideas on paper, though not usually in an organized form, and brainstorm thoughts that might eventually make their way into our writing. In this stage, students think quickly without inhibition so as to produce as many ideas as possible, consult resources for different kinds of information, create life map, develop word bank, decide on form, audience and purpose, etc.

1.1.1.2 Rough Drafting

When we talk about "writing", we often mean "drafting". We imagine sitting down at the keyboard, opening up a blank document, and typing away, filling the screen with exactly what we want to say, expressed clearly and cleverly. It is almost impossible to get a piece of writing just right during the first draft. So, here the students get their ideas on paper. Still they are not concerned to writing convention i.e. they write without concern for conventions. Furthermore, in the rough draft the written work does not have to be neat; it is 'sloppy choppy'. The characteristics of this stage are:

Some sections from your plan don't seem to fit any more.

A particular chapter (or character, subplot, theme) just isn't working

We haven't explained ideas clearly enough

Sentences are flabby (over-wordy) or clumsy (ambiguous, repetitive, clunky-sounding)

1.1.1.3   Re-read

In this stage, the students re -read to proof their own work by reading aloud and reading for sensibility.

1.1.1.4   Share with a Peer Reviser

This is the stage of sharing ideas and making suggestions for improvement. This could be done by asking: who, what, when, where, why, and how questions about parts of writing. Students look for better words and talk about how to make the work better.

1.1.1.5   Redrafting

This is the craftsmanship side of writing. Preparing the first draft is not the final product. So, the writer can not merely check the language errors. At this stage, one improves what the narrative says and how it says it. Here, he may take out unnecessary work and use peer suggestions to make the work better. This is the stage which newer writers often skip – but it's just as important a part of writing as the first draft stage.

Redrafting or rewriting is when you take what you've written and rework it. That doesn't mean checking for typos, or tidying up a few sentences. It usually involves big-picture, structural change like:

Cutting whole chapters or sections

Adding in chunks of new material (and returning to the drafting stage for these)

Moving things around – perhaps chapter 5 should really be chapter 1

Sorting out any of those "notes to self" from the first draft – adding in facts or cross-references.

1.1.1.6 Editing

It denotes putting the last touches on work to make sure it flows well like adding any missing pieces or removing parts that don't fit. Here, one is engaged in tidying up his/her text as they prepare the final draft for evaluation. It can be done in peer or group. The reason for editing is to look after mechanics and spelling. This stage often gets muddled up with redrafting. We will have cut out anything irrelevant. We will have added new material where it is needed. But, even after redrafting, your piece is not finished. There will still be some awkward sentences and, inevitably, some typos for which editing are must. Editing means going through piece of writing line by line and looking for things like:

Sentences which would read better if you swapped them round

 Paragraphs which do not break in the right place

Words which are not quite what you meant to say

Repeated phrases or words – all writers have some favourites which they overuse

Mistakes, like missing or mistyped words

1.1.1.7 Final Draft

 This is the stage where actual work that requires creativity and discipline to get the final draft by putting pen to paper or fingertips to keyboard. In this stage discussion is done for producing final draft as per the goal of writing. Here, the students can discuss with teacher and other on writing.

1.1.1.8 Publishing

The first impression readers should have when they look at our work is: "The writer has thought about me and has tried to make the report easy to follow and interesting to read". This is the phase where the students publish their written pieces; sending their work to publisher; reading their finished matter; making books.

1.1.2 Components of Writing

Obviously, writing is an activity of encoding verbal thoughts in printed symbols. But it consists of number of other components. According to Sharma and Phyak (2009, p.258) the main components of writing are:

1.1.2.1 Mechanics

Effective writing requires a sound understanding of the mechanics of good writing. A useful analogy in thinking about the mechanics of writing is that of driving a car. Important information includes the various components of the car (or parts of speech in writing), and how they function together (the rules of grammar), and what is needed to keep the car moving along, stopping and starting in the right places, and pausing whenever it is necessary (punctuation).
So, mechanics involve the aspects of writing such as spelling, use of   punctuation marks, numbers, capitals, abbreviations. Mechanics is the indispensable part of writing.

1.1.2.2 Coherence

In a piece of discourse, there is a logical sequence of ideas. One idea must lead to another logically and this transition from one idea to another must be maintained all along. If this logical sequence of ideas is not maintained, it becomes impossible for the readers to make sense of the text. A good text is always coherent.

Coherence may be both intra sentential and inter sentential. More over, it is a thread or a string of logic that brings the beads of meaning, together, making the text into a coherent whole.

Yule (2006, p.126) defines coherence as "everything fitting together well. It is not something that exists in words or structure, but something that exists in people." He means to say that coherence exists in the interlocutor's act of bringing various elements meaning together and linking them with logical relationship. So, coherence is the unifying element in good writing. It refers to the unity created between the ideas, sentences, paragraphs and sections of a piece of writing. Coherence is what gives a piece of writing its flow. It also gives the reader a sense of what to expect and, therefore, makes the reading easier to comprehend as the ideas appear to be presented in a natural, almost automatic, way. When writing lacks coherence, the reader is forced to stop and reread. Occasionally, the reader may just give up out of frustration.

In other words, the relationship between utterances it conveys is called coherence. To be more specific, it is the semantic relationship of different sense units between and among the utterances. Incoherent sentences result confusion of thought. So, coherence is inevitable to get freedom from it. It could be achieved through a good organization of a text, chronological organization, spatial organization and logical organization of a text. When the link is unclear or not there, it may be because there is a break in the coherent flow in writing. If this happens, one needs to revise. This may involve:

- Adding or changing a transition or conjunction;
- Repeating a key term or phrase;
- Making a referent clearer;
- Creating parallel structures; and
- Changing tenses and time words.

As seen among most Nepalese learners of English language, they are found often missing the content in their text, perhaps, due to their inability to use appropriate words or expressions that the context demands. From my point of view, such learners need rigorous practice in writing and reading.

1.1.2.3 Cohesion

One of the effective components of writing is cohesion. It is the internal patterning, repetition of items used to create relationship of meaning within a text. In other words, cohesion is a relationship between sentences in a text. Furthermore, cohesion refers to the grammatical and lexical relationship between different elements of a text. It may be inter paragraph or intra paragraph. The simplest definition of cohesion is "it refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text and that define it as text" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, p.4). Cohesion connects a string of sentences to form a text rather than a series of unrelated statements. It, in English, presents a detailed system for analyzing the cohesive relationship within a text. The cohesive tie is the unit of analysis for cohesion. Cohesive ties among the sentences are those which contribute most strongly to creating a unified text. A text stands as a text by means of cohesion. If this is absent in writing some successive sentences can be parted from each other and will not form a text.

Cohesion is the act of sticking together. So, the various linguistic means (grammatical, lexical, and phonological) by which sentences 'stick together', are linked into larger units of paragraphs, or stanzas or chapters.

Cohesion is a formal link that makes various types of inter clause and inter sentence relationship within the text of discourse. To maintain the above mentioned relationship, and for coherent and meaningful writing, cohesive devices are needed. They work as backbone for coherence.

Cohesion is a quality of writing which makes our writing 'joined up' and makes it flow and hang together well. It means everything in our writing is logically laid out and connected. If it was an essay, one thing leads to another, so that your topic sentences come first and logically would come your supporting ideas. For example, I love Dolphin because they are cute lovable and smart. In the above example, the supporting ideas are; Cute, lovable and smart. To put differently, one thing follows another or A follows B.

(http/depts.washington.edu\eng\)

1.1.3 Why Cohesion in English Writing?

Cohesion is the network of lexical, grammatical, and other relations which link various parts of a text. These relations or ties organize and, to some extent, create a text, for instance, by requiring the reader to interpret words and expressions by reference to other words and expressions in the surrounding sentences and paragraphs. Cohesion is a surface relation and it connects together the actual words and expressions that we can see or hear.

Writing is not merely putting correct and meaningful sentences. It is the matter of linking sentences with no any feeling of gap. One can feel absence of gap, if accepted logical order is followed with well and correct structures. This could be done one and only by paying attention to cohesion. It helps readers to follow structure in writing. It is important that one's writing should be well structured in accordance with the expected logical order of English writing. In writing, ideas can be organized in chronological order or order of importance and can show contrast and comparison. Similarly, ideas should be divided into well connected paragraphs which contain well connected sentences. This proves the essence of cohesion in writing. In absence of cohesion, writing can be said to be just writing

of writing, not the writing as real writing. So, cohesion is part and parcel of an authentic writing.

1.1.1.3 Ways to Achieve Cohesion

Cohesion in English presents a detailed system for analyzing cohesive relationship within a text. So, it is indeed a need for apt writing. English for University.com presents some ways to achieve cohesion. They are as follows:

- By developing ideas from one sentence to the next.
- By using different words to refer to the same ideas previously mentioned.
- Using appropriate linking words that have different functions according to
  What we want to say. The functions of these linking words are to:

 - add information.

 - give an example or illustrate a point.

 - add a condition to the sentences.

 - show a contrast between ideas.

 - show a comparison/or similarity.

 - show a cause and reasons.

 - show a time and order of ideas.

To sum up, cohesive writing is writing that creates clear and logical relationship among ideas. We often describe writing that cohesively ties ideas together in a seamless way as writing that "flows" and writing that does not as "choppy". Cohesion is the glue that holds a piece of writing together. In other words, if a paper is cohesive, it sticks together from sentence to sentence and from paragraph to paragraph.

Cohesive devices certainly include transitional words and phrases such as therefore, furthermore, for instance, that clarify for readers the relationships among ideas in a piece of writing. However, transitional are not enough to make

writing cohesive. Repetition of key words and use of reference words are also needed for cohesion. (http/.English for university.com)

1.1.4 Elements of Cohesion in Writing

1.1.4.1 Repetition

We can tie sentences or paragraphs together by repeating certain key words from one sentence to the next or from one paragraph to the next. This also helps to emphasize the main ideas of a piece of writing.

1.1.4.2 The Known new Contrast

It is the way of ordering ideas or information that communicates what is already known before introducing a new topic. For example, if someone says all of sudden and without any context, "It is stolen", one will have to ask that person "what is?" because no known information has been introduced. Instead, if a person says, "Do you remember the cricket ball that I like? It is stolen", one will understand the relationship between the 'cricket ball' and 'It'. Pronouns, synonyms, near synonyms, etc can be used to establish known new contract in writing.

1.1.4.3 Metadiscourse

Metadiscourse refers to the signal words and phrases that explicitly link sentences and paragraphs together by: indicating relationship among ideas. For example:

Contradiction, which may be indicated by: however, but, nevertheless, although, on the other hand, etc.

Cause-effect, which may be indicated by: as a result, consequently, etc

Reason- conclusion, which may be indicated by: therefore because, hence, etc

Elaboration, which can be indicated by: in other words, to put it simply, that is to say, etc

Addition, which can be indicated by additionally, moreover, furthermore, besides, etc.

1.1.4.4 Parallelism

Parallelism is one of the most useful and flexible rhetorical techniques. It refers to any structure which brings together parallel elements, be these nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, or larger structures. Parallelism imparts grace and power to passage.

Example 1 (no parallelism):

- Open the book first.

- You must read the text now.

- There are pictures in the book. Look at them.

- The questions must be answered.

Example 2 (parallelism):

- Open the book.

- Read the text.

- Look at the pictures.

- Answer the questions.

1.1.5 Cohesive Devices

Cohesive devices are among those elements which contribute to the coherence of the text in a positive way if they are used appropriately by the writer. To bring the flow in writing, cohesive devices are indispensable. These are the words and phrases establishing relationship between clauses and sentences of a text. Halliday and Hasan (1976, p.32) discuss five major types of cohesive devices that occur in a text:

1.1.5.1 Reference

It is one of the significant cohesive devices among the elements in a written or spoken text. Expressing semantic relation by grammatical means can be said as

reference. The meaning of referential expression can be discovered by referring to the other elements in a written or spoken context. For example, Doctor Foster went to Gloucester in a shower of rain. He stepped in a puddle of right up to his middle and never went there again. In this example, there refers to Gloucester. So, in the case of reference the information to be retrieved is the referential meaning. There are two types of references. They are situational and textual reference. First one refers to a thing identified in the context of situation and the last one in the context of surrounding text. Halliday and Hasan (1976, p.33) call the situational reference as exophora and the textual reference as endophora reference. In chart it can be demonstrated below;

Reference

Situational   Textual
(Exophora)   (Endophora

                                                    Preceding
               Following text   text
               (Anaphora)   (Cataphora)

Exphoric references are not text internal. But they contribute to the creation of text in that it links the language with the context of outside situation. Endophoric reference contributes directly to cohesion where their interpretation lies within a text. These references can be noticed as anaphoric and cataphoric uses of pronominal in a text.

14

1.1.5.2 Conjunction

Simply, conjunction is a joining word. It sets up a relationship between two clauses. Examples include; then, however, in fact, and consequently. Conjunctions can also be implicit and can be deduced by the interpretation of the text. The aim of using conjunction is to create a logically articulated discourse. So, a conjunction is a word that "joins". A conjunction joins two parts of a sentence.

Here are some example conjunctions:

Coordinating Conjunctions	Subordinating Conjunctions
and, but, or, nor, for, yet, so	although, because, since, unless

We can consider conjunctions from three aspects.

Form

Conjunctions have three basic forms:

  Single Word

for example: and, but, because, although

  Compound (often ending with as or that)

for example: provided that, as long as, in order that

  Correlative (surrounding an adverb or adjective)

for example: so...that

Function

Conjunctions have two basic functions or "jobs":

  Subordinating conjunctions are used to join a subordinate dependent clause to a main clause, for example:

- I went swimming although it was cold.

  Coordinating conjunctions are used to join two parts of a sentence that are grammatically equal. The two parts may be single words or clauses, for example:

- Jack and Jill went up the hill.

- The water was warm, but I didn't go swimming.

Position

Coordinating conjunctions always come between the words or clauses that they join. Subordinating conjunctions usually come at the beginning of the subordinate clause.

1.1.5.3 Substitution

Substitution is a relation between linguistic items that involves replacement of one item by another: For example, (The Lion was about to reply when suddenly they came to another gulf across the road. But this one was so broad and so deep that the Lion knew at once he could not leap across it.) Here, one substitutes for gulf. Similarly, another example for substitution is:

There are many students in the class. I like the studious one.

Here, one substitutes for the student.

1.1.5.4 Ellipsis

Words or phrases are left out from sentences where they are unnecessary because they have been referred to or mentioned previously, or they are obvious from the context. It means ellipsis is substitution by zero. In other words, it is the form of substitution where the item is replaced by nothing. (Halliday and Hasan 1976, p.142) define ellipsis as " substitution by zero or something left unsaid." For example,

"When will he be back?","Tuesday." (ellipsis: He'll be back)

"Got bad news..." (ellipsis: I've)

1.1.5.5 Lexical Cohesion

A lexical cohesion device is a sub component of cohesion devices. In writing a cohesion device (such as substitution, reiteration, repetition, etc) is used to connect sentences together physically, provide semantic harmony in a discourse or add ecstatic flow to a poem (or other similar form of written art). A lexical cohesion device simply refers to cohesion where the inferent belongs to the identical lexical category as the referent. The cohesion is based on a symbolic similarity (physical appearance of the words) or stored in nearby lexemes. (answer.com)

It means, lexical cohesion is the semantic relationship between lexical items. Halliday and Hassan (1976, p.318) have mentioned two major types of lexical cohesion:

1.1.5.6 Reiteration

It is the repetition of lexical items or the occurrence of a synonym of some kind. " Reiteration is a form of lexical cohesion which involves the repetition of a lexical item, at one end of this scale; the use of general word to refer back to a lexical item, at the other end of the scale; and a number of things in between use of synonym, near synonym, or super ordinate." (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, p.278).

1.1.5.7 Collocation

Halliday defines collocation as the tendency of certain lexical items to co-occur. A collocation is a predisposed combination of words, typically pair wise words, that tend to regularly co-occur (e.g. orange and peel). There is always the possibility of cohesion between any pair of lexical items which are in some way associated with each other in the text. All lexical cohesions are not concerned by reiteration; we therefore, treat them under collocation.

1.2 Review of the Related Literature

Cohesion is not only confined to writing, it has adherence with other skills too. Although few researches are carried out in cohesion, still it is wide open to be studied. The researches that have been carried out on cohesion are as follows:

Sharma (2003) carried out a research on "Cohesion in Written Discourse." He attempted to find out the B.Ed. students' ability to use the cohesion in written discourse based on the Kathmandu valley and found that the students performed more exactly and appropriately in given context than free context.

Poudel (2005) carried out the research on "Cohesion in English writing". The main objective of his study was to find out the bachelor's level students' ability to use cohesive devices in English writing. For this, he collected data from bachelor's level first year students studying in T.U constituent and affiliated campuses in Kathmandu Valley. The students were given subjective and objective test items. He found that B. Ed. Students are better in receptive ability than productive ability to establish Cohesion on writing.

Poudel (2006) carried out a research on "Students' Ability to Establish Cohesion in Reading." He attempted to find out the ability of 10th graders of government aided schools in Kathmandu. He took the sample population of 180 students and took tests in cohesive ties format and fixed ratio format. He found that the students were more proficient to establish cohesion in reading on cohesive ties format than on the fixed ratio format.

Dawadi (2008) carried out a research on "Students' Ability to Establish Cohesion in Reading" with the objective to find out the ability of the grade 12 students to establish cohesion in reading. It came out with the finding that the Students are more proficient to establish cohesion in reading on cohesive ties format than on

the fixed ratio format. This study was limited in Kathmandu valley and the size of sample population was 120.He used simple random sampling procedure to select the sample population and used cohesive ties test and cloze test as a tool for data collection.

Jamkatel (2008) carried out survey research on "Cohesion on Written English." The main objective of his study was to find out the types and frequency of cohesive devices used in writing. The study was limited to three secondary school of Kathmandu valley. He found that the frequency of pronoun was the highest one. The present study differs from the previous studies in terms of objectives, place of research and the way of analysis. The researcher has focused on cohesive devices. Furthermore, it is the comparative study of grade 12 students' proficiency to establish cohesion in free vs given context.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The study had the following objectives:

i. To find out the ability of grade 12 students in establishing cohesion in writing.

ii. To compare the ability of the students to establish cohesion in free vs. given context.

iii. To suggest some pedagogical implications.

1.4 Significance of the Study

This study attempts to study proficiency of grade 12 students in establishing cohesion in writing. So, it will be useful to all those who are involved in professional writing, teachers, students. It will also be helpful to all those who are directly or indirectly involved in English language teaching learning sector.

It is significant for the teachers to focus on given context while teaching and doing evaluation as this research has been found that the students learn better to use the cohesive devices in given context in comparison to free context. Similarly, it is equally significant for the curriculum designers to incorporate the more content of given context in the curriculum so as to facilitate the students to learn the cohesive devices in a more natural way and the teacher to teach accordingly. Furthermore, it is indeed significant for the researcher to do the further in-depth research in this field to find out the reality and make the best generalizations as this research is done in surface level and limited within 5 colleges of kanchanpur district.

CHAPTER TWO
METHODOLOGY

As the methodology varies concomitantly with the field or nature of the research, the researcher has adopted the following methodology to fulfill the specified objectives of the study.

2.1   Sources of Data

The researcher has used both primary and secondary sources of data. The primary sources of data were used to make research more valid and reliable and secondary sources were used to enrich and facilitate the study.

2.1.1 Primary Sources of Data

The primary data are elicited from the students of grade 12 of five higher secondary schools of Kanchanpur district. Schools are : Baljagriti College, Siddhanath Multiple Campus, Morning Glory Higher Secondary School, Janjyoti Campus, and Ghatal Higher Secondary School, where the researcher himself went and asked the sampled population to solve the question. So, the primary sources of the study were the students of the above colleges.

2.1.2 Secondary Sources of Data

While making the theoretical back up of the study the researcher has consulted Halliday and Hasan (1976), Harmer (1988), Kumar (1976), Nunan, (1992), Mishra, (2010), Sharma, and Phyak (2010), Sharma (2008), Poudel, (2005), Poude, (2006) Dawadi (1995), Yule (2006).

2.2 Population of the Study

The total population of the study was 30 students of the grade12 from five higher secondary schools of Kanchanpur district.

Table No. 1

Sampled Population of the Study

Name of the campus	Sampled population
Morning Glory Higher Secondary School	6
Siddhanth Multiple Campus	6
Janjyoti College	6
Baljagriti College	6
Ghatal Higher Secondary School	6

2.3 Sampling Procedure

First of all, the researcher visited concerned higher secondary schools for the permission to conduct the research. After getting the consent of the authority, the researcher adopted simple random sampling procedure and selected six students from higher secondary schools. All together 30 students from 5 higher secondary schools were taken as a population of this research. They were given subjective items and objective items to solve. Time allotment was 1:30 hour.

2.4 Tools for Data Collection

The tools for the data collection were two types of test. The test included two types of writing in free and given context. Objective test items were provided for given context and subjective for free context. One hour and thirty minutes was given for 40 objectives and three subjective items. Analysis was done minutely. Responses were assigned marks. One mark for each correct objective and 13

marks for each subjective test items and one mark for neatness were allotted. In this way, 40 marks for objective and 40 marks for subject items was determined.

While marking the responses of the students, items of objective modes were marked according to the checklist prepared by the researcher.

2.5 Process of Data Collection

The process of data collection was as follows;

The researcher collected the primary data by the following process:

- First, the researcher prepared the tools for the data collection.
- Then, the researcher visited the concerned higher secondary schools and built the rapport with the authority and the subjects.
- Then, the researcher sampled population for the study.
- After sampling the population, the researcher disseminated the prepared test items to the sampled population and requested them to fill or write.
- Lastly, the researcher collected given test items back.

2.6 Limitations of the Study

This study had the following limitations:

- The study was limited to the grade 12 students of five colleges of Kanchanpur district.
- Only 30 students of five higher secondary schools were treated as sample population.
- The primary data for the study were collected from the written test items.
- This study was focused on eight cohesive devices. They are: anaphora, cataphora, exophora, ellipsis, substitution, conjunction, collocation and reiteration.

CHAPTER THREE

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of the data collected systematically from primary sources. The data collected through the subjective and objective test items is analyzed and interpreted separately. Therefore, this chapter is divided into two sub-headings viz. holistic analysis and comparative analysis, in order to analyze the facts in respect to both free and given contexts. Then, the inference has been drawn from the findings of the two analyses.

 Various statistical procedures are in the hand of the researcher, of which to choose as the most effective one. Otherwise, the findings may not turn out to be reliable. As far as the nature of data demands, I have employed the most suitable statistical procedures in the research like statistical tools for the analysis and interpretation of the data. Mostly I have exploited the measures of central tendency (viz. mean and mode) as my research primarily aims at finding out the proficiency of 12th graders in establishing cohesive relations in their use of the English language.

3.1 Holistic Analysis

This is the overall analysis of the performance of the students in using cohesive devices in given contexts. This analysis has been carried out on the basis of the answers my subjects opted for in the objective test items and their use of cohesive devices in the free contexts of subjective test items. In this analysis the linguistic performance of 30 students from five different colleges of Kanchanpur district in

using cohesive devices appropriately has been presented to figure out the facts about the tendency, repetition etc. of the students behind its occurrence and to induce valid generalizations, in particular. The analysis of these two different test items is presented separately as follows:

Table No. 3

Holistic Analysis of Students' Proficiency to Establish Cohesion in Writing in Given Context

Total No. of students	Erroneous use		Appropriate Use	Total Marks
30	15.4		24.5	40
	38.66%		61.33%	100%

The above table shows that there are altogether 30 students who have obtained the average score of 24.5 out of the total marks of forty which indicates that in 61.33% instances, the subjects are able to use cohesive devices appropriately. In contrast to it, in 38.66% instances Subjects failed to use cohesive devices appropriately. This, in turn, exhibits the fact that the performance of the students in using the cohesive devices in given contexts is considerably satisfactory as the percentage of errors is fairly lower in comparison to the percentage of appropriate

Table No.4

Holistic Analysis of Students' Proficiency to Establish Cohesion in Writing in Free Context

Total No. of students	Erroneous Use	Appropriate Use	Total Marks
30	17.3	22.7	40
	42.5%	57.5%	100%

The above presented table exhibits that students have obtained the average score of 22.7 out of the total marks of 40 which shows that the subjects created cohesive sentences in 57.5% instances. In comparison to it, they are unable to produce cohesive sentences in 42.5% instances. This data illustrates that the performance of the students in using the cohesive devices in free contexts is not quite promising as the instances of errors are almost as frequent as the instances of appropriate use.

3.2 Comparative Analysis

Comparative analysis in research work is the most powerful technique that can prove expedient to compare and contrast two interrelated but seemingly divergent aspects/fields of study. In the history of research methodology, comparative analysis technique has been exploited most profoundly by researchers. It is the way of examining things from close prospective in order to establish interrelationship between two things or two unveil the nuances between the two. If carried out with minute exploration, comparative analysis can turn the research fruitful in limited span of time and findings can be used to generalize the problem/issues and to foreshadow the implication of other similar activities.

Nonetheless, the researcher did not feel it necessary to refer to comparative analysis already exploited by former researchers. That is to say, the researcher has

ingeniously employed this technique in his research to compare and contrast the ability of students from different colleges in establishing cohesive devices in their usages of EFL.

3.2.1 College-wise Proficiency of the Students to Establish Cohesion in Writing

This is the comparison of the average scores of the students from five different colleges in free versus given contexts. This comparison was mainly carried out to find out the consistency of scores in similar type of test items in different colleges. With the help of this comparison we can easily infer whether the linguistic performance of students of one college in establishing cohesive relations in their use of English language is similar to that of other colleges. Put in other words, the researcher has attempted for a comparative analysis of the linguistic performance of the students of different Higher Secondary Schools in establishing cohesive relations in their use of English language in order to expedite a generalization of the study. So, this is a very important aspect of the analysis to come to the generalization as to which test item is good to apply to teach the cohesive devices i.e. context bound or free.

Table No. 5

College wise Comparison of the Proficiency of the Students in Establishing Cohesion in Writing in Free vs Given Contexts.

S.N.	Name of college	No. of student	Given context		Free context		Full marks
			Average marks	Percentage	Average marks	Percentage	
1	BJC	6	26.48	66.2%	16.70	41.90%	40
2	SMC	6	22.0	55%	16.16	40.40	40
3	MGHC	6	25.28	63.2%	15.66	39.15	40
4	JJC	6	22.96	57.4	13.48	33.70	40
5	GHSS	6	23.68	59.2%	12.87	32.18	40

The above table No. 6 shows that the students of BJC have secured the average score of 66.2 % in given context and 41.90% in the free context where we can find the difference of approximately 14.3%. Likewise, the students of SMC have also secured the average scores of 55 % in given context and 40.40% in the free context where there is the difference of about 14.60 % . In the same way, the students of MGHC have secured the average score of 63.20% in the given context and 39.15% in the free context where there as well the difference of the scores in two test items is about 14.05%. Similarly, the students of JJC have secured 57.4% in the given context and 33.70% in the free context, the difference between the context being 13.70%. And, the students of GHSS have secured 59.2% marks in given context and 32.18% in the free context, the gap being 18.02%. By this we can infer that there is the lack of consistency in the scores of students between given and free context in all the colleges more or less. In another way, we can also find the consistency in the differences of the scores of given and free context of all the five colleges where we can see the students of all the colleges have secured good scores in the given context in comparison to the free context.

3.2.2 Comparison of the Scores Assigned to Different Cohesive Devices: Averages of all the Colleges in the Free Context

For the sake of convenience, the researcher has assigned scores to different cohesive devices at his own discretion as there are no standard norms for assigning scores to subjective tests in respect of the use of cohesive devices. Without loss of generosity, the full marks of each category of cohesive devices has been taken as 40 for the sake of convenience. The following table presents a comparison of the average scores of students from different colleges.

Table No. 6

Comparison of the Scores Assigned to different Cohesive Devices: Averages of all the Colleges

S.no	Name of the Colleges	Cohesive Devices in Free Context							
		A	CA	EX	EL	SUB	CON	COL	REI
1	BJC	3.73	1.90	1.04	0.5	0.56	4.81	3.21	0.96
2	SMC	3.04	3.04	1.50	0.73	0.31	4.44	2.91	0.19
3	MGHC	2.92	1.60	1.19	0.08	0.27	4.50	4.77	0.33
4	JJC	4.38	0.75	0.75	0.13	0.25	4.63	2.54	0.06
5	GHSS	4.75	0.17	0.29	-	-	4.75	2.91	
	Total X	**Xa= 18.81**	**Xc =7.46**	**Xe =4.77**	**Xel= 1.44**	**Xs =1.40**	Xcon=23.13	Xcol=16.35	**Xr= 1.54**

From the above table,

Average use of anaphora ($\overline{X}$)=   Xa/n=18.81/5=3.76,

average use of cataphora($\overline{X}$)=   Xc/n=7.46/5=1.49,

average use of exophora($\overline{X}$ x) =   Xex/n=4.77/5=0.95,

average use of ellipsis($\overline{X}$) =   Xel/n=1.44/5=0.29,

average use of substitution($\overline{X}$)=   Xsub/n=1.40/5=0.28,

average use of conjunction($\overline{Xc}$)=   Xcon/n=23.13/5=4.63,

average use of collocation($\overline{Xc}$) =   Xcol/n=16.35/5=3.27,and

average use of reiteration($\overline{Xr}$) =   Xrei/n= 1.54/5=0.33

The above table illustrates the college wise averages of scores of each category of cohesive devices in the free context. The averages are taken out of 5 as full marks.

As the table illustrates, the subjects from all the colleges were most proficient at using conjunction with aggregate average of 23.13 out of 25. Among the chosen colleges, BJC secured best (4.81 out 5) in the use of conjunction whereas SMC was marked the least (4.44 out of 5). On the contrary the average use of substitution was observed to be the least (1.40 out of 25) . In respect of the use of substitution, BJC fared the best (0.56 out of five) and GHSS fared the least (null). The aggregate scores of all the colleges in use of anaphora, cataphora, exophora, ellipsis, substitution, conjunction, collocation and reiteration, out of 25 were marked 18.81, 7.46, 4.77, 1.44, 23.18, 16.35, 1.54 respectively.

Out of the five colleges, GHSS was marked to be the least consistent in using cohesive devices with the null use of ellipsis, substitution, and reiteration. BJC fared best in the use of conjunction and least in the use of substitution; SMC fared best in the use of conjunction (4.44 out of 5) and least in reiteration (0.19 out of

5); MGHC fared best in the use of collocation (4.77 out of 5); and least in ellipsis (0.08 out of 5); JJC fared best in the use of conjunction (4.63 out of 5) and least in the ellipsis (0.13 out of 5); GHSS fared best both in anaphora and conjunction (4.75 out of 5) in both and least in ellipsis, substitution and reiteration (each null).

The above table was constructed to calculate the averages of scores of each category of cohesive devices in the free context. The aggregate averages of all the colleges in the use of anaphora, cataphora, exophora, ellipsis, substitution, conjunction, collocation and reiteration were observed to be 3.76, 1.49, 0.95, 0.28, 4.63, 3.27, and 0.33 respectively. To conclude, the subjects were most proficient in using conjunction and least proficient in using ellipsis.

Table No. 7

Comparison of the Scores Assigned to Different Cohesive Devices: Average of all the Colleges in the Free Context

S.no	Name of the colleges	Cohesive devices in given context							
		A	CA	EX	EL	SUB	CON	COL	REI
1	BJC	3.83	3.5	2.66	2.83	3	3.5	3.33	3.83
2	SMC	2.83	**2.16**	3.16	2.33	3.66	2.83	2.5	2.5
3	MGHC	3.5	2.83	3.16	2.16	3.83	3.33	3.66	2.83
4	JJC	4.16	3	2.83	2.33	2.5	3.16	2.66	2.33
5	GHSS	2.5	2.66	2.66	3.83	2.83	3.5	2.33	3.33
	Total	Xa= 16.82	Xc =14.15	Xe =14.47	Xel =12.48	Xs =15.82	Xc on=16.32	Xc ol=14.48	Xr =14.82

Average use of anaphora (($\overline{X}$) =   Xa/n=16.82/5=3.36,

average use of cataphora (($\overline{X}$) =   Xca/n=14.15/5=2.83,

average use of exophora(($\overline{X}$) =   Xex/n=14.47/5=2.89,

average use of ellipsis(($\overline{X}$) =   Xel/n=12.48/5=2.49,

average use of substitution($\overline{X}\,u$) =   Xsub/n=15.82/5=3.16,

average use of conjunction($\overline{Xc}$) =   Xcon/n=16.32/5=3.26,

average use of collocation($\overline{X_c}$ = Xcol/n=14.48/5=2.89, and

average use of reiteration($\overline{X_7}$)= Xrei/n= 14.82/5=2.96

The above table illustrates the college wise average scores of each category of cohesive devices in the given context. The averages are taken out of 5 as full marks.

As the table illustrates, subjects from all the colleges were found most proficient at using anaphora with aggregate average of 16.82 out of 25. Among chosen colleges, JJC was marked best (4.16 out of 5) in the use of anaphora whereas GHSS was marked the least (2.5 out of 5). On the contrary, the average use of ellipsis was observed to be the least (12.48 out of 25). In respect of use of substitution MGHC fared best (3.83 out of 5) and JJC fared least (2.5 out of 5). The aggregate scores of all the colleges in the use of anaphora, cataphora, exophora, ellipsis, substitution, conjunction, collocation and reiteration ot of 25 were marked 16.82,14.25, 14.47, 12.48, 15.82, 16.32, 14.48 and 14.82 respectively.

As presented in the table BJC was marked to be best in using anaphora and reiteration (3.83 out of 5); SMC fared the best in the use of substitution (3.66 out of 5) and least in the use of cataphora (2.16 out of 5); MGHC fared best in the use of substitution (3.83 out of 5) and least in the use of ellipsis (2.16 out of 5); JJC fared best in the use of anaphora (4.16 out of 5) and least in the use of ellipsis and reiteration (2.33 out of 5); GHSS fared best in the use of ellipsis (3.83 out of 5) and least in the use of collocation (2.33 out of 5).

The above table was constructed to calculate the averages of scores of each category of cohesive devices in the given context. The aggregate averages of all the colleges in the use of anaphora, cataphora, exophora, ellipsis, substitution,

conjunction, collocation and reiteration were observed to be 3.36, 2.83, 2.89, 2.49, 3.16, 3.26, 2.89 and 2.96 respectively.

These averages of cohesive devices have been presented in the following table for analysis/ description.

Table no.8
Comparison of Students' Proficiency in Using Cohesive Devices in Free vs Given Context

S.N.	Parameters	Free context		Given Context	
		OM	%	OM	%
1	Anaphora	3.6	75.20	3.36	67.20
2	Cataphora	1.49	29.80	2.83	56.60
3	Exophora	0.95	19	2.89	57.80
4	Ellipsis	0.29	5.80	2.49	49.80
5	Substitution	0.28	5.60	3.16	63.20
6	Conjunction	4.63	93	3.26	65.20
7	Collocation	3.27	65.40	2.89	57.80
8	Reiteration	0.33	6.60	2.96	59.20

The above table illustrates that the subjects are more proficient at using various kinds of cohesive devices in given contexts than free context, which is evident from the fact that the given context has higher percentage figures than the free context. This maybe because they cannot find enough real life situations where they can use cohesive devices more profoundly.

The above table also shows that students are better in using conjunction (which was marked 93% in the free context and 65.20% in the given context) and anaphora (which was marked 75.20% in the free context and57.80% in the given

context). The subjects are found to be particularly inconvenient at using ellipsis, substitution and reiteration (marked 5.8% , 5.6% and 6.60% respectively) on their own that is in the free context. On the contrary, they are quite at ease at using these three types of cohesive devices in the given context (which were marked 49.80%, 63.20% and 59.20% respectively).

In both free context and given context, the varying percentages forground the fact that the subjects are inherently inconsistent about using different types of cohesive devices in their writings. The greatest percentage value is 93% and the least percentage value is 5.60%, the difference between the two being 87.40%, which is the evidence of an unusual fluctuation in the data and hence, purports the inconsistency in using cohesive devices.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this section the findings of the research are drawn on the basis of analysis and interpretation of the data. Findings are of worth so as to fulfill the specified objectives of the research and to skim the reality onto the surface from the bottom of ignorance and to recommend for the acceptance and behavioral change.

4.1 Findings

I personally believe that my research has turned out fruitful in achieving the objective specified. Certainly to distill findings from the analysis of research is not like cherry picking but all the same as the statistics of my research shows, some findings do come on the surface which I have enumerated in the following lines.

4.1.1 Findings Based on the Free vs. Given Context

The findings based on the free vs. given context are as follows:

i) The performance in using cohesive devices in given context is considerably satisfactory as the percentage of error is fairly lower in comparison to the percentage of appropriate use.

ii) After analyzing the responses of the students, the researcher found that the students had more confidence in given context than free context. Students were found better in some devices and poorer in others.

iii) They were found more proficient to establish cohesion in given context i.e. 61.33%

iv) The students were found less proficient to establish cohesion in free context with 57.5% of appropriate use. So, they were found to perform more expectedly and appropriately in given context than that in free context.

4.1.2 Findings Based on the College wise Performance

The findings based on the college wise performance are as follows;

     i) The students of Baljagriti College were found the best in using cohesive devices both in given and free context with the average of 26.48 out of forty and 16.70 out of forty respectively.

     ii) The students of Siddhanath Multiple Campus were found the weakest in using cohesive devices in both given and free context with the average of 22 and 16.16 out of forty respectively.

4.1.3 Findings Based on Different Cohesive Devices

The findings based on the different cohesive devices are as follows;

a) Anaphora

     The students felt comfortable to use anaphora in both contexts i.e. given and   free. They obtained 3.76 (i.e.75.20%) out of 5 in free context and 3.364 (i.e. 67.28%)

out of five in given context.

b) Cataphora

     The students felt difficult to use cataphora in given context in comparison to free context. Informer, they obtained 1.49 (i.e.29.80 %) out of 5 and in later one, they found better than that with the average of 2.83 (i.e. 56.6%) out of five.

c) Exophora

     The students felt really difficult in using exophora in free context having the average of 0.95 (i.e.19%) out of 5. They were found better in given context having the average of 2.894 (i.e.57.88%) out of five.

d) Ellipsis

The students felt more difficult to use ellipsis in free context with the average of 0.29 (i.e. 5.80%) out of 5. While in given context they were found satisfactory with the average marks 2.294 (i.e 45.88%).

e) Substitution

The students felt the most difficult to use substitution in free context with the average of 0.28 (i.e. 5.60%) out of 5. However, they did better in given context with the average of 3.164 (i.e.63.28%) out of five.

f) Conjunction

The students felt easiest to use conjunction in free context with the average of 4.63 (i.e. 93%) out of 5. Similarly, they were found satisfactory in using conjunction in given context with the average of 3.26 (i.e. 65.2%) out of five.

g) Collocation

The students were found using collocation more frequently but found mostly using collocation in wrong way. The average appropriate use of collocation is 3.27 (i.e.65.40%) out of 5.

Similarly, they were found quiet satisfactory with the average of 2.89 (i.e.57.80%) out of five.

h) Reiteration

The students were found not so good in using reiteration as cohesive device in free context .The average proficiency is 0.33 (i.e. 6.60%) out of forty in free context. They felt easy to use reiteration in given context. The average proficiency is 2.964 (i.e. 59.28%) out of five.

4.2 Recommendations

i)   It is found that the students are not so proficient at using cohesive devices in writing. So, while designing the course written skill should be encouraged.

ii)   The research shows that the students need more practice in free writing.

iii) The students were found very weak in using ellipsis, collocation and substitution. They should be provided with additional real life situations prompting the use of cohesive devices wherein they can improve their level of writing.

iv)   Most of the students were found unable to write maintaining the unity among paragraphs and to use cohesive devices in free writing. To improve this weakness they should get enough practice to develop writing skills.

v)   The students should be given adequate exercises for practice.

vi)   Since cohesive devices are the needs in writing, they must be given emphasis.

References

Bhattarai, R. (2000): *A comparative study of the writing proficiency of bachelor level*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University.

Cook, G. (1995). *Discourse*. New York : OUP.

Dawadi,G. (2008). *Students' ability to establish cohesion in reading*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University.

Gnawali,L. (2001). Noticing text cohesion; A way to language awareness in *Journal of NELTA*, 2002 Vol.7,No.1-2.

Halliday, MAK and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English* . London: Longman.

Harmer, J. (1988). The *practice of English language teaching*. London:Longman.

Kumar,R. (1976). *Research methodology*. London: Sage Publication.

Mishra, C. (2010). *Discourse analysis. Katmandu*: Nilam Publication.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge: CUP .

Paudel, R. (2005). *Cohesion in English writing*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University.
.
Paudel, P. (2006). *Cohesion in writing*. An Unpublished M.Ed. thesis,Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University.

Sharma, B and P. Phyak (2009). ELT *theories and methods*. Kathmandu: Sunlight
                Publication.

Sharma, B. (2003). *A Study of cohesion on written discourse*. An Unpublished
                M.Ed. Thesis. Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University.

Yule,G. (2006). *The study of language.* Cambridge: CUP.

APPENDIX 1

Test Items

Student's name:

Campus:

1. Fill in the blanks with best alternative given in the bracket

    a) Did the gardner water my hydrangeas?

    He did ---------------- (like, so, such)

    b) My husband and I are leaving. --------------- have seen quiet enough of this unpleasantness. (I, we, he)

    c) A: Would you like these pens?

    B: NO, as a matter of fact, I would like -------------- sets (the other, such, these)

    d) A: I am fond of curd, I m fond of curry. These are my favorites.

    B: ----------- are my favorites too. (those, one these)

    e) I bought some books yesterday.------------- books are really interesting. (this, those, such , they)

    f) She cut grass. So ------ Radha. (did, do, does, doesn't)

    g) She used to be an Oxford Scholar in …………(these, those,that) days.

    h) I love black trousers. My wife loves blue ----------- .(ones, only one)

    i) How did you like the movies on that DVD ?. I find --------------- interesting. (It , them, these)

    j) We are going to Nainitaal tomorrow.------------ be our first out going for month. (it'll, this'll, that'll)

    k) There are many students in the class. I like the studious……… (Students, Student, one).

2   Below are the words having similar meaning. Underline them.

a) Trilok seems very worried about something. I think I need to have a talk with the boy.

b) Bird flu has arrived with the hot season and dirty shelter. The disease is spreading from hens to men.

c) I have been to my lovely son. The obedient boy is getting worse now a days.

d) We all kept quiet. That seemed the best way.

e) Each variety of perfume smells good. Cobra is the most favorite.

3   Write the words, phrases or clues, which can be deleted without changing the meaning and violating structure.

   a) I have not visited Dodhara yet but Jeevan has already visited Dodhara.

   Ans. --------------------------------------

   Ans. --------------------------------------

   b) Dr. Khagendra Bhatt diagnosed the disease and Dr. Khagendra provided service to the patients.

   Ans.   ----------------------------------

   c) Ram killed Ravan but Ram saved Bibhisan.

   Ans   ---

   d) I am in dilemma where to go and I am in dilemma when to go?

   Ans. ---

   e) Who wrote Munamadan? Laximi prasad Devkota wrote Munamadan

4) Fill in the blank by choosing appropriate conjunction from the box.

Although, otherwise, in spite of, after all, instead, in either case, further, because, by contrast, however,

a) He fell asleep, -------------------- his great discomfort.

b) ------------------------he was very uncomfortable, he fell asleep.

c) My client says he does not know this witness.---------------, he denies ever having seen her or spoken to her.

d) Our gardener didn't do very well this year. ---------------------, the orchard is looking very healthy.

e) Your partner may support you or may change to another suit. -----------------
--------, you should respond.

5) Choose the best word from the brackets to complete the following Sentences:

a) He has got a -------------------------- (good/ nice / remarkable) success in his business.

b) I could anticipate the foul ---------------------- (play/ plot / conspiracy).

c) His face was beaming with the charm of --------------------- (bright/ good/ positive) attitude.

d) I'm ----------------- (broadly/ deeply/greatly) indebted to you.

e) (this/that.it) was a bright day of April.

f) (there / it / that) was raining heavily.

g) "The old woman was trying to cross the road and, you know, (this/ that/ it) car was just loosing balance. Tyres creaked but then the woman came under the car."

h) I don't like (him/ her/them) that mischivous dude.

i) (this,it, that) is easy to make mistakes.

j) (this, that,it) is the place where I work.

k) He ………… (takes,eats, have) medicine.

l) If you want……………(her, him, them) , there are cookies in the kitchen.

m) She fainted………. (where, there, it)

n) (these,that,they) boys are really mischievous, Ram and Hari.

Thank you

APPENDIX -II

- Write an essay on "Mobile and its use among students" in about 200 words.
- Write an essay on "Politics and involvement of students in it" about 200 words
- Write an essay on "Employment" about 200 words.

APPENDIX III

1	Introducing Part	Subjective	Free	0.5
2	Ideas on the Text	Subjective	Free	0.5
3	Developing Ideas	Subjective	Free	0.5
4	Linguistic Competence	Subjective	Free	0.5
5	Organization	Subjective	Free	0.5
6	Mechanics	Subjective	Free	0.5
7	Concluding Paragraph	Subjective	Free	0.5
8	Economy	Subjective	Free	0.5
9	Unity	Subjective	Free	0.5
10	Figurative Use	Subjective	Free	0.5
11	Neatness	Subjective	Free	1
12	Cohesive Devices	Subjective	Free	8

APPENDIX IV

Marking Scheme for the Test items of Objective Mode

Answer key of Question no. 1

a) so

b) we

c) the other

d) those

e) those

f) did

g) those

h) ones

i) them

j) this wili

k) one

Answer key of Question no. 2

a) Trilok and the boy

b) bird flue and the disease

c) lovely son and the obedient boy

d) quiet and the best way

e) perfume and cobra

Answer key of Question no. 3

a) visited there

b) Dr. Khagendra

c)Ram

d)i am in dilemma

e) wrote Munamadan

Answer key of Question no. 4

a) in spite of

b) although

c) by contrast

d) however

e) in either case

Answer key of Question no. 5

a)remarkable

b) play

c) positive

d) deeply

e) it

f) it

g) this

h) him

i) this

j)this

k) takes

l)them

m) there

n) These

APPENDIX V
Table

Description of Subjective Items as Research Tool

Table 1

S.N.	Scoring Parameters	Mode of item	Context	FM
		Subjective	Free	
1	Introducing Part	Subjective	Free	0.5
2	Ideas on the Text	Subjective	Free	0.5
3	Developing Ideas	Subjective	Free	0.5
4	Linguistic Competence	Subjective	Free	0.5
5	Organization	Subjective	Free	0.5
6	Mechanics	Subjective	Free	0.5
7	Concluding Paragraph	Subjective	Free	0.5
8	Economy	Subjective	Free	0.5
9	Unity	Subjective	Free	0.5
10	Figurative Use	Subjective	Free	0.5
11	Neatness	Subjective	Free	1

12	Cohesive Devices	Subjective	Free	8