

**An Investigation into Text Quality
In Writing by Farsi Learners of English**

Omid Nassery

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts
in
English Language Teaching

Eastern Mediterranean University
October 2013
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Elvan Yılmaz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in English Language Teaching.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gülşen Musayeva Vefali
Chair, Department of English Language Teaching

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in English Language Teaching.

Prof. Dr. Necdet Osam
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Necdet Osam
2. Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatos Erozan
3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev

ABSTRACT

Various studies on L1 and TL usage were conducted for a number of different reasons. The aim of this study is to first, illustrate the quality of text in L1 and L2 separately based on two significant features of text linguistics (coherence and cohesion), and then compare the results to find out whether there is any relation between the level of text quality in first and second language. It is popularly believed that, having high proficiency in L1 and consequently ability to write in good quality can lead to be a mature user of TL specially in writing area. Of course, the study is conducted in an Eastern Mediterranean University as an English medium based university – and the participants were Iranian undergraduate students holding Persian language as their first language.

Having observed the findings of the study it can be concluded that, participants in L1 texts do not reflect a significant percentage in either coherence or in cohesion features. Albeit participants wrote those texts in their L1, their texts were not distinguished as very cohesive and coherent texts by the L1 evaluators. This low average also confirms that Coherence and cohesion are serious and complicated process even in learners` native language.

Surprisingly, it is observed that two participants who had the maximum and minimum average scores in the evaluation reflect similar educational and cultural background to a large extent. Therefore, it also can be claimed that cultural and educational background of participants did not affect their text quality.

Keywords:First language L1, Foreign or Target language TL, Coherence and Cohesion in text, text quality, writing.

ÖZ

Birinci dil ve ikinci dil kullanımı üzerine birçok çalışma yapılmıştır. Bu çalışmanın amacı ise metinlerdeki birinci ve ikinci dil kalitesini uyum ve bağlılık açısından ayrı ayrı gösterebilmektir. Daha sonrada bu ayrı çalışmaları karşılaştırarak metinlerdeki birinci ve ikinci dil kalitesi arasındaki ilişkiye bakmaktır. İnanılır ki, birinci dildeki yüksek yeterlilik daha iyi yazmaya ve bu da ikinci dildeki yeterliliğe yansır. Bu çalışma İngilizce eğitim veren bir üniversite olan Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi'nde, lisans yapan, birinci dilleri Farsça olan, İranlı öğrencilerden oluşan bir grup üzerinde yapılmıştır.

Çalışmanın sonuçlarına bakılınca görülmektedir ki katılımcıların birinci dil metinleri uyum ve bağlılık açısından yüksek bir yüzdellik belirtmemektedir. Albeit katılımcıları metinlerini birinci dilde yazmışlardı ve birinci dil değerlendiricileri tarafından değerlendirilen metinlerde çok bir uyum ve bağlılık bulunmamıştır. Bu düşük yüzdellik göstermektedir ki insanların birinci dillerinde bile metinlerdeki uyum ve bağlılık öğrenilmesi zor bir süreçtir.

Şaşırtıcı bir şekilde, deęerlendirmede en düşük ve en yüksek puanı alan katılımcıların eğitim ve kültürel altyapılarının çok benzediđi ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu bağlamda idda edilebilir ki katılımcıların eğitim ve kültürel altyapıları metin kalitesini etkilememektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Birinci dil, Hedef ve yabancı dil, metindeki uyum, metindeki bağlılık, metin kalitesi, yazma.

To My Lovely Wife

Atefeh

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I offer my sincerest gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Necdet Osam for the continuous support of my MA. study and research, for his patience, motivation, enthusiasm, and immense knowledge. His guidance helped me in all the time of research and writing of this thesis. I could not have imagined having a better advisor and mentor.

Besides, I would like to offer my special thanks to the rest of my thesis committee: Assist. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev and Assist. Prof. Dr. Fatos Erozan for their encouragement, insightful comments, and hard questions.

My sincere thanks also go to Prof. Dr. Majid Hashemipour and in particular to Derya Sabrilar for their generous support and warm encouragement. I would like to thank my close friend, Mr. Abdollah Mobaraki, Mr. Mehdi Sadeghi, Mr. Ammar Shoaweneh and Mr. Abdollah Razavi who helped me a lot during my educational lifetime.

I would like to express the deepest appreciation to my lovely family who support me generously throughout my life.

Last but not the least, I own quite a lot to my lovely wife who has been extraordinarily tolerant and supportive all throughout my life. I would like to dedicate the research to her.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| ABSTRACT | iii |
| ÖZ | v |
| DEDICATION | vi |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | viii |
| LIST OF TABLES | x |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 Presentation | 1 |
| 1.2 Background of the Study | 1 |
| 1.3 Brief Background of Second Language Writing | 3 |
| 1.4 Problem Statement | 7 |
| 1.5 Aim of the Study and Research Questions | 6 |
| 1.6 Research Design | 8 |
| 1.7 Limitations | 9 |
| 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE | 11 |
| 2.1 The Relationship of L1 Research to L2 Research | 11 |
| 2.2 Text | 17 |
| 2.3 Text Linguistics | 18 |
| 2.4 Seven Underlying Features of Text | 18 |
| 2.5 Summary | 26 |
| 3 METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION AND DATA ANALYSIS | 27 |
| 3.1 Research Design | 27 |
| 3.2 Subjects | 28 |
| 3.3 Context | 28 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 3.4 Data Collection , Method and Instruments | 29 |
| 3.5 Method of Data Analysis | 30 |
| 3.6 Checklist Items..... | 30 |
| 3.6.1 Coherence Items..... | 32 |
| 3.6.2 Cohesion Items..... | 32 |
| 4 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND FINDINGS | 37 |
| 4.1 Presentation..... | 37 |
| 4.2 Findings and Discussion | 37 |
| 4.2.1 Coherence..... | 39 |
| 4.2.2 Cohesion..... | 44 |
| 4.3 Overall Findings..... | 49 |
| 5 CONCLUSION | 54 |
| 5.1 Presentation | 54 |
| 5.2 Elaboration of the Research | 54 |
| 5.3 Implication for Practice..... | 59 |
| 5.5 Suggestion for Further Research..... | 59 |
| REFERENCES..... | 60 |
| APPENDICES | 63 |
| Appendix 1 | 64 |
| Appendix 2:..... | 80 |
| Appendix 3:..... | 100 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Distribution of Coherence Average Score for Each Participant | 39 |
| Table 2: Distribution of Cohesion Average Score for Each Participant | 40 |
| Table 3: Distribution of Average Score of Coherence Items | 41 |
| Table 4: Distribution of Average Score of Coherence Items: (first group) | 42 |
| Table 5: Distribution of Average Score of Coherence Items: (second group)..... | 42 |
| Table 6: Distribution of Average Score of Cohesion Items | 44 |
| Table 7: Distribution of Average Score of Cohesion Items | 46 |
| Table8: Distribution of Average Score of Cohesion Items | 47 |

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Presentation

This chapter starts with a brief background of second language writing. It then goes on to problem statement, aim of the study and research questions section. Finally, methodology and limitation of this study will be explained in brief.

1.2 Background of the Study

In the history of language teaching, various approaches and methods such as grammar translation, audio lingual, silent way, communicative approach and others have sought to find the most appropriate way of teaching a language but they have not been successful and new methods has been proceeded the school.

The role of writing in English as a second or foreign language in the lives of teachers, students, and different professionals appears to have increased considerably all over the world. Writing is a complex process which allows writers to explore their ideas and thoughts in order to make them visible (Wolfersberger, 2003). Writing process encourages thinking and learning. It also stimulates communication and makes thought clear and available to be reflected (Chen, 2002). A great attention to EFL and ESL writing has led to a series of challenges among specialists, searching for an appropriate way of teaching writing in second and foreign language. Meanwhile, some specialists found L1 as a non-deniable factor affecting L2 writing (Kaplan, 1996). Consequently, many scholars such as Cummins (1989), Kaplan

(1996), Silva (2003), Hinkel (2003) and many others have sought to find the primary effective issues in L2 writing.

The theories in language learning / teaching refer to the learning of skills in some hierarchical order. Clearly, knowing four skills—speaking, reading, writing and listening— is essential for a learner who wants to communicate in target language (TL); however, some learners may have low competency in some skills but high level of competency in another one. Therefore, many researches sought to find out the reasons of having low and high competencies in different language skills.

It is important to consider that variety of second language usage makes different areas of close attention to language skills for learners and researchers; despite the close inter-relation which exists among them. Throughout the literature, language skills are classified in two main groups: productive and receptive. Speaking and writing are regarded as productive while listening and reading as receptive skills.

It is generally claimed that in the academic context, productive skills and more specifically writing skill has always been the center of close consideration. Having a quick scan in academic context, some problems can be overtly observed in both teaching and learning writing skill; for instance, planning the main idea in essay writing, grammar usage, using appropriate lexis and following coherence and cohesion principles in target language.

As a matter of fact, writing for academic purpose needs cautious effort and practice in composing, developing, and analyzing thoughts and ideas. Students writing in TL have acquired sort of proficiency in the use of the language skills.

Usually expressing ideas and particularly writing compositions or paragraphs in another language are problem makers for students in academic context. Learners face difficulty for creating new ideas due to transforming or reworking information process, which is more complicated in writing. By putting together concepts and solving problems, the writer engages in "a two-way interaction between continuously developing knowledge and continuously developing text" (Bereiter&Scardamalia, 1987, p. 12).

Moreover, writing includes composing process that needs the competency to tell or retell a piece of information in the form of narratives or description, or to transform information into new texts, as in expository or argumentative writing (Omaggio& Hadley, 1993).

This study tries to find to what extent this popular belief that, having high proficiency in L1 can lead to be a mature user of TL specially in writing area is true for some Iranian undergraduate students who are studying abroad. In other words, as Jones and Tetroe(1987) stated, this study aims to see whether the text in TL owns better quality if the writer is being highly proficient in L1 writing.

Therefore, the existence of any possible relation between the level of L1 and TL writing competency as one of the productive skills of a language will be observed and analyzed throughout two main factors piloted in previous studies considering their social-cultural background whenever seems necessary.

1.3 Brief Background of Second Language Writing

Before going on to look at the existence of any possible relation between the level of L1 and TL writing competency it is important to consider the background of English

language teaching in brief while writing skill is the point of interest in order to clarify how and from when the real attention to writing competency has commenced.

In the 1940s, according to Matsuda (2003), largely Spanish speakers received education in ESL courses. During the 1950s, a few pieces of studies in second or foreign language writing were conducted in the field. Foreign learners and their need to learn English was not the center of consideration on that time. In addition, their focus was on the speech rather than text proficiency.

Next, some theories in the 1950s and early 1960s for instance the “audio-lingual method” by behaviorists prevailed the pedagogy of English-as-a-second classes (Matsuda, 2003). The focus of instruction during that time was on sound structures. They believed in significant role of phonological awareness and practice in ESL classrooms. There were only a few linguists interested in writing skills (Matsuda, 2003).

In brief, it can be claimed that almost everyone agreed that teaching writing skills should be acquired after teaching sound structures. Learners writing skills and techniques should be taught after phonological awareness. From the viewpoint of the social as well as educational context, it is appropriate to mention that teaching TL writing itself was marginalized during the 1950s.

By the 1960s, growing the number of international students led language teachers to focus on TL pedagogy and practice.

By that time, teachers distinguished some major differences in writing between L1 and TL. Therefore, they tried to reconsider and add new approaches to the old pedagogy for L2 and TL learners. Obviously, teaching English to foreign learners became one of the most important categories of foreign or second language researches. Meanwhile, these differences between how to teach L1 and TL writing to the respective groups resulted in controversial debate (Matsuda, 2003).

Therefore, it is not quite clear to say how TL writing was instructed exactly. Taking a case in point, Pincas (1962) indicated prescriptive writing instruction, mastering the target language structure with controlled pattern practices, to ESL students. Since then, teachers of TL writing have determined progressive exercises in TL writing above the sentence level, containing the structural exercises for teaching paragraph writing to TL learners (Leki, 1992).

During last 50 years, number of enquiries towards learning how to write in English increased rapidly. Leki, Cumming, and Silva (2008) pointed out that the last 30 years or so have seen several firsts in L2 writing research: “the first journal devoted to L2 writing; the first book on the development of writing ability; the first bibliographies of published papers on L2 writing; and the first conference devoted exclusively to L2 writing”. Particularly during the late 1980s, and the early 1990s, L2 writing started to become an inter-disciplinary field of academic study with its own structure. This improvement has linked it with other different fields of enquiry, such as compositions studies, applied linguistics, foreign language education, and bilingual education.

1.4 Problem Statement

Writing in L2 is a challenging and a complicated process. First language writing structures contain producing and drafting ideas, revising paragraphs, using proper lexis and editing text. Writing composition in TL includes all the abovementioned elements plus second language processing issues. For lower TL proficiency learners, those TL issues can force the writing process, even to a complete breakdown of the process (Bereiter&Scardimalia, 1987).

According to Jones and Tetroe (1987), although many L2 writers use their L1 in some way while writing in the L2; however the amount of L1 used during L2 writing is not the same for all L2 writers. In general, the proficient L2 learners do not depend heavily on the L1 to drive the writing process, because they have a sufficient level of L2 automaticity and knowledge to think and plan in L2 (Jones &Tetroe, 1987). However, lower L2 proficiency writers rely more heavily on their L1 during the writing process in order to sustain the process and prevent a complete breakdown in language (Cumming, 1989).

On the other hand, many L2 writers, even those who possess adequate sentence-level knowledge of grammar and vocabulary, have difficulties writing well-organized essays just as Kaplan (1966) found in his L2 writing classes. Having studied those difficulties and problems I decided to investigate these findings to a group of Iranian undergraduate students studying in English as target language in university but living in a non-English spoken domain.

1.5 Aim of the Study and Research Questions

Many significant and fruitful studies on the relationship of L1 and TL use in different aspects holding different goals, have conducted to the fields but many of them did not relate their findings to text quality directly (Sasaki, 2004; Wolfersberger, 2003) therefore the influence of the language, in which different activities occur, on text quality remains unclear.

This study aims to investigate the significant features of text, namely coherence and cohesion in L1 and TL in order to find out if there is any possible relationship between the quality of text in L1 and TL. In other words, the aim of this study is to first illustrate the quality of text in L1 and L2 separately based on two significant features of text linguistics (coherence and cohesion), and then compare the results to find out whether there is any relation between the level of text quality in first and second language. It is popularly believed that, having high proficiency in L1 and consequently ability to write in good quality can lead to be a mature user of TL specially in writing area. Therefore, the text in TL owns better quality if the writer is highly proficient in L1. In line with above statement, Jones and Tetroe (1987) agreed on the same view.

This research was conducted by means of personal and educational background questionnaires; besides two essays on one topic that were written in L1 and TL through participants. Then, the texts are analyzed to see the assumption of whether the better qualified writer in L1 shows the same sort of quality in TL writing or there is not any evident relation between text quality in L1 and TL. Of course, the study is conducted in an academic environment- Eastern Mediterranean University as an

English medium based university – and the participants were Iranian undergraduate students that their first language is Persian.

The main research questions are:

1. Is there any significant relation between the quality of text written in L1 (Persian) and TL (English) based on text linguistics features?
2. To what extent cohesion and coherence as two significant features in text linguistics are related in L1 and TL contexts?

In this piece of study the term “quality” refers to investigating the texts according to the standard text linguistics features, clearly the adaptable features in L1 and TL (Persian and English). Of course, in this study, cohesion and coherence of text are the underlying features to be investigated.

The terms “quality, coherence and cohesion”, which are the most important key words in this study, are defined in chapter two in details.

1.6 Research Design

The research carried out involves a descriptive survey. Seliger and Shohamy (1989) stated that “descriptive research in second language acquisition provides descriptions of naturally occurring phenomena connected with language development and processing”. In descriptive research, data collection instruments are based on specific research questions or hypotheses derived from second language acquisition or related fields (Seliger&Shohamy, 1989, p. 129).

Therefore, this study aims to provide qualitative-quantitative interpretative data in the form of reports from the questionnaires administered to a sample population of Iranian undergraduate students in various departments such as architecture, tourism,

business, electronic and civil engineering departments; moreover, the analysis of two written tasks which are written in L1 and TL are declared.

The study is conducted in Eastern Mediterranean University as an English medium university in Famagusta, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. Twenty participants take part in this study through filling out an initial questionnaire on their social, cultural and academic background. They do two written tasks on their L1 (Persian) and TL (English) on the same subject. The texts are reviewed, observed and surveyed according to the main aim of the study.

All participants are studying for a bachelor degree and according to data gathered through the questionnaires, they almost have the same range of age in the sense of having equal degree in educational background. Moreover, they all passed the EMU English proficiency exam.

The paragraphs are evaluated by two external evaluators in each language, the researcher as Persian native speaker and an experienced Persian language teacher; likewise, the same procedure will be applied for texts written in English language. Obviously, exact text verification leads the study to figure out the answer of the research question.

1.7 Limitations

As in any study, the study findings are limited to the grade level of the participants as well the particular tasks, constructs and measures included in the study. It is unknown whether similar findings would occur with older or younger students, with different cultural background or in another context.

The researcher distributes the questionnaires to many students and asks their participation in this study, but unexpectedly only a limited numbers filled the consent forms and accepted to participate in this research voluntary. It is well-worth to know that some of the students mentioned that writing task which they have to do is annoying them and that is the reason of their rejection.

Furthermore, there are a lot of related studies in the field; however, nearly most of them concentrate on the second language (L2) not on foreign or target language. Most studies used participants who are in high second language proficiency position.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 The Relationship of L1 Research to L2 Research

In the recent years lots of comprehensive studies have indicated significant differences between learning to write in L1 and English as L2 or TL (Target Language), however, the teaching of second language writing and in our case target language writing was based on L1 writing for many years. According to Silva (1993) and Hinkel (2006), significant differences exist between all areas of L1 and TL writing. Silva (1993) specifically stated that the learning needs of TL writers are certainly different from L1 writers. Moreover, the pedagogy of TL writing entails specific approaches that involve the cultural, rhetorical, and linguistic differences between L1 and TL writers. In line with that, Hinkel (2003) in her empirical study of L1 and TL text mentioned that even after years of target language learning and composition training, TL texts are different from L1 texts clearly regarding the linguistic features. She declared that advanced TL writers carry on using their limited lexical ability which leads them to write just simple text limited to the most common language features usually faced in conversational discourse. Nevertheless, specialists in second or target language composition were motivated and encouraged to learn from their first language composition theory, practice, and research. They are asked to use the effective L1 techniques in TL writing instruction. They have found guidance and helping points in first language studies, and have adopted L1 writing process research designs. The main purpose of this study is to observe coherence and cohesion of participants` writing texts in L1 and TL in order to see if there is any

difference or perhaps any relationship between the qualities of those features. Therefore, it is crucial to review extensively and in more details some important related studies which have sought to find the differences, similarities or relationship between writing in first and target or second language in different aspects. Albeit, every single study varies to another in terms of its goal(s) and conclusion, the results of those can delight the path of this study.

Wolfersberger (2003) believes that writing in L2 is a challenging and complicated process. He declared that L1 writing process contains producing and drafting new ideas, revising and re-editing the writing task and choosing correct and proper vocabularies. Meanwhile writing process in L2 also involves those elements plus second language processing issues.

Former second language writing researches have stated that L2 writers use their L1 while writing in L2; however, the extent of this usage varies from one to one (Friedlander, 1990; woodall, 2000). So far many studies have concluded that writers use their L1 while writing in TL for many different purposes. For instance L1 is used to plan to idea and content generation or linguistic problem solution for issues such as vocabulary. Therefore, L1 is said to be used for cognitive overload in terms of reporting and back-tracking (Uzawa& Cumming, 1998; Wang, 2003; Woodall, 2002; Qi, 1998).

Conducting research on the usage of L1 for different reasons and research goals was prepared by many scholars. Writing skill as to compare L1 and L2 usage was one of the main focuses of the research areas conducted (Uzawa& Cumming, 1989; Wolfersberger, 2003). Thus, translation from L1 to L2 in the writing skill was the

outcome of most studies. Some other studies with the focus on the effect of learners' characteristics shared the same point of view (Cumming, 1989; Sasaki, 2004).

When use of L1 was the main focus in writing skill, whether it was translation or directly writing from L1 itself, participants used the structures of L1 as they wrote in L2. As well as translating from L1 to L2, generating ideas, backtracking and planning were other research factors in particular writing activities. Although, some researchers investigated the influence of L2 proficiency on L1 use, the actual influence of L1 was still not clear in some articles. While some articles argued that more use of L1 in specific topics resulted in better quality texts, others criticized the over usage of L1 (Friedlander, 1990; Wang & Wen, 2002; Woodall.2002).

Most of the scholars' focus was on the correlation between the L1 and L2 usage in proficiency and text quality. Although there are controversial arguments, one outcome of these studies was that high proficient learners shifted more between L1 and L2.

According to Sasaki and Hirose (1996), weak proficiency writers tended to use translation more often than high proficiency writers. He argued in his two studies that low proficient learners referred to their L1 more than high proficiency learners. Wang and Wen (2002)'s argument and Wolfersberger (2003), who only studied low proficiency L2 writers, were in the same manner as Sasaki and Hirose. He added that they use their L1 in prewriting, translating, to cover their weaknesses and compensate for their learning ability.

Beare and Bourdages and Woodall (2002) both discussed the use of L1 during L2 writing and stated that high proficient learners hardly use their L1 whereas Intermediate level learners used their L1 more depending on whether they were writing in cognate or non-cognate languages.

Woodall (2002) stated that: “some students seemed to control their Language Switching, using their L1 as a tool. For others, L-S (language switching) seemed out of control, and the L1 seemed more like a crutch to obtain cognitive stability”. Centeno-Cortes and Jimenez (2004) also reported that language learners in intermediate level used their L1 more than learners in advanced level that used their L1 with difficult problem solving.

Cohen & Brooks-Carson (2001) and Uzawa and Cumming (1989) argued that translation between L1 and L2 during their writing can be beneficial for the learners. Knutson (2006) and Woodall (2002, p.20) declared that L1 use seemed to be positive for learners in high proficient of languages. Finally, the other studies in the field concentrated on the effect of task features, for example topic knowledge or cultural issues on L1 use while writing in L2 in terms of quality of the text, but they were unsuccessful to find any important effect (Friedlander, 1990; Lally, 2000). They believed that learners seemed to write their best texts on topics which are in close relation to their L1 cultural background. Krapels (1990) and Lay (1982) also stated that tasks with related topics in learners` L1 generated more L1 use during L2 writing than other tasks.

The understandings generated from this review of the literature on relationship of L1 and L2 writing provided new guide lines into the role of L1 in L2 writing process.

The main general findings are:

- 1) “Using L1 during L2 writing can be beneficial, but not in all situations and not for all writers (Cohen & Brooks-Carson, 2001). This seems to depend on:
 - a) writers` L2 proficiency (Berae&Bourdages, 2007; Wang & Wen, 2002)
 - b) the type of task (Wang & Wen, 2002)
 - c) topic-knowledge (Friedlander, 1990; Qi, 1998)
 - d) the L1 and the L2 are cognate or non-cognate languages (Woodall, 2002).

Furthermore, the reasons for L1 use and which cognitive activities are carried out in L1 also remain to some extent unclear.

- 2) The L1 can be used to solving linguistic or lower-order problems (Woodall, 2002).
- 3) The L1 is also used for higher-order activities such as planning or to prevent cognitive overload (Uzawa& Cumming 1989; Woodall, 2002).
- 4) L1 use in planning and generating ideas has a positive effect on text quality in L2 writing, depending on the moment at which planning and generating ideas occur during the writing process (Van Weijen, 2008).”

Previous studies did not provide a clear explanation or measurement of L1 use because the main focus of those studies was not L1 (Sasaki, 2002; Wolfersberger, 2003). Mentioned studies based their results of L1 use on self-reports on the percentage of use of L1 (Sasaki & Hirose 1996) and duration or length of L1 use (Woodall, 2002).

Some indications, on the other hand, state that L1 was mainly used to plan and generate ideas for formulating their writing activities rather than linguistic purposes (Wang and Wen, 2002). This is probably because planning a task needs more cognitive effort where learners depend on their L1 more (Stevenson, 2005). Thus, the most demanding activities require cognitive effort more where learners tend to rely on their L1. Centeno-Cortes and Jimenez Jimenez (2004) also agreed with this statement by stating that learners rely on their L1 in the difficult problem-solving tasks. However, these statements are not directly related with the text quality itself and therefore the use of L1 still remains unclear in this case.

Therefore, it is difficult to come up with a single conclusion or to correlate text quality with the use of L1 when all these theoretical and methodological problems combined. This study aims to investigate two significant features of text, coherence and cohesion in L1 and TL and sought to find any possible relationship between the quality of text in L1 and TL, based on those two features as a case study. Consequently, it is crucial to explore some related terms such as text linguistics and its features which are thoroughly laid under the subject of this study in the latter parts.

Furthermore, stating the reason of using TL instead of L2 should be clear. This study is a sort of case study and the participants are all Iranian. Obviously, their first language (L1) is Persian but English is considered as their foreign language in educational system of Iran and not as a second language; however, students have to pass English courses during their years of schooling. On the other hand, English as the language of international communication is in the center of consideration by students and their parents thus lots of governmental and private English language

institutes are available all around Iran. In other words, the way people see and treat English language is the same as their second language but the researcher tends to use TL (target language) due to follow the academic principles. In addition, participants of this research have to study in English language in their current context.

2.2 Text

The word “Text” comes from a metaphorical use of the Latin verb “weave”, suggesting a sequence of sentences or utterances “interwoven” structurally and semantically. The text was defined as a unit larger than the sentence (Pike, 1967). One research began with identifying text structures, which were interpreted as something manifest rather than being created, and classifying them followed by sequences of texts or situations of occurrence (Pike, 1967).

Text as a noun is used to refer to a sequence of sentences or utterances which are unified by reason in a linguistic cohesion or semantic coherence such as in poems or articles.

A text can be semantically complete in it or related to a specific situation with a sentence, a word or just an utterance such as traffic signs. Thus, cohesion and coherence are the two main factors that make up a text. Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), define a text as a “communicative occurrence which meets seven standards of textuality. Accordingly, textuality is listed as: “cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, situationality, informativity and intertextuality” (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981). These underlying terms should be explained in the text linguistics domain.

2.3 Text Linguistics

Text linguistics is a branch of linguistics which deals with texts as communication process. Its purpose is to find and describe text grammars. The application of text linguistics has evolved from this approach to a much broader term as an entire text.

Text linguistics as a sub-branch of linguistics did not really develop until the early 1970s, until linguistics itself began to be less concerned with the sentence as the prime unit of analysis; or at least until it began to be felt that some special discipline should take care of potential units larger than a sentence, or of intra-sentence relations. One major concern is the definition of textuality and also the classification or typology of texts according to their genre characteristics. Under the influence of pragmatics and psychology, more attention is being focused on the production or processing and reception of texts, and on their social function in society. Accordingly, text linguistics can be defined as the study of text as a product (text grammar) or as a process (theory of text).

2.4 Seven Underlying Features of Text

1. Cohesion:

Cohesion is the first set of textuality which concerns the components of the exterior text that has a sequence. The components are based on grammatical forms and conventions in which cohesion lies on grammatical dependencies. They are major signals for sorting out meanings and uses. Additionally, all the functions that signal relations on the surface elements are included within cohesion (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981, p. 5).

The science of texts ought to clarify how ambiguities are possible on the surface and how people can exploit these ambiguities without any complexity. Cohesion and other standards of textuality need to have interaction for the purpose of communication.

2. Coherence:

Coherence is defined as the second set of textuality which is related with the textual world being mutually accessible and relevant. Beaugrande and Dressler (1981, p. 7, 8) concept is the configuration of cognitive content and the relations are the links that appear in the textual world. Nonetheless, relations are not always precise and activated on the surface (Beaugrande& Dressler, 1981).

Coherence illustrates the nature of science of text as human activities. A text gains meaning with the interaction of the text-presented knowledge and people-stored knowledge of the world (Petöfi, 1974).

3. Intentionality:

Intentionality is defined as the third set of textuality which concerns the attitude of writer's reflecting the intentions of the writer including cohesion and coherence such as distributing knowledge or attaining a goal specified in a plan. Although cohesion and coherence are sometimes said to be operational goals without considering other goals which may be blocked, text users still tolerate products whose condition is difficult to uphold cohesion and coherence together especially in casual conversations (Beaugrande& Dressler, 1981, p. 13).

4. Acceptability:

Acceptability is the fourth feature of textuality which deals with attitude of the text receiver where the occurrences are formed by a cohesive and coherent text such as to acquire knowledge or to provide cooperation in a plan. This kind of attitude is reactive to factors such as text type, social or cultural setting, and the desirability of goals (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981, p. 14). "If acceptability is restricted, communication can be diverted." (Dickens 1836-37, p.774)

5. Informativity:

The fifth set of textuality is informativity which concerns the occurrences of the presented text that are expected versus unexpected or known against unknown/certain (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981, p. 17, 18). Highly informative occurrences are more demanding and fascinating and therefore there needs to be special concern paid to the overloading of the receiver for the result of miscommunication. Since every text is informative, content and form cannot always be understood fully. On the other hand, low informative occurrence can lead to boredom of the text.

6. Situationality:

The sixth feature of textuality is situationality which is related with the factors that make up a text relevant to a situation of occurrence. The simplicity of deciding on an issue is because of the influence of the situation in the text. Thus, situationality can even affect the means of cohesion (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981, p. 20).

7. Intertextuality:

The seventh feature of textuality is intertextuality which is concerned with the factors of utilization of one text encountering the knowledge of previous texts. Intertextuality is the evolution of text types as classes of texts with typical patterns of characteristics. Relying on intertextuality for a particular text is important as with text types such as parodies, critical reviews, rebuttals or reports the text producer must take into consideration the prior text and text receivers need to take into consideration the familiarity of the latter texts (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981, p. 22)

Generally, academic texts should have coherence and cohesion. Cohesion and coherence are the main terms by which discourse analysis and text linguistics explain the elements of texts. The term coherence refers to the content side of a text. A paper is coherent if it contains clear and comprehensible arguments. Cohesion focuses to formal side of writing texts, particularly on the paragraph and sentence level. High quality papers in terms of cohesion should contain a tight fit of meaning and form. This is achieved by a proper use of lexico-grammatical forms that combines the sentences and paragraphs in a written text.

Briefly, a text is cohesive if its elements are linked together. A text is coherent if it makes sense. It is significant to know that these are not the same thing. In other words, a text may be cohesive (linked together), but incoherent (meaningless).

The relationship between cohesion and coherence is a matter of discussion for many years. While it is true that a sequence of unlinked speeches in specific context or situation can make sense, it is often the case that some form of linking, with cohesive devices such as coordinate conjunctions (and, but, so) can make it easier for the

reader to process and to make sense of what they read. Coherence is more complicated but it has a lot to do with the way that the propositional content of texts is organized. If the content of a text is organized in such a way that it meets the reader's expectations, it is more likely to achieve its communicative effect.

Yan Xi (2010) in his study on the development of cohesion in the past 30 years stated that, according to Traugott and Prattthe, the earliest study of the cohesion in English was done by Jakobson in 1960, who analyzed syntactic structure and parallelism in literary texts. Moreover, Xi (2010, p. 139) mentioned that, it was Halliday in 1964 who first devided cohesion into grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. Later, Hasan in 1968 made a detailed exploration into grammatical cohesion. Several studies also conducted to investigate the relation of cohesion to coherence and the quality of writing in L1 and L2 texts. According to a study conducted in Thammasat University for instance, Tierney and Mosenthal (1983) analyzed the relationship between coherence scores and the number of cohesive classes in texts written by ESL students. That study also mentioned that Connor (1984) tested the difference in the cohesive congestion in argumentative texts by two native speakers of English language and two advanced learners of English language.

In another study which is stated in Thammasat University research on “Cohesion and Coherence in Text”, Field and Oi in 1992 compared the use of conjunction in argumentative paragraphs composed by high school students in two different nationalities.

On the whole, cohesion and coherence are explained differently in text linguistics and translation studies. According to de Beaugrande and Dressler in 1981, coherence

and cohesion features “are the most obvious standards of textuality”. Cohesion refers to the way in which the surface features of a text, such as lexical or grammatical features cling together and display continuity. Coherence refers to the way in which continuity of sense is established. De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981, p. 85) also mentioned that “a text makes sense because there is a continuity of senses among the knowledge activated by the expressions of the text”.

Consequently, Dressler (1998), referring to de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), describes coherence as the way in which a text hangs together semantically, pragmatically and thematically.

Based on Monika Krein-Kuhle study, however, the best-known and detailed model of cohesion available is the one which is outlined by Halliday and Hasan (cohesion in English, 1976). She believes that it was this book that made cohesion an important concept in many fields and has caused wide discussion and application ever since (Xi, 2010).

In 1976, Halliday and Hasan published this book, which marked the establishment of the cohesion theory. Xi (2010, p. 140) explained that in Halliday and Hasan’s opinion, the concept of cohesion is described as “a semantic one; it refers to relation of meaning that exist within the text and that define it as text”; furthermore, for the occurrence of cohesion, they explain that: “cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some elements in the discourse is dependent on that of another” (Halliday&Hasan, 1976, p. 4).

Stephen P. Witte and Laster Faigley (1981, p. 189 & 190) declared in their study that, to Halliday and Hasan a text is a semantic unit which its parts are linked together by vivid cohesive ties. Consequently, cohesion defines a text as text. A cohesive tie "is a semantic relation between an element in a text and some other element that is crucial to the interpretation of it" (Halliday&Hasan, 1976, p. 8).

Furthermore, they specify five major classes of cohesive ties in their book, "Cohesion in English". Those five major classes are Reference, Substitution, Ellipsis, Conjunction and Lexical Reiteration, and Collocation (Halliday&Hasan, 1976).

Stephen P. Witte and Laster Faigley (1981, p. 190-195) explored five major classes of Halliday and Hasan`s theory of cohesion as follow.

- 1) Substitution: Substitution replaces one property with another which is not a personal pronoun.
- 2) Ellipsis: Ellipsis involves elimination of a word, phrase, or clause.

These two major classes (1 and 2) are used more in conversation than in written domain; however, one of the main focuses of this study is to check the coherence and cohesion of a written text, the major concern of this study is centered on the other three classes. In other words, this study tends to check 3) Reference Cohesion, 4) Conjunctive Cohesion and 5) Lexical cohesion by means of a piloted checklist created by Steve Y. Chiang in 1999. These three items in brief are:

- 3) Reference cohesion: It occurs when one element in a text points to another item for its interpretation. Reference classes are of three

types: i. Pronominal (he & his), ii. Demonstratives (this & that),
iii. Definite Articles (the) and iv. Comparatives (less).

4) Conjunctive cohesion: Its items are not cohesive in themselves, but they "express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse". Halliday and Hasan determine five types for it: i) Additive (and), ii) Adversative (however), iii) Causal (therefore), iv) Temporal (before) and v) Continuative (of course).

5) Lexical cohesion: It is the dominant means of linking sentences in discourse. Halliday and Hasan distinguish two significant subclasses of lexical cohesion: i) Reiteration and ii) Collocation. Reiteration is in turn divided into four subclasses, ranging from repetition of the same item to repetition through the use of a synonym or near-synonym, a super-ordinate item, or a general item. All the lexical cohesive relationships which cannot be properly subsumed under lexical reiteration are included in a "miscellaneous" class called collocation.

The following chapter will analyze the procedure of data collection and data analysis as the main goal of this study is to explore the coherence and cohesion of a text in L1 and TL.

2.5 Summary

Various studies on L1 and TL usage were conducted for a number of different reasons. Despite of having different aims, many of these researches sought to find

any relation of L1 use to either L2 or TL proficiency or text quality in different ways. For instance, Hinkel's (2003) in his large analysis of L1 and L2 text stated that the participants' L2 texts continue to differ significantly even from novice L1 writers in terms of linguistic features, whereas they are learning English as a second or Target language writing skills for many years. In another study, Silva (1993) strongly declared that the learning needs of TL writers are definitely different from L1 writers.

One important finding of these studies indicates that learners with high proficiency switched more than learners with low proficiency between their L1 and TL (Wang, 2003). Furthermore, Cumming (1989) concluded that expert writers used their L1 more during word searches. On the other hand, Wolfersberger (2003) finding shows that low proficiency TL writers mostly used their L1 during writing and in order to cover their weaknesses, they use translation from their L1 to their TL.

Finally, further studies focused on some issues such as topic knowledge or cultural issues on L1 use in terms of quality of the text, but they were unsuccessful to find any important effect on text quality (Friedlander, 1990; Lally, 2000). However, Friedlander (1990) found that learners seemed to write their best texts on topics which are in close relation to their L1 cultural background.

Chapter 3

METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION AND DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter deals with the research design and gives detailed information of the subjects involved in the study and the context in which the study is carried out. Also, method of data collection and data collection instruments are introduced in detail. Then it is followed by the method of data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

This study aims to investigate two significant features of text, coherence and cohesion in L1 and L2 and sought to find any possible relationship between the quality of text in L1 and L2. In terms of design, the research can be quantitative in light of the questionnaires that participants are asked to read carefully and answer. On the other hand, the study can be qualitative according to various reports of other studies as well as the researcher interpretation and discussion. It is mentioned that this is an Iranian case study administered in Eastern Mediterranean University named an English medium university. All participants in this study are undergraduate students. Consequently, they have the same educational background, high school diploma, and more or less the same range of age. This is also proved by the information collected through questionnaire. The range of English Proficiency score of participants need not to be in the same level in this study because of individual text investigation.

3.2 Subjects

In this study, the subject includes a sample population of Iranian undergraduate students in ten various departments of Eastern Mediterranean University. Obviously, only the English medium departments such as Business Administration, Communication, Computing and Technology, Molecular Biology and Genetics, Pharmacy, Tourism, Architecture, Civil engineering, Electrical and Mechanic Engineering departments are included. The population of Iranian undergraduate students consists of 20 participants from the different faculties of Eastern Mediterranean University. The participation of participants were thoroughly voluntary and they are asked to fill a consent form before starting to fill the questionnaire. The researcher distributed the questionnaires to students in different fields of study to have more general results at the end. Participants in various departments are chosen based on their degree of education. Clearly they are all in studying for a bachelor degree.

3.3 Context

This study is conducted in Eastern Mediterranean University in Famagusta, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. EMU is an English Medium University. All admitted students have to submit an acceptable score of a standardized test such as TOEFL or IELTS beforehand, otherwise, they are required to pass the proficiency test prepared by the EMU School of Foreign Languages before going to their respective departments. Students who pass the proficiency test can enter their departments while the students who cannot succeed in this test should attend the School of Foreign Languages programme for one or two semesters to achieve the requirement. All participants in this study are studying in their accepted departments, that is to say, they have submitted the required certificate of English proficiency (international

ones or local one) or they have finished the programme of EMU Language Preparatory School. Thus, regarding to the target language proficiency, nearly all undergraduate participants in this study own the adequate level of proficiency in TL.

3.4 Data Collection , Method and Instruments

This study is qualitative in terms of researcher reports and interpretations and quantitative in terms of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences and numerical values collected from collected questionnaire.

This study collected data by means of administrating a questionnaire including two batteries. The first battery focuses on educational, social and cultural background of participants. In the second battery of questionnaire, each participant is asked to write two essays on the same topic but first in their L1 and then in their TL. The first battery includes closed-ended items. It contains 22 major questions in form of Yes/No questions and Multiple Choice questions and also 8 sub-questions in form of contingency questions. All these 30 questions are aiming at personal information, educational background, social, and cultural background of the participants in different format. That is to say, the first 3 questions are asking for personal information. The next 9 questions focus on participants educational background in L1 and TL. It continues discovering specific cultural issues related to TL language in next 7 questions. For instance it is asking participants to specify whether they listen to English music or not, and if the response is 'Yes' they have to mention how much time they spend on it. Another following 8 questions in first part of questionnaire aim at educational and social background of participants` families. Finally, the last 4 questions of the first battery of questionnaire concern about social situation of participants in their society. In the second battery of questionnaire, there is an open-

ended question. Participants are asked to write down their personal views freely on a given topic in their L1, Persian Language, and then in their TL, English Language. The instruction part contains clear enough explanation. For the purpose of having better understanding, the topic of writing task is written in both languages, L1 & TL. The topic of writing task has been chosen carefully and purposefully by the researcher under the guidance of his supervisor, to meet the aim of study. The chosen topic for this study is a challenging one and concerns a current issue in the daily life of young people. The researcher believes that because of participants` sense of familiarity to the given topic, plenty of ideas and various points of view must be present in their minds.

3.5 Method of Data Analysis

In this study the data were collected by means of a questionnaire including close-ended and open-ended questions. After all the questionnaires were collected, they were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Programme by coding the data from the questionnaires and then descriptive reports were written by the researcher accordingly. In the first part, educational, cultural and social background information of participants in separate categories was coded according to the questionnaires. Afterwards, the writing tasks were rated based on the checklist on coherence and cohesion. The checklist was created and piloted by Chiang (1999) in his study in the same subject area (appendix 1). It evokes the main features of coherence and cohesion in a text according to Halliday and Hasan`s theory (1976), put them in checklist format and gave them numerical values (5= Strongly Agree, 4= Agree, 3= undecided, 2= Disagree, 1= Strongly, Disagree and 0= Not Applicable). Participants were tagged by a specific mark on their L1 and their TL writing task from 1 to 5 by two evaluaters in each language. An experienced

language teacher in L1 and the researcher as a native speaker of that language rated the first writing task in L1. The TL writing task was rated by another TL experienced teacher as well as the researcher. The rates were analyzed by means of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Programme by coding the data from the checklist. The obtained data as a result of comparing the results of the first and the second battery of the questionnaires are represented qualitatively in the form of a detailed report.

In the first battery of the questionnaire the questions were related to the educational, cultural and social background of the participants as well as their parents (Appendix 1, Table C). In the second battery of the questionnaire, the participants were asked to write one essay in their native tongue, Persian, and in target language, English, about a specified topic (Appendix 1, Table C). The example of original and typed copies of participants' writing tasks in L1 and TL can be seen in appendices (Appendix 3). These texts were evaluated on the basis of Coherence and Cohesion checklist (Appendix 1, Table A& B). The checklist was adopted to this study for the English copy according to the topic of essay, and also adopted and translated into Persian language by expertise judgment. It includes ten basic elements in coherence section and nine items in the cohesion one. The participants' texts were evaluated according to these items lists in L1 and TL separately. The two evaluators for each language were experienced language teachers. They were given the original and typed copies of participants' texts in L1 and TL. Prior to the evaluation process, the raters were delivered the definition of checklists items, too. They were kindly asked to evaluate the texts according to the checklist items. To avoid any pre-judgments by the raters, only the second part of the questionnaire, writing task, were handed to them.

Obviously, those texts are nameless and without any other information about the participants' background.

Before going on to explore the findings of the study, a brief clarification of the checklist items to know what the evaluation criteria are, will be necessary.

3.6 Checklist Items

3.6.1 Coherence Items

The coherence section of the checklist (Appendix 1, Table A) that includes 10 items aims to specify the relation among opinions and ideas of text organization. Obviously, each item carries an implied meaning which needs to be clarified.

[(A) The beginning section is effective in introducing the reader to the subject.]

Item "A" represents the idea that whether the beginning part of an essay helps the reader to require enough information about the subject of the text.

[(B) The ideas in the essay are all very relevant to the topic.]

Items "B" refers to a sort of relation that how various ideas are related to the main topic of the task.

[(C) The ideas in the essay are well-related one to another.]

In item "C" the relationship of one idea to another one in the text is considered.

[(D) The causal relationship between ideas is clear.]

Item "D" stands for cause and effect ideas, if there exists any.

[(E) Different ideas are effectively compared/ contrasted.]

Expressing any effective difference or similarity between two ideas or topics has rated by means of item “E”.

[(F) Ideas mentioned are elaborated.]

If the writer gives some new ideas and then brings further information and explanation about it, item “F” represents it.

[(G) The writer's overall point of view is clear.]

The writers of the essays should express their overall point of views in an understandable and clear way for the readers. Item “G” stands for this factor.

[(H) The division of paragraphs is justifiable in terms of content relevance.]

[(I) Transition between paragraphs is smooth.]

If the writers divide their ideas in different paragraphs, this division should be logical and the transition process which is used should convey a smooth movement to the reader’s. Otherwise, the texts can hardly be called a coherent text. All these specifics can be rated through items “H” and “I”.

[(J) The ending gives the reader a definite sense of closure.]

The last item of the coherence checklist is “J” which focuses on the sense of closure in the essays. For having a coherent text, the writer should make the reader feel he is coming to the end of the subject or discussion. That is to say, the reader is expecting to reach the end of story by reading that part.

3.6.2 Cohesion Items

In the second part of the checklist (Appendix 1, Table A), cohesion items are listed. It includes 9 items which first seven are based on de Beurgrande and Dressler`s (1981) taxonomy of cohesive ties.

[(A) The exact same vocabulary/expressions/structures are repeated consistently.]

[(B) Equivalent words/paraphrases, when used, are used appropriately.]

Items “A” and “B” represents equivalence. This includes direct repetition of patterns, using the parts of speech to change the form, using different structures conveying the same meaning and paraphrasing.

[(C) Pronouns of reference are used appropriately and accurately.]

[(D) Ellipsis is used where needed.]

The accurate and appropriate use of pronouns and references are reflected in item “C”, and the correct usage of ellipsis feature which means repetition of a pattern or structure with some omitted parts have been stated in item “D”.

[(E) Junction words are used judiciously and accurately.]

[(F) Where no junction words are used, transition between sentences is smooth.]

Items “E” and “F” considers the connection and the transition words between sentences. The texts were evaluated according to the appropriate and smooth movement of ideas from one sentence or clause to another one plus focusing on the correct usage of junction words between sentences when they are needed.

[(G) New information is introduced in an appropriate place or manner.]

Adding any new and more ideas should be done in an appropriate place or manner for having a cohesive text. Item “G” is demonstrated to represent this factor.

All above items in cohesion “A, B, C, D, E, F and G” are based on de Beaugrande and Dressler’s (1981) taxonomy of cohesive ties. According to Chiang (1999) these items can be categorized in four groups, namely, “ I) expressing equivalence, II) constituting compactness and efficiency, III) signaling relationships among events or situations in the textual world and, IV) showing importance or newness of content”.

[(H) Examples are introduced judiciously, not just to form an exhaustive list.]

Furthermore, item “H” is added to the list of cohesion features in order to detect the unnecessary long list of examples which some novice writers used instead of judicious instances.

[(I) Punctuation is employed appropriately to separate ideas and sentences.]

The last item “I” stands for punctuation accuracy. Punctuation plays a very significant role in dividing ideas, sentences or expressions. Incorrect usage of punctuation can affect the whole texts and mislead the reader to receive the main message of the text.

After a brief exploration of the checklist items, the rating process can be introduced. Raters for each language were both experienced language teachers for many years. The texts in Persian and English, cohesion and coherence checklist and the brief definition of each item were delivered to them. They were asked to evaluate the texts on the checklist rating scale system from 0 to 5 (further explanation in chapter 3, p. 31 & 32). All evaluation figures were placed in related tables and charts to

show any possible difference or similarity. Next, in line with the findings, the comparison between coherence and cohesion items was conducted according to the first research question (page 8). The author first calculated average score of L1 items and compared to the same items in TL. This comparison was a search for any logical or reasonable relationship between coherence and cohesion types in both languages. In addition, the background information of participants which is presented in table 1 was used after the comparison to find out how much differences the participants with highest or lowest mark have in their educational, cultural and social background.

Chapter 4

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Presentation

This chapter presents the results of the research through tables together with their discussion and interpretation. The findings of the study are stated in relation to the main research question.

4.2 Findings and Discussion

This section presents the findings of the study in the form of tables with their interpretation according to the research question.

The participants' mother tongue is Persian and their target language is English. They are studying for an undergraduate degree in different departments of the EMU.

In table 1 in the appendices section the personal information of participants was presented. According to the table 1, 25% of participants were female and 75 % were male.

As stated earlier the main aim of study was to find out if there was any relation between coherence and cohesion in L1 and target text. The main research question is: "Is there any relation between the quality of text written in L1 and TL according to text linguistic features (coherence and cohesion)?" In the following tables the percentage of coherence and cohesion items will be presented and analyzed.

The two following tables show the distribution of coherence and cohesion average score for each participant in their L1 and TL.

Table 1: Distribution of Coherence Average Score for Each Participant

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Part. Avg. | ST.1 | ST.2 | ST.3 | ST.4 | ST.5 | ST.6 | ST.7 | ST.8 | ST.9 | ST.10 |
| Cr.E. Average | 0.6 | 0.54 | 0.64 | 0.61 | 0.52 | 0.56 | 0.43 | 0.75 | 0.5 | 0.79 |
| Cr.P. Average | 0.36 | 0.6 | 0.52 | 0.24 | 0.3 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.24 | 0.28 | 0.32 |
| Part. Avg. | ST.11 | ST.12 | ST.13 | ST.14 | ST.15 | ST.16 | ST.17 | ST.18 | ST.19 | ST.20 |
| Cr.E. Average | 0.77 | 0.57 | 0.56 | 0.4 | 0.63 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.28 | 0.41 | 0.24 |
| Cr.P. Average | 0.28 | 0.3 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.22 | 0.14 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.16 | 0.16 |

Participants: St1, St2, St3, ..., St20

Avg.:Cr.E.A. = Average score of Coherence Items in English (TL)

Cr.P.A. = Average score of Coherence Items in Persian (L1)

Table 2: Distribution of Cohesion Average Score for Each Participant

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Part. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Avg. | ST.1 | ST.2 | ST.3 | ST.4 | ST.5 | ST.6 | ST.7 | ST.8 | ST.9 | ST.10 |
| Cs.E. Average | 0.47 | 0.44 | 0.57 | 0.53 | 0.37 | 0.35 | 0.25 | 0.60 | 0.42 | 0.60 |
| Cs.P. Average | 0.37 | 0.51 | 0.55 | 0.33 | 0.46 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.42 | 0.37 | 0.33 |
| Part. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Avg. | ST.11 | ST.12 | ST.13 | ST.14 | ST.15 | ST.16 | ST.17 | ST.18 | ST.19 | ST.20 |
| Cs.E. Average | 0.43 | 0.44 | 0.35 | 0.33 | 0.48 | 0.28 | 0.25 | 0.24 | 0.38 | 0.37 |
| Cs.P. Average | 0.33 | 0.35 | 0.31 | 0.17 | 0.20 | 0.17 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 |

Participants: St1, St2, St3, ..., St20

Avg.:Cs.E.A. = Average score of Cohesion Items in English (TL)

Cs.P.A. = Average score of Cohesion Items in Persian (L1)

All participants` texts in both L1 and TL were evaluated according to the checklist items by two external evaluators and the average score of per person in cohesion and coherence were calculated and displayed separately (Appendix 2, p. 80, Tables E, F, G, H, I & J). In the final tables (Appendix 2, Tables K & L) the total score of each participant in coherence and cohesion is shown in L1 and TL.

Afterwards, the average of coherence and cohesion items in two languages are calculated, (Appendix 2, TablesM & N). In the next two sections, average score of coherence and cohesion items in participants` L1 texts were compared to their TL texts. This investigation tried to find any possible logical relation, similarity or difference.

4.2.1 Coherence

Average points of Coherence items can be divided in three groups according to result of L1 in table 3 to have clearer analysis and interpretation. Group one contains items

which catch less than 30 points. The second group starts from 30 up to 70, and the third group from 70 to 100 points.

Table 3: Distribution of Average Score of Coherence Items

| Items Avg. | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | Total Average |
|---------------|---------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------------------|
| | Cr.E.A. | 0.58 | 0.59 | 0.635 | 0.55 | 0.45 | 0.49 | 0.625 | 0.44 | 0.405 | 0.515 |
| 58% | | 59% | 63% | 55% | 45% | 49% | 62% | 44% | 40% | 51% | 53% |
| Cr.P.A. | 0.32 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.32 | 0.1 | 0.15 | 0.26 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.31 | 0.254 |
| | 32% | 36% | 36% | 32% | 10% | 15% | 26% | 19% | 17% | 31% | 25% |

Items: Items of Coherence Checklist = A, B, C, D, D, E, F, G, H, I & J

Avg: Cr.E.A. = Average score of Coherence Items in English (TL)

Cr.P.A. = Average score of Coherence Items in Persian (L1)

First group of items which is less than 30 points in L1 texts (Persian language) includes “E, F, G, H and I” items (Table4); however, these items received considerable higher average scores in TL texts.

Table 4: Distribution of Average Score of Coherence Items: (first group)

| Items Avg. | E | F | G | H | I |
|---------------|---------|------|------|-------|------|
| | Cr.E.A. | 0.45 | 0.49 | 0.625 | 0.44 |
| 45% | | 49% | 62% | 44% | 40% |
| Cr.P.A. | 0.1 | 0.15 | 0.26 | 0.19 | 0.17 |
| | 10% | 15% | 26% | 19% | 17% |

Items: Items of Coherence Checklist = E, F, G, H & I

Avg: Cr.E.A. = Average score of Coherence Items in English (TL)

Cr.P.A. = Average score of Coherence Items in Persian (L1)

It is evident that participants show better performance in their TL in those items. Item “E” [*Different ideas are effectively compared / contrasted*] highlights that participants are able to compare various ideas in effective ways in their TL essays but not in their L1. Moreover, in item “F” [*Ideas mentioned are elaborated*] writers

are not successful to give further appropriate information about the topic in L1. On the other hand, in their TL they can clearly make it. Item “G” [*The writer's overall point of view is clear*] illuminates that participants reveal their own point of view on the given topic in TL more explicit than in L1. The last two items “H & I” [*The division of paragraphs is justifiable in terms of content relevance / Transition between paragraphs is smooth*] clarify that participants are more proficient to split their ideas into separate paragraphs and connect them by appropriate transition words in TL while in their L1 these items merely received 19 and 17 points out of 100 by the evaluators.

This first group of items (“E, F, G, H and I”) received the lowest rate in participants' L1 texts. Although, all participants have accomplished their initial education for at least 11 years in their L1 according to their educational background (Appendix 2, TableO), some serious problems still exist in their writing regarding the coherence features.

These different percentages as a result of evaluation of texts make any logical or reasonable relation between L1 and TL impossible. Having a look at the table 3, makes it obvious that more than 30% difference in total average of those items “E, F, G, H and I” couldn't lead the study to any significant or reliable relationship in these coherence items.

The second category of items in coherence refers to the features which received 30 to 70 points. Items “A, B, C, D & J” are placed in this category (Table 5). Although these items are in the second group, the maximum percentage of the items is only

36%, which indicates that participants couldn't reveal any acceptable performances in these items in their L1 either.

Table 5: Distribution of Average Score of Coherence Items: (second group)

| Items | A | B | C | D | J |
|----------------|------|------|-------|------|-------|
| Avg. | | | | | |
| Cr.E.A. | 0.58 | 0.59 | 0.635 | 0.55 | 0.515 |
| | 58% | 59% | 63% | 55% | 51% |
| Cr.P.A. | 0.32 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.32 | 0.31 |
| | 32% | 36% | 36% | 32% | 31% |

Items: Items of Coherence Checklist = E, F, G, H & I

Avg: Cr.E.A. = Average score of Coherence Items in English (TL)

Cr.P.A. = Average score of Coherence Items in Persian (L1)

Based on the average score of item “A” [*The beginning section is effective in introducing the reader to the subject*] in L1 (Table 5), except a few writers, the others were unable to introduce the main topic in a clear way to the readers. This item has been rated 58% in TL essays. From author’s point of view, TL texts look more coherent in the introductory section. Perhaps it is because participants have to use their TL for living as well as studying. Moreover, item “B” [*The ideas in the essay are all very relevant to the topic*] in table 5 clarifies that the mentioned ideas and opinions in L1 texts are not really well linked to the main topic of the task by the participants, nevertheless, they are partially successful in this item in TL by achieving 59% from evaluators. Low average score of item “C” (36%) [*The ideas in the essay are well-related one to another*] in L1 (Table 5) illuminates that participants could not make reasonable and logical relation among their opinions; however, this is one of their best rated item in their TL texts. More than 60% score in item “C” implied that the sample population of this study has acquired mostly the ability to link their ideas in a coherent method to each other in their TL writing. The

next item “D” [*The causal relationship between ideas is clear*] with similar average score (36%) to item “C” in L1 texts makes the low skill of participants explicit in bringing relevant reasons to support their own ideas about the main topic. On the contrary, the TL average rate of item “D” (55%) shows the usage of more appropriate relevant supporting ideas in the texts. That is to say, participants could bring more supporting details in a relevant manner for better understanding of the readers in TL.

According to the average percentage for each coherence item (Table 3), the difference between the total L1 and TL coherence average score (28%, Table 3) and their interpretations concluded that the population of this study did not follow the coherence features appropriately in their L1 writing, however, their performances towards making coherent texts in TL were more acceptable. It is fruitful for this study to mention that not surprisingly, those participants who present a very low performance in some coherence items in their L1 for instance “E, F, H and I” (Appendix 2, Table I), show their lowest scores in their TL as well (Appendix 2, E & F) but not in a parallel line.

According to the average score of coherence items in L1 in table 3, this can be drawn that expressing the main point of view and giving extra information about the topic are the main problems of Iranian undergraduate students to make a coherent text in their L1. Moreover, they have difficulty to arrange different ideas in separate paragraphs, besides their problems to use accurate and appropriate transition words to connect ideas and paragraphs in L1 texts. The total average rate of TL coherence items is 53% which is not a real high rate; nonetheless, they seem to have fewer

difficulties with these coherence items in their TL texts than L1. As it is mentioned, living and studying by using TL might be one reason to have such a result.

4.2.2 Cohesion

The review of total average score of cohesion items (32% in L1 and 50% in TL; Table 6) shows that the usage of cohesion features neither in L1 nor TL is really sufficient. Table 6 shows the distribution of average score of cohesion items.

Table 6: Distribution of Average Score of Cohesion Items

| Items Avg. | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | Total Average |
|---------------|------|-------|-----|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------------------|
| Cs.E.A. | 0.47 | 0.545 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.345 | 0.38 | 0.485 | 0.55 | 0.405 | 0.497 |
| | 47% | 54% | 40% | 90% | 34% | 38% | 48% | 55% | 40% | 50% |
| Cs.P.A. | 0.47 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 0.24 | 0.38 | 0.33 | 0.14 | 0.3 | 0.24 | 0.323 |
| | 47% | 41% | 40% | 24% | 38% | 33% | 14% | 30% | 24% | 32% |

Items: Items of Cohesion Checklist = A, B, C, D, D, E, F, G, H & I

Avg: Cs.E.A. = Average score of Cohesion Items in English (TL)

Cs.P.A. = Average score of Cohesion Items in Persian (L1)

Item “G” (14%, Table 6) [*New information is introduced in an appropriate place or manner*] got the least average score among all cohesion features in participants` L1 writing. This item tends to evaluate the appropriate place for introducing new information in text. This given score (14%) by L1 evaluators for item “G” obviously indicates that the participants were not successful to find the proper position in their writing whenever they mentioned new information about the topic. They lack this skill in their writing organization skills; on the contrary, they were gained 48% in their target language by English language evaluators. It shows they introduced new ideas and information to the readers in more organized manner.

Participants did not receive high scores in items “D and I” [D) *Ellipsis is used where needed / I) Punctuation is employed appropriately to separate ideas and sentences*] in their L1 either. Actually, 24% was the score of these two items (Table 6). Item “D” refers to use ellipsis feature in cohesion writing when it is needed in the text. When the writers feel that a part of structure or pattern is unnecessary or it can be omitted and the text still remains clear enough for the readers, ellipsis normally is acted. By reviewing table 6, it is concluded that many participants show failure to achieve at least half of the score in ellipsis feature. In addition, table XII Conveys that punctuation feature (item “I”) [*Punctuation is employed appropriately to separate ideas and sentences*] is obviously another element which is not well used in L1 writing. Correct and proper usage of punctuation can help the text to transfer the expected meaning to the readers; on the other hand, the incorrect usage of them can lead the readers to a wrong understanding. Item “I” in participants' L1 writing owns only 24% and in their TL writing it is 40%. Although participants show better performance in their TL, neither L1 nor TL texts are fed with appropriate punctuation. However, punctuation is not mentioned in de Beurgrande and Dressler`s (1981) taxonomy of cohesive ties, personally the author believes that it is a very significant factor due to the role which is playing in forming the whole text and transmitting the meanings.

Table 7: Distribution of Average Score of Cohesion Items

| Items Avg. | H | I |
|---------------|------|-------|
| Cs.E.A. | 0.55 | 0.405 |
| | 55% | 40% |
| Cs.P.A. | 0.3 | 0.24 |
| | 30% | 24% |

“Cs.E.A. = Average score of Cohesion Items in English (TL)

Cs.P.A. = Average score of Cohesion Items in Persian (L1)”

The next problematic cohesion item in L1 writing is “H” [*Examples are introduced judiciously, not just to form an exhaustive list*]. This is an element in cohesion which is not in de Beurgrande and Dressler’s (1981) taxonomy of cohesive ties either. Chiang (1999) states that it refers to a certain L2 novice-level learners who try to make a list of inappropriate or irrelevant examples in their essays in order to transmit their ideas to the readers in any way. Not only this wrong usage makes their writing non-cohesive, but also makes it harder for the readers to draw the main point out of the text. Average percentage of this item in L1 is 30% and in TL is 55% (Table 7). It is evident that the participants were not well trained to use this feature in their L1 and TL writing tasks during their education period. They tried to bring a lot of examples to express their mean but many of those examples were unnecessary and just extended the text in a confusing manner. Perhaps lack of vocabulary and structure knowledge caused it.

Table 8: Distribution of Average Score of Cohesion Items

| Items Avg. | A | B | C | D | F |
|---------------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| Cs.E.A. | 0.47 | 0.545 | 0.40 | 0.90 | 0.38 |
| | 47% | 54% | 40% | 90% | 38% |
| Cs.P.A. | 0.47 | 0.41 | 0.4 | 0.24 | 0.33 |
| | 47% | 41% | 40% | 24% | 33% |

“Cs.E.A. = Average score of Cohesion Items in English (TL)
Cs.P.A. = Average score of Cohesion Items in Persian (L1)”

Having a brief overview of table 8, shows mostly the same range of scores for the other items of cohesion checklist “A, B, C, D and F”; albeit none of them owns a high score. Items “A and B” implied four main elements for having a cohesive texts with reference to taxonomy of cohesive ties of de Beaugrande and Dressler’s (1981): straightforward or partially repetition of the already used patterns; besides using parallel structure with new factors and finally paraphrasing some ideas. Item “A” [*The exact same vocabulary/expressions/structures are repeated consistently*] received 47% in L1 and TL texts. This is the highest score in cohesion features which was given by the evaluators for L1 texts. It shows that they could keep important and useful expressions in their mind and use them when they are necessary. This partly higher average score in item “A” may be the result of their lack of knowledge to use new vocabularies and structures therefore they cover their weakness by using exact vocabularies and structures in L1. One proof is that item “B” which evaluates the vocabularies substitution and paraphrasing in text gained less average score than item “A” in participants’ L1 cohesion table (Table 8).

The next item to be analyzed in cohesion list is “B” [*Equivalent words/paraphrases, when used, are used appropriately*]. Average score of Item “B” is a little stronger in TL but weaker in L1 comparing to item “A”. Writers tired to substitute vocabularies and paraphrase the ideas, but the evaluation did not show very high performances

even in L1 which it was not expected by the author of this study. Surprisingly, participants were gained better average score in their TL. This brief outline suggests that all evaluators in L1 and TL agreed that participants are only partially successful to paraphrase their ideas or repeat them in different structures to express their mean.

In addition, table 6 shows the same percentage for item “C” (40%) [*Pronouns of reference are used appropriately and accurately*] in L1 and TL. This item focuses on the usage of pronouns of references in their appropriate place and time. Although the researcher expects a very high score in this item in writers` L1 texts, surprisingly, the marks show that these undergraduate students even had problems in using accurate references in their mother tongue. As a result of L1, low percentage of this item in TL is expected by the researcher due to similar and confusing English (TL) vocabularies in the role of pronouns comparing to simple words in the same position in Persian (L1). Finally, the last two items “E and F” [*E) Junction words are used judiciously and accurately & F) Where no junction words are used, transition between sentences is smooth*] in the cohesion checklist sought to clarify the role of using accurate connection and transition words between expressions and sentences; however, they were failed to achieve a high score in the average list in both languages. In L1, item “E” is 38% and item “F” is 33% while in TL, item “E” owns 34% and item “F” catches 38% (Table 8). These ratings reflect that writers neither could connect their ideas to other ones smoothly in texts nor could use appropriate transition when they're moving from one sentence to another. Having a look on the coherence table 4, it is realized that even the division of paragraphs having different sub-topics or ideas is not justifiable and smooth and here we can see that connection and transition words between sentences and ideas are not smooth either. Most probably the writers tried to solve their linguistic problems in their L1 first and then

shift or translate them into their TL according to Cumming (1998). But even their L1 texts had some serious problems in terms of using proper connection words; consequently, they did not receive high mark neither in L1 nor in TL and the evaluation in both L1 and TL were not significant.

4.3 Overall Findings

Result from my investigation on relation of coherence and cohesion features in L1 and TL among Iranian undergraduate students shows that they were holding low writing performances both in their mother tongue and their target language in terms of coherence and cohesion features. Their writing tasks were granted only 29% in L1 and 52% in TL by the evaluators (table 4 & 8).

The main findings of this study are:

- 1) The quality of L1 textswritten in L1 could not stand in a parallel line with the quality of textswritten in TL.
 - a) In terms of coherence, considering the average score of L1 coherence items (25%) and TL coherence items (53%) will imply the non-parallel quality of the texts (Table4).
 - b) In terms of cohesion, the table XII shows 32% as the average score of L1 cohesion features and 50% for TL cohesion features which is again a big difference between the qualities of L1 and TL texts and reinforces the different level of quality in L1 and TL quality of texts (Table 8).

- 2) Another important finding indicates that the quality of coherence and cohesion in participants` TL written texts (TL total average score = 52%) is placed in a higher position than their L1 written texts (L1 total average score = 29%). Observing the results of coherence and cohesion tables (2, 3, 4&8) highlighted that living in academic context actively can have positive influence on some language skills; in our case participants` TL writing skills have affected positively. These participants, who are studying in their foreign (target) language in a foreign country (not English speaking country) learnt and used the TL coherence and cohesion features in their writing tasks more properly than their L1.

- 3) Given the observed results of coherence and cohesion tables it can be concluded that the average scores of coherence and cohesion features of the population of this study in target language are nearly in the same range of percentage (coherence 53% & cohesion 50%) which shows their skills were improved in the same way and to the same level. On the contrary the participants` average scores in L1 coherence and cohesion items (coherence 25% & cohesion 33%) show a bigger gap which is indicating a different improvement level of writing skills. Surprisingly, the tables of results show that participants were performed better in L1 cohesion than L1 coherence. In contrast to that they were granted higher marks in TL coherence than TL cohesion.

- 4) Although the participants` texts in English were carrying better average scores in coherence (52%) and cohesion items (50%) than L1 (L1 coherence 25% & L1 cohesion 33%) according to the tables of statistics, they were only granted a half

percentage of marks by the evaluators which shows the writers were not successful to achieve higher score. It implies that they have many problems in their TL as well.

5) As a result of table 8 (Distribution of average score of Cohesion items), most of cohesion items in L1 and TL participants' written texts showed a relation, although weak, in sense of their granted percentage from the author's point of view. The majority of cohesion items in L1 and TL have been gained partially equal percentage except a few items. Due to this point and considering higher average score of TL cohesion items than L1 items, it can be concluded that these writers followed TL rules to make cohesive texts and they were mostly successful except in items "D, G & I" which their scores have big different percentage in L1 and TL.

a) The biggest difference in L1 and TL cohesion items was in item "D" [*Ellipsis is used where needed*]. This item has been granted the maximum average score (90%) in the table of TL cohesion items but in L1 it is only 24%. When a language learner feels lack of vocabulary knowledge to improve or extend his ideas in a text, he uses ellipsis and starts to give references to the previous elements, but again his low knowledge of references which is needed in this situation makes the text less cohesive. Thus, they made ellipsis in their paragraphs but for referring the omitted parts to the proper reference they faced difficulty. Clearly, in this study also participants' TL average score of item "C" which is related to the references is one of their least scores.

- b) The next item which its average score in L1 and TL has a big difference is “G” [*New information is introduced in an appropriate place or manner*] and the last item is “I” [*Punctuation is employed appropriately to separate ideas and sentences*]. The higher average scores in TL than L1 for these mentioned items (G & I) were not shocking findings because of some basic differences between the origin of participants` mother tongue and their foreign [target] language. The way which new ideas and information are introduced in English language including topic sentences, supporting details and supporting examples is different to Persian language method; therefore, there is another gap between one of L1 cohesion items and TL items. Next, a lot of different punctuation rules for instance punctuation rules for junction words plus different writing direction (Persian writing direction is right to left) were the reasons of low average score of item “I” in L1 and as a result, another big difference in L1 and TL cohesion items is seen. It is necessary to mention that evaluators rated the L1 texts based on L1 punctuation rules.
- 6) On the other hand, the tables of coherence items indicate that the majority of coherence items in L1 and TL do not follow any sort of relation. The coherence items in L1 and TL were in non-parallel lines according to the tables of coherence analysis (Table2&4).
- 7) All participants` educational, cultural and social background and their families were analyzed in separate tables (Appendix 2, Table O). Surprisingly, the participant who was gained the maximum average scores in coherence and

cohesion items did not have any priority in terms of his/her background to one who had the least average scores.

In conclusion, that is to say that coherence items are attempting to connect and relate the ideas of a text in a meaningful way to make sense but cohesion items are more mechanical and trying to link elements of the text in a smooth way. Comparing the result of participants` performances in coherence and cohesion tables, show their more advanced, proper and accurate usage of cohesion and coherence features in their target language than in their mother tongue.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

5.1 Presentation

In this chapter the elaboration of the study is presented. In addition, implications for practice that are based on the findings of the study and suggestions for further research are stated.

5.2 Elaboration of the Research

This study observed coherence and cohesion items as the most important linguistic features separately in L1 and TL of participants' written texts and stated the result by means of main findings from the comparison of L1 and TL analysis tables.

The main research questions of this study were:

1. Is there any significant relation between the quality of text written in L1 (Persian) and TL (English) based on text linguistics features?
2. To what extent cohesion and coherence as two significant features in text linguistics are related in L1 and TL contexts?

Given the observed trends of coherence and cohesion items analysis in participants' written texts and considering the main research question of this study [*Is there any significant relation between the quality of text written in L1 (Persian) and TL (English) based on text linguistics features?*], it can be concluded that:

Writers in L1 texts do not reflect an outstanding percentage either in coherence or in cohesion features. In participants' L1 written texts, the average score of cohesion

items is 32% and the average score of coherence items is only 25%. Although the rate of L1 cohesion was a little higher than L1 coherence items, it could not be an expected score for adult participants in their mother tongue yet. Albeit participants wrote those texts in their L1, their texts were not distinguished as very cohesive and coherent texts by the L1 evaluators who were language teachers for many years. This low average also confirms that Coherence and cohesion are serious and complicated process even in learners` native language. It is important to consider that participants were adult learners and they have been taught how to write composition in their L1 in their school before but now the quality of their L1 texts in comparison to their TL showed a weaker average. This low average score is a sort of warning particularly for the population of this study towards their writing skills in their mother tongue. They may have serious difficulties whenever they tend to express their ideas through written texts in their L1.

In order to have more reliable results in terms of average scores of coherence and cohesion items, the researcher observed the individual participants` average scores (Appendix 2, Table K & L), and also considered participants` educational, cultural and social backgrounds (Appendix 2, Table O). The individual average score of participants confirmed the previous findings and their weak result in coherence and cohesion items.

Surprisingly, it is observed that two participants who had the maximum and minimum average scores in their L1 reflect similar educational and cultural background to a large extent. For instance, they had the same years and types of schooling, they took equal extra courses in English and they were familiar to TL culture up to the same level according to the information from questionnaire. In

addition, their parental educational and social condition is seen more or less in the same range whereas there is a big difference between their average scores in their writing. A part of this finding seems to be in line with Friedlander (1990) and Lally (2000) findings in their studies. They believe that participants' cultural issues do not affect the text quality. In this study particularly, the results of the tables were not affected by the participants' educational or cultural differences. In some cases the average scores were the same but big differences in participants' background exist. In other cases, however, writers have the same educational and cultural background, the average scores differ a lot. Therefore, it also can be claimed that cultural and educational background of participants did not affect their text quality.

On the other hand, the written texts in TL are holding better average scores in coherence and cohesion features. Participants' texts written in TL have gained 53% in coherence items and 50% in cohesion items (Appendices, 4&8). Clearly, TL percentages are placed in a higher position comparing to L1 items. These average scores direct a text to be more coherent and cohesive. It implied that writers are more proficient to relate their different ideas in a text in their target language. In addition, they can divide their ideas in different paragraphs more reasonably. They have the acceptable understanding of transition words. Finally, they know better how to connect expressions, sentences and paragraphs in a text through junction words and punctuations in their TL writing.

Albeit participants' TL average scores in coherence and cohesion items were not really outstanding, they were granted better averages comparing to their L1 averages. Considering the analysis table of individual participant's TL coherence and cohesion (Appendix 2, Table K & L), it is observed that nearly all participants were successful

to achieve half of score in all items despite having some minor or major differences in their educational or cultural background. Again, this is evidence on ineffectiveness of cultural issues on text quality.

They wrote more coherent and cohesive texts in their TL comparing to their L1. One important finding of this study along with the second research question [*To what extent cohesion and coherence as two significant features in text linguistics are related in L1 and TL contexts?*] indicates that the quality of texts in L1 and TL could not be related in terms of coherence due to non-organized distribution of average scores in coherence items (Appendix 2, Table M). However, in terms of cohesion items it is observed that the average scores are distributed more regularly in L1 and TL tables (Appendix 2, Table N). That is to say, whenever the rate of one cohesion item is high in L1, in the table of TL cohesion that item has a high average as well. Considering the point that average score of participants in cohesion items were better in their TL than in their L1 and also according to Kaplan who states that structure of writing composition in English language is more direct comparing to some other Semitic languages (such as Arabic and Persian), this relation between L1 and TL cohesion items should be originated from TL. In other words, they follow the TL cohesion rules first and then they apply them into their L1 texts. Furthermore, participants do not use cohesion rules in their L1 conversational language; obviously they learnt how to use them when they had to write their assignments in their TL.

To sum up, a text is coherent if it makes sense. A text is cohesive if its elements are linked together. It is well-worth to know that these are not the same thing. In other words, a text may be cohesive, but incoherent (meaningless). Considering these definitions and going through the findings again, it can be stated that these

undergraduate students who participated in this study were holding low performance in their L1 and their TL text quality based on coherence and cohesion items.

5.3 Implications for Practice

Analysis of the findings throughout this study revealed that there is not a serious relation between the quality of texts in L1 and TL according to the population of participants in this study. In addition, the average scores of participants not only in their L1 but also in their TL were not in high position. However, there is a sort of weak relation between the cohesion items in L1 and TL and that is because of participants are studying in an academic context in a foreign country.

All participants of the recent study were educated from high school and currently they are studying in university. Thus learners' needs in TL should be in the center of teachers' consideration. Their teachers should be aware that they are studying and writing in their foreign or target language and not native or second language. Therefore, their method of teaching, correcting and motivating should be overtly towards TL but not L2. Also they have to know that these learners are adult and they had learnt much about writing in L1 and TL in their background. Teachers should not expect very high performance from their learners and instead they have to try to find the most suitable and practical way of teaching the materials to make themselves sure that the learners understand and can use those structure later in their TL; although it is quite difficult to find suitable materials to match all learners' interests and also to help to use their creativity in a class full of students with different cultural background.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Research

Follow up research about the relationship of text quality can be done by including other items of linguistic features into consideration along with coherence and cohesion items for instance intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality and intertextuality. All these features are significant in the quality of a text.

Another suggestion for follow up research is to choose master and PhD candidates as the sample population of the study. Those participants definitely have more educational experience in their L1 and TL and most probably they are more culturally affected. Other similar conducted studies in the field differ in participants` L1 languages and their degree of education. They mostly have higher educated students as their participants. The researcher, in this study tended to use undergraduate students as less experienced ones considering their educational background and perhaps less culturally affected because of their less years of living in a foreign country. Comparing the findings of those studies with the current one can be helpful having more reliable result regarding the quality of text in L1 and TL involving educational and cultural issues in such case studies.

Finally, another study can be conducted by collecting data through participants who are studying in an academic context but living in their mother tongue country. Certainly they should have the expected knowledge of target language. Through this study perhaps the effect of cultural issues on text quality is clearer, if any exists.

REFERENCES

- Ardnt, (1987). Six writers in search of texts: A protocol based study of L1 and L2 writing. *ELT Journal*, 41, 257-267.
- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The Psychology of Written Composition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen, A & Brooks-Carson, A. (2001). Research on direct versus translated writing: Students' strategies and their results. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85, 169-188.
- Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second language proficiency. *Language Learning*, 39, 81-141.
- Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (1988). Effects of Sex Differences, Career Choice, and Psychological Type on Adult Language Learning Strategies. *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 72, No. 3, pp. 253-265.
- Ehrman, M., E. & Leaver, B., L., & Oxford, R. (2003). A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning.
- Golestani, N., & Zatorre, R., J. (2009). Individual differences in the acquisition of second language phonology.
- Henry, A., & Apelgren, B., M. (2008). Young learners and multilingualism: A study of learner attitudes before and after the introduction of a second foreign language to the curriculum.
- Ibarraran, A., & Lasagabaster, D. & Sierra, J., M. (2008). Multilingualism and Language Attitudes: Local Versus Immigrant Students' Perceptions. *Language Awareness*, 17:4, 326-341.

Jones, S., & Tetroe, J. (1987). Composing in a second language. In A. Matsuhashi (Ed.), *Writing in real time* (pp. 34-57). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert C. (1994). Effects of first language on second language writing: Translation versus direct composition. In A. H. Cumming (Ed.), *Bilingual performance in reading and writing* (pp. 223- 255). Ann Arbor, MI: Research Club in Language Learning.

LoCastro, V., (2000). Individual differences in second language acquisition: attitudes, learner subjectivity, and L2 pragmatic norms.

Lay, N. D. S. (1982). Composing processes of adult ESL learners: A case study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 406.

Miguel. C., S. & Rogan, F., &Kilstoff, K., & Brown, D. (2006). Clinically speaking: A communication skills program for students from non-English speaking backgrounds. www.elsevierhealth.com/journals/ *Nurse Education in Practice* 6, 268–274

Pritchard, R., &Loulidi, R. (1994). Some Attitudinal Aspects Of Foreign Language Learning In Northern Ireland: Focus On Gender And Religious Affiliation. *British Journal Of Educational Studies* VolXxxxii No 4, December Issn 0007-1005

Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 229-258.

Thurstun, J., &Candlin, C. (1998).Concordancing and the Teaching of the Vocabulary of Academic English. *English for specific purposes*, vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 267-280

Uzawa, K., & Cumming, A. (1989). Writing strategies in Japanese as a foreign language: Lowering or keeping up the standards. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 46, 178-194.

Yang, N., D. (1999).The relationship between EFL learners' belief and learning strategy use.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Table A: Coherence and Cohesion Checklist. English Copy

Coherence and Cohesion checklist

Please circle the number that reflects the degree to which you agree with the statement about the essay. Circle NA (Not Applicable) when insufficient or no information is available concerning the particular feature.

5 = Strongly Agree 4 = Agree 3 = Undecided 2 = Disagree 1 = Strongly Disagree

COHERENCE

5 4 3 2 1 NA (A) The beginning section is effective in introducing the reader to the subject.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (B) The ideas in the essay are all very relevant to the topic.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (C) The ideas in the essay are well-related one to another.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (D) The causal relationship between ideas is clear.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (E) Different ideas are effectively compared/contrasted.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (F) Ideas mentioned are elaborated.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (G) The writer's overall point of view is clear.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (H) The division of paragraphs is justifiable in terms of content relevance.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (I) Transition between paragraphs is smooth.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (J) The ending gives the reader a definite sense of closure.

COHESION

5 4 3 2 1 NA (A) The exact same vocabulary/expressions/structures are repeated consistently.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (B) Equivalent words/paraphrases, when used, are used appropriately.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (C) Pronouns of reference are used appropriately and accurately.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (D) Ellipsis is used where needed.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (E) Junction words are used judiciously and accurately.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (F) Where no junction words are used, transition between sentences is smooth.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (G) New information is introduced in an appropriate place or manner.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (H) Examples are introduced judiciously, not just to form an exhaustive list.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (I) Punctuation is employed appropriately to separate ideas and sentences.

Table B: Coherence and Cohesion Checklist. Persian Copy

Coherence

انسجام (کلام)

- ای) بخش آغازین تأثیر زیادی در معرفی موضوع به خواننده دارد.
- بی) عقاید مطرح شده در مقاله با موضوع ارتباط کامل دارند.
- سی) عقاید مطرح شده در مقاله با یکدیگر مرتبط اند.
- دی) رابطه‌ی میان عقاید مطرح شده واضح و روشن است.
- ایی) طرح مسایل با راه حل‌ها یا پاسخ‌های مناسب پی‌گیری شده است.
- اف) عقاید مختلف به صورت موثری در قیاس و تقابل قرار گرفته اند.
- جی) ایده‌های مطرح شده استادانه پرداخته شده اند.
- اچ) دیدگاه نهایی نویسنده واضح و روشن است.
- آی) تقسیم‌بندی پاراگراف‌ها مبنی بر ارتباط مضمون‌ها موجه است.
- جی) ارتباط بین پاراگراف‌ها سلیس و روان است.
- کی) پایان‌بندی مقاله درک شخصی از پایان یافتن مطلب به خواننده می‌دهد.

Cohesion

- ای) واژگان، اصطلاحات و ساختارهای دقیقاً یکسانی پیوسته تکرار شده اند.
- بی) واژگان و عبارات معادل به طور مناسب به کار رفته اند.
- سی) ضمائر ارجاع مناسب و درست به کار گرفته شده اند.
- دی) از حذف در موارد نیاز استفاده شده است.
- ایی) حروف ربط عاقلانه و صحیح به کار رفته اند.

اف) هرگاه حروف ربطی استفاده نشده است، گذر میان جمله ها
سلیس و روان است.

جیی) اطلاعات جدید در جای درست و به روش درست معرفی شده اند.

اچ) مثال ها عاقلانه مطرح شده اند ، نه تنها به صورت فهرستی
طویل!

آی) علایم نگارشی به درستی به کاررفته اند تا جمله ها و ایده
های مختلف را از هم جدا سازند.

Table C: Questionnaire complete copy

Questionnaire

Consent form

**A DETAILED INVESTIGATION ON EFFECTIVE ISSUES ON WRITING
PERFORMANCE IN L1 AND L2**

Dear Students:

You are being invited to take part in a research study for my M.A. theses in English Language Department. Before you decide to participate in this study, it is important that you understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take the time to read the following information carefully. Please ask the researcher if there is anything that is not clear of if you need more information.

In this study, the researcher will particularly try to focus on L2 writing performance of Iranian learners, and then make a comparison and contrast with respect to their L1 writing skill to detect the effect of L1 upon L2. In this study L1 represents the mother tongue of participants-Persian- and L2 is an English Language. The main aim of this study is to find out the effect of L1 upon L2 in writing competency.

Confidentiality:

Please do not write any identifying information on your questionnaire. Your responses will be anonymous. Every effort will be made by the researcher to preserve your confidentiality including the following: Assigning code names/numbers for participants that will be used on all researcher notes and documents. Notes, written essays and any other identifying participant information will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the personal possession of the researcher. When no longer necessary for research, all materials will be destroyed. The

researcher and the members of the researcher's committee will review the researcher's collected data. Information from this research will be used solely for the purpose of this study and any publications that may result from this study. Any final publication will contain the names of the public figures that have consented to participate in this study (unless a public figure participant has requested anonymity): all other participants involved in this study will not be identified and their anonymity will be maintained. Participants should tell the researcher if a copy of the interview is desired.

Participant data will be kept confidential except in cases where the researcher is legally obligated to report specific incidents. These incidents include, but may not be limited to, incidents of abuse and suicide risk.

Person to Contact:

Should you have any questions about the research or any related matters, please contact the researcher - OMID NASSERY, M.A. candidate in English Language Department, Eastern Mediterranean University - at (omid.nassery@emu.edu.tr / mobile: +90 533 876 2533).

By signing this consent form, I confirm that I have read and understood the information and have had the opportunity to ask questions. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving a reason and without cost. I voluntarily agree to take part in this study.

Full Name: _____

Department: _____

Student no. : _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

E-mail: _____

Section 1 Personal Information

INFORMED CONSENT

Part A: Personal Information Questionnaire

Please fill in or put a tick (✓) in the space provided, reflecting information about the items provided below.

1. Age: _____
2. Gender: Female Male
3. Marital Status: Married Single
4. Years of schooling: _____
5. Which types of school did you attend? Governmental
private
6. How many years during your schooling you have had English courses?

7. Did you take any extra English courses (general English / speaking / writing /
...) in private language institutes? Yes No
 - 7.1 If yes, how much do you spend in average for those courses?

8. Do you know any other foreign languages? Yes No

8.1 If yes, which language(s):

9. Have you ever been in any English speaking countries during your schooling?
Yes No

9.1 If yes, how many years

what grades were you in_____

10. How much time on average do you spend on reading magazines, newspapers, and books per day? _____ or per week? _____

11. Do you read magazines, newspapers, books in English language? Yes
No

12. If yes, how much time on average do you spend on reading magazines, newspapers, and books in English language per day? _____ or per week? _____

13. Do you watch movies in English language or with English subtitles? Yes
No

13.1If yes, how much time on average do you spend on watching movies in English language or with English subtitles per day? _____ or per week? _____

14. Do you listen to English music? Yes No

14.1If yes, how much time on average do you spend on listening to English music per day? _____ or per week? _____

15. Father's education: Primary Secondary High School
Bachelor's Master's PhD

16. Does your father speak any foreign languages? Yes No

16.1 If yes, which language(s): _____

17. What type of occupation does your father have?

Academic Business Transportation

Employed Medicine

Other _____

18. Mother's education: Primary Secondary High School

Bachelor's Master's PhD

19. Does your mother speak any foreign languages? Yes No

19.1 If yes, which language(s): _____

20. What type of occupation does your mother have?

Academic Business Transportation

Employed Medicine

Other _____

21. Do you or your family own a house? Yes No

21.1 If yes, how much does it worth?

Less than \$50,000 \$50,000-100,000

\$100,000-150,000 More than \$150,000

21.2 If no, how much do you pay for rent per month?

\$100-300 \$300-500 \$500-700 \$700-900

22. How much is your or your family annual income?

\$5000-8000 \$8000-10000 \$10,000-15,000 More than

\$15,000

Section 2

Writing task

INFORMED CONSENT

Dear students,

Write down two essays on the given topic, please. It could be more than 100 words and less than 250. The first essay should be in your mother tongue language – Persian- and the second one in English as your second language. You are free to write your personal idea without limitation but related to subject.

Topic:

“Every single minute human comes up with a new technology regarding The Media. No one is able to ignore or hide the effect of The Media on new generation. Does it guide or mislead them? How and where to? Express your own views to evaluate the degree of The Media`s influence by mentioning its symptoms and also you can make a comparison between new and old generation regarding the result of this impression.”

موضوع:

پیشرفت در حیطه رسانه با توجه به رشد سریع تکنولوژی بر هیچ کس پوشیده نیست؛ اما آیا این رشد رسانه‌ای باعث پیشرفت نسل جدید میشود یا آنان را از رسیدن به اهداف اصلی دور می‌کند. نظر شخصی خود را در مورد اندازه تاثیرگذاری رسانه بر روی نسل جدید با ذکر مثال بیان کنید و همچنین نتیجه این تاثیر را بر روی نسل جدید و قدیم ارزیابی نمایید. (هر گونه نظر شخصی با توجه به مربوط بودن به اصل موضوع قابل قبول می‌باشد)

Table D: A guide to questionnaire data analysis

Personal Information Questionnaire Data Analysis Guide

Part A:

1. Age: [?]
2. Gender: Female [2] Male [1]
3. Marital Status: Married [1] Single [2]
4. Years of schooling: [?]
5. Which types of school did you attend? Governmental [1] private [2]
6. How many years during your schooling you have had English courses? [?]
7. Did you take any extra English courses (general English / speaking / writing / ...) in private language institutes? Yes [1] No [2]
8. Do you know any other foreign languages? Yes [1] No [2]
9. Have you ever been in any English speaking countries during your schooling?
Yes [1] No [2]
10. How much time on average do you spend on reading magazines, newspapers, and per week? [?] mins.
11. Do you read magazines, newspapers, books in English language? Yes [1] No [2]
12. If yes, how much time on average do you spend on reading magazines, newspapers, and books in English language per week? [?] mins.
13. Do you watch movies in English language or with English subtitles? Yes [1] No [2]
14. Do you listen to English music? Yes [1] No [2]
15. Father's education: Primary [1] Secondary [2] High School [3]
Bachelor's [4] Master's [5] PhD [6]
16. Does your father speak any foreign languages? Yes [1] No [2]
17. What type of occupation does your father have?
Academic [1] Business [2] Transportation [3]

Employed 4 Medicine 5 Other6

18.Mother's education: Primary 1Secondary 2 High School 3

Bachelor's 4Master's5PhD 6

19.Does your mother speak any foreign languages? Yes 1No 2

20.What type of occupation does your mother have?

Academic 1 Business 2 Transportation 3

Employed 4 Medicine 5 Other6

21.Do you or your family own a house? Yes 1 No 2

21.2If yes, how much does it worth?

Less than \$50,000 1\$50,000-100,000 2

\$100,000-150,000 3More than \$150,0004

22.How much is your or your family annual income?

\$5000-8000 1\$8000-10000 2 \$10,000-15,000 3 More than \$15,000

4

Appendix 2:

Table E: Coherence Rate for Each Participant (English1)

(5= Strongly Agree / 4= Agree / 3= Undecided / 2= Disagree / 1= Strongly Disagree / Na= Not Applicable)

| Part. Items | ST.1 | ST.2 | ST.3 | ST.4 | ST.5 | ST.6 | ST.7 | ST.8 | ST.9 | ST.10 | ST.11 | ST.12 | ST.13 | ST.14 | ST.15 | ST.16 | ST.17 | ST.18 | ST.19 | ST.20 |
|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| A | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| B | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| C | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| D | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| E | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| F | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| G | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| H | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | NA | 1 | NA | NA |
| I | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | NA | 1 | NA | NA |
| J | 5 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | NA | 4 | 1 |

COHERENCE

5 4 3 2 1 NA (A) The beginning section is effective in introducing the reader to the subject.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (B) The ideas in the essay are all very relevant to the topic.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (C) The ideas in the essay are well-related one to another.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (D) The causal relationship between ideas is clear.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (E) Different ideas are effectively compared/contrasted.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (F) Ideas mentioned are elaborated.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (G) The writer's overall point of view is clear.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (H) The division of paragraphs is justifiable in terms of content relevance.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (I) Transition between paragraphs is smooth.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (J) The ending gives the reader a definite sense of closure.

Table F: Coherence Rate for Each Participant (English2)

(5= Strongly Agree / 4= Agree / 3= Undecided / 2= Disagree / 1= Strongly Disagree / Na= Not Applicable)

| Part. Items | ST.1 | ST.2 | ST.3 | ST.4 | ST.5 | ST.6 | ST.7 | ST.8 | ST.9 | ST.10 | ST.11 | ST.12 | ST.13 | ST.14 | ST.15 | ST.16 | ST.17 | ST.18 | ST.19 | ST.20 |
|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| A | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| B | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| C | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| D | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| E | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | NA | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| F | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | NA | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| G | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| H | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | NA | NA | NA | 1 | NA |
| I | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | NA | NA | NA | 2 | NA |
| J | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | NA | 2 | NA |

COHERENCE

5 4 3 2 1 NA (A) The beginning section is effective in introducing the reader to the subject.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (B) The ideas in the essay are all very relevant to the topic.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (C) The ideas in the essay are well-related one to another.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (D) The causal relationship between ideas is clear.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (E) Different ideas are effectively compared/contrasted.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (F) Ideas mentioned are elaborated.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (G) The writer's overall point of view is clear.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (H) The division of paragraphs is justifiable in terms of content relevance.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (I) Transition between paragraphs is smooth.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (J) The ending gives the reader a definite sense of closure.

Table G: Cohesion Rate for Each Participant (English1)

(5= Strongly Agree / 4= Agree / 3= Undecided / 2= Disagree / 1= Strongly Disagree / Na= Not Applicable)

| Part. Items | ST.1 | ST.2 | ST.3 | ST.4 | ST.5 | ST.6 | ST.7 | ST.8 | ST.9 | ST.10 | ST.11 | ST.12 | ST.13 | ST.14 | ST.15 | ST.16 | ST.17 | ST.18 | ST.19 | ST.20 |
|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| A | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| B | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| C | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| D | 1 | 1 | 2 | NA | NA | 2 | NA | 2 | NA | 2 | 1 | 1 | NA | NA | NA | 1 | 1 | NA | 1 | NA |
| E | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | NA | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | NA | 2 | 2 |
| F | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| G | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| H | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| I | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |

COHESION

5 4 3 2 1 NA (A) The exact same vocabulary/expressions/structures are repeated consistently.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (B) Equivalent words/paraphrases, when used, are used appropriately.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (C) Pronouns of reference are used appropriately and accurately.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (D) Ellipsis is used where needed.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (E) Junction words are used judiciously and accurately.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (F) Where no junction words are used, transition between sentences is smooth.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (G) New information is introduced in an appropriate place or manner.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (H) Examples are introduced judiciously, not just to form an exhaustive list.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (I) Punctuation is employed appropriately to separate ideas and sentences.

Table H: Cohesion Rate for Each Participant (English2)

(5= Strongly Agree / 4= Agree / 3= Undecided / 2= Disagree / 1= Strongly Disagree / Na= Not Applicable)

| Part. Items | ST.1 | ST.2 | ST.3 | ST.4 | ST.5 | ST.6 | ST.7 | ST.8 | ST.9 | ST.10 | ST.11 | ST.12 | ST.13 | ST.14 | ST.15 | ST.16 | ST.17 | ST.18 | ST.19 | ST.20 |
|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| A | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| B | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| C | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| D | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | NA | NA | NA | 2 | NA | 2 | 1 | 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| E | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | NA | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | NA | 2 | 2 |
| F | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| G | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| H | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | NA | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| I | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |

COHESION

5 4 3 2 1 NA (A) The exact same vocabulary/expressions/structures are repeated consistently.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (B) Equivalent words/paraphrases, when used, are used appropriately.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (C) Pronouns of reference are used appropriately and accurately.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (D) Ellipsis is used where needed.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (E) Junction words are used judiciously and accurately.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (F) Where no junction words are used, transition between sentences is smooth.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (G) New information is introduced in an appropriate place or manner.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (H) Examples are introduced judiciously, not just to form an exhaustive list.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (I) Punctuation is employed appropriately to separate ideas and sentences.

Table I: Coherence Rate for Each Participant (Persian1 & 2)

(5= Strongly Agree / 4= Agree / 3= Undecided / 2= Disagree / 1= Strongly Disagree / Na= Not Applicable)

| Part. Items | ST.1 | ST.2 | ST.3 | ST.4 | ST.5 | ST.6 | ST.7 | ST.8 | ST.9 | ST.10 | ST.11 | ST.12 | ST.13 | ST.14 | ST.15 | ST.16 | ST.17 | ST.18 | ST.19 | ST.20 |
|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| A | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| B | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| C | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| D | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| E | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | NA | NA | 1 | 1 | NA | NA | 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| F | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| G | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| H | 1 | 4 | 1 | NA | NA | NA | 1 | NA | NA | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| I | 1 | 4 | 1 | NA | NA | NA | 1 | NA | NA | NA | 3 | 1 | 1 | NA | 3 | NA | NA | NA | 1 | 1 |
| J | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | NA | NA | NA | 1 | 1 |

COHERENCE

5 4 3 2 1 NA (A) The beginning section is effective in introducing the reader to the subject.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (B) The ideas in the essay are all very relevant to the topic.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (C) The ideas in the essay are well-related one to another.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (D) The causal relationship between ideas is clear.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (E) Different ideas are effectively compared/contrasted.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (F) Ideas mentioned are elaborated.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (G) The writer's overall point of view is clear.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (H) The division of paragraphs is justifiable in terms of content relevance.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (I) Transition between paragraphs is smooth.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (J) The ending gives the reader a definite sense of closure.

انسجام (کلام)

- ای) بخش آغازین تأثیر زیادی در معرفی موضوع به خواننده دارد.
- بی) عقاید مطرح شده در مقاله با موضوع ارتباط کامل دارند.
- سی) عقاید مطرح شده در مقاله با یکدیگر مرتبط اند.
- دی) رابطه‌ی میان عقاید مطرح شده واضح و روشن است.
- ای) عقاید مختلف به صورت موثری در قیاس و تقابل قرار گرفته اند.
- اف) ایده‌های طرح شده استادانه پرداخته شده اند.
- جی) دیدگاه نهایی نویسنده واضح و روشن است.
- اچ) تقسیم بندی پاراگراف‌ها مبنی بر ارتباط مضمون‌ها موجه است.
- آی) ارتباط بین پاراگراف‌ها سلیس و روان است.
- جی) پایان بندی مقاله درک شخصی از پایان یافتن مطلب به خواننده می‌دهد.

Table J: Cohesion rate of participants (Persian1 & 2)

(5= Strongly Agree / 4= Agree / 3= Undecided / 2= Disagree / 1= Strongly Disagree / Na= Not Applicable)

| Part. Items | ST.1 | ST.2 | ST.3 | ST.4 | ST.5 | ST.6 | ST.7 | ST.8 | ST.9 | ST.10 | ST.11 | ST.12 | ST.13 | ST.14 | ST.15 | ST.16 | ST.17 | ST.18 | ST.19 | ST.20 |
|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| A | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| B | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| C | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| D | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| E | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| F | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | NA | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| G | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | NA | NA | 2 | NA | NA | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| H | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | NA | NA | NA |
| I | 1 | 3 | 1 | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | NA | 2 | 1 | NA | 1 | 1 |

COHESION

5 4 3 2 1 NA (A) The exact same vocabulary/expressions/structures are repeated consistently.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (B) Equivalent words/paraphrases, when used, are used appropriately.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (C) Pronouns of reference are used appropriately and accurately.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (D) Ellipsis is used where needed.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (E) Junction words are used judiciously and accurately.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (F) Where no junction words are used, transition between sentences is smooth.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (G) New information is introduced in an appropriate place or manner.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (H) Examples are introduced judiciously, not just to form an exhaustive list.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (I) Punctuation is employed appropriately to separate ideas and sentences.

انسجام (کلام)

ای) واژگان ، اصطلاحات و ساختارهای دقیقاً یکسانی پیوسته تکرار شده اند.

بی) واژگان و عبارات معادل به طور مناسب به کار رفته اند.

سی) ضمائر ارجاع مناسب و درست به کار گرفته شده اند.

دی) از حذف در موارد نیاز استفاده شده است.

ایی) حروف ربط عاقلانه و صحیح به کار رفته اند.

اف) هرگاه حروف ربطی استفاده نشده است، گذر میان جمله ها سلیس و روان است.

جی) اطلاعات جدید در جای درست و به روش درست معرفی شده اند.

چ) مثال ها عاقلانه مطرح شده اند ، نه تنها به صورت فهرستی طویل!

آی) علایم نگارشی به درستی به کار رفته اند تا جمله ها و ایده های مختلف را از هم جدا سازند.

Table 2:Distribution of Coherence Average Score for Each Participant

| Part. Items | ST.1 | ST.2 | ST.3 | ST.4 | ST.5 | ST.6 | ST.7 | ST.8 | ST.9 | ST.10 | ST.11 | ST.12 | ST.13 | ST.14 | ST.15 | ST.16 | ST.17 | ST.18 | ST.19 | ST.20 |
|------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Cr.E.1 | 0.84 | 0.54 | 0.62 | 0.70 | 0.56 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.74 | 0.68 | 0.86 | 0.78 | 0.60 | 0.66 | 0.44 | 0.60 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.32 | 0.42 | 0.24 |
| Cr.E.2 | 0.36 | 0.54 | 0.66 | 0.52 | 0.48 | 0.52 | 0.26 | 0.76 | 0.32 | 0.72 | 0.76 | 0.54 | 0.46 | 0.36 | 0.66 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.24 | 0.40 | 0.24 |
| Cr.P.1 | 0.36 | 0.60 | 0.52 | 0.24 | 0.30 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.24 | 0.28 | 0.32 | 0.28 | 0.30 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.22 | 0.14 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| Cr.P.2 | 0.36 | 0.60 | 0.52 | 0.24 | 0.30 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.24 | 0.28 | 0.32 | 0.28 | 0.30 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.22 | 0.14 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| Cr.E. Average | 0.60 | 0.54 | 0.64 | 0.61 | 0.52 | 0.56 | 0.43 | 0.75 | 0.50 | 0.79 | 0.77 | 0.57 | 0.56 | 0.40 | 0.63 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.28 | 0.41 | 0.24 |
| Cr.P. Average | 0.36 | 0.60 | 0.52 | 0.24 | 0.30 | 0.16 | 0.28 | 0.24 | 0.28 | 0.32 | 0.28 | 0.30 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.22 | 0.14 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.16 | 0.16 |

Participants: St1, St2, St3, ..., St20

Items:

Cr = Coherence / E = English / P = Persian / A = Average score

“For instance:

Cr.E.A. = Average score of Coherence Items in English (L2)

Cr.P.A. = Average score of Coherence Items in Persian (L1)”

Table 3: Distribution of Cohesion Average Score for Each Participant

| Part. Items | ST.1 | ST.2 | ST.3 | ST.4 | ST.5 | ST.6 | ST.7 | ST.8 | ST.9 | ST.10 | ST.11 | ST.12 | ST.13 | ST.14 | ST.15 | ST.16 | ST.17 | ST.18 | ST.19 | ST.20 |
|------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Cs.E.1 | 0.48 | 0.44 | 0.57 | 0.46 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.24 | 0.60 | 0.42 | 0.60 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.35 | 0.33 | 0.48 | 0.28 | 0.26 | 0.24 | 0.40 | 0.37 |
| Cs.E.2 | 0.46 | 0.44 | 0.57 | 0.60 | 0.37 | 0.33 | 0.26 | 0.60 | 0.42 | 0.60 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.35 | 0.33 | 0.48 | 0.28 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.37 | 0.37 |
| Cs.P.1 | 0.37 | 0.51 | 0.55 | 0.33 | 0.46 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.42 | 0.37 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.35 | 0.31 | 0.17 | 0.20 | 0.17 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 |
| Cs.P.2 | 0.37 | 0.51 | 0.55 | 0.33 | 0.46 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.42 | 0.37 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.35 | 0.31 | 0.17 | 0.20 | 0.17 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 |
| Cs.E. Average | 0.47 | 0.44 | 0.57 | 0.53 | 0.37 | 0.35 | 0.25 | 0.60 | 0.42 | 0.60 | 0.43 | 0.44 | 0.35 | 0.33 | 0.48 | 0.28 | 0.25 | 0.24 | 0.38 | 0.37 |
| Cs.P. Average | 0.37 | 0.51 | 0.55 | 0.33 | 0.46 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.42 | 0.37 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.35 | 0.31 | 0.17 | 0.20 | 0.17 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 |

Participants: St1, St2, St3, ..., St20

Items:

Cs = Cohesion / E = English / P = Persian / A = Average score

“For instance:

Cs.E.A. = Average score of Cohesion Items in English (L2)

Cs.P.A. = Average score of Cohesion Items in Persian (L1)”

Table 4: Distribution of Average Score of Coherence Items:

| Items Parts | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | |
|----------------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|------------------|
| Cr.E.1 | 0.64 | 0.60 | 0.73 | 0.62 | 0.53 | 0.48 | 0.70 | 0.48 | 0.44 | 0.58 | |
| | 64% | 60% | 73% | 62% | 53% | 48% | 70% | 48% | 44% | 58% | |
| Cr.E.2 | 0.52 | 0.58 | 0.54 | 0.48 | 0.37 | 0.50 | 0.55 | 0.40 | 0.37 | 0.45 | |
| | 52% | 58% | 54% | 48% | 37% | 50% | 55% | 40% | 37% | 45% | |
| Cr.P.1 | 0.32 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.32 | 0.10 | 0.15 | 0.26 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.31 | |
| | 32% | 36% | 36% | 32% | 10% | 15% | 26% | 19% | 17% | 31% | |
| Cr.P.2 | 0.32 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.32 | 0.10 | 0.15 | 0.26 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.31 | |
| | 32% | 36% | 36% | 32% | 10% | 15% | 26% | 19% | 17% | 31% | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | Total Average |
| Cr.E.A. | 0.58 | 0.59 | 0.635 | 0.55 | 0.45 | 0.49 | 0.625 | 0.44 | 0.405 | 0.515 | 0.528 |
| | 58% | 59% | 63% | 55% | 45% | 49% | 62% | 44% | 40% | 51% | 53% |
| Cr.P.A. | 0.32 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.32 | 0.10 | 0.15 | 0.26 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.31 | 0.254 |
| | 32% | 36% | 36% | 32% | 10% | 15% | 26% | 19% | 17% | 31% | 25% |

Items:

Items of Coherence Checklist = A, B, C, D, D, E, F, G, H, I & J

Parts:

Cr = Coherence / E = English / P = Persian / A = Average score

“For instance:

Cr.E.A. = Average score of Coherence Items in English (L2)

Cr.P.A. = Average score of Coherence Items in Persian (L1)”

COHERENCE

5 4 3 2 1 NA (A) The beginning section is effective in introducing the reader to the subject.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (B) The ideas in the essay are all very relevant to the topic.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (C) The ideas in the essay are well-related one to another.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (D) The causal relationship between ideas is clear.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (E) Different ideas are effectively compared/contrasted.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (F) Ideas mentioned are elaborated.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (G) The writer's overall point of view is clear.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (H) The division of paragraphs is justifiable in terms of content relevance.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (I) Transition between paragraphs is smooth.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (J) The ending gives the reader a definite sense of closure.

انسجام (کلام)

- ای) بخش آغازین تأثیر زیادی در معرفی موضوع به خواننده دارد.
- بی) عقاید مطرح شده در مقاله با موضوع ارتباط کامل دارند.
- سی) عقاید مطرح شده در مقاله با یکدیگر مرتبط اند.
- دی) رابطه‌ی میان عقاید مطرح شده واضح و روشن است.
- ایی) عقاید مختلف به صورت موثری در قیاس و تقابل قرار گرفته اند.
- اف) ایده‌های طرح شده استادانه پرداخته شده اند.
- جیی) دیدگاه نهایی نویسنده واضح و روشن است.
- اچ) تقسیم‌بندی پاراگراف‌ها مبنی بر ارتباط مضمون‌ها موجه است.
- آی) ارتباط بین پاراگراف‌ها سلیس و روان است.
- جی) پایان‌بندی مقاله درک شخصی از پایان یافتن مطلب به خواننده می‌دهد.

Table 5: Distribution of Average Score of Cohesion Items

| Items parts | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | |
|----------------|------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------------------|
| Cs.E.1 | 0.47 | 0.55 | 0.40 | 0.15 | 0.34 | 0.37 | 0.48 | 0.55 | 0.40 | |
| | 47% | 55% | 40% | 15% | 34% | 37% | 48% | 55% | 40% | |
| Cs.E.2 | 0.47 | 0.54 | 0.41 | 0.13 | 0.35 | 0.39 | 0.49 | 0.55 | 0.41 | |
| | 47% | 54% | 41% | 13% | 35% | 39% | 49% | 55% | 41% | |
| Cs.P.1 | 0.47 | 0.41 | 0.40 | 0.24 | 0.38 | 0.33 | 0.14 | 0.3 | 0.24 | |
| | | | 40% | | 38% | 33% | 14% | 33% | 24% | |
| | 47% | 41% | | 24% | | | | | | |
| Cs.P.2 | 0.47 | 0.41 | 0.40 | 0.24 | 0.38 | 0.33 | 0.14 | 0.30 | 0.24 | |
| | | 41% | 40% | 24% | 38% | 33% | 14% | 30% | 24% | |
| | 47% | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | Total Average |
| Cs.E.A. | 0.47 | 0.545 | 0.40 | 0.90 | 0.345 | 0.38 | 0.485 | 0.55 | 0.405 | 0.497 |
| | 47% | 54% | 40% | 90% | 34% | 38% | 48% | 55% | 40% | 50% |
| Cs.P.A. | 0.47 | 0.41 | 0.40 | 0.24 | 0.38 | 0.33 | 0.14 | 0.30 | 0.24 | 0.323 |
| | 47% | | 40% | 24% | 38% | 33% | 14% | 30% | 24% | |
| | | 41% | | | | | | | | 32% |

Items:

Items of Cohesion Checklist = A, B, C, D, D, E, F, G, H & I

Parts:

Cs = Cohesion / E = English / P = Persian / A = Average score

“For instance:

Cs.E.A. = Average score of Cohesion Items in English (L2)

Cs.P.A. = Average score of Cohesion Items in Persian (L1)”

COHESION

5 4 3 2 1 NA (A) The exact same vocabulary/expressions/structures are repeated consistently.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (B) Equivalent words/paraphrases, when used, are used appropriately.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (C) Pronouns of reference are used appropriately and accurately.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (D) Ellipsis is used where needed.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (E) Junction words are used judiciously and accurately.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (F) Where no junction words are used, transition between sentences is smooth.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (G) New information is introduced in an appropriate place or manner.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (H) Examples are introduced judiciously, not just to form an exhaustive list.

5 4 3 2 1 NA (I) Punctuation is employed appropriately to separate ideas and sentences.

ای) واژگان ، اصطلاحات و ساختارهای دقیقاً یکسانی پیوسته تکرار شده اند.

بی) واژگان و عبارات معادل به طور مناسب به کار رفته اند.

سی) ضمائر ارجاع مناسب و درست به کار گرفته شده اند.

دی) از حذف در موارد نیاز استفاده شده است.

ایی) حروف ربط عاقلانه و صحیح به کار رفته اند.

اف) هرگاه حروف ربطی استفاده نشده است، گذر میان جمله ها سلیس و روان است.

جی) اطلاعات جدید در جای درست و به روش درست معرفی شده اند.

اچ) مثال ها عاقلانه مطرح شده اند ، نه تنها به صورت فهرستی طویل!

آی) علایم نگارشی به درستی به کار رفته اند تا جمله ها و ایده های مختلف را از هم جدا سازند.

Table 1: Questionnaire Data Analysis, Personal Information (Section 1)

| Part. Items | ST.1 | ST.2 | ST.3 | ST.4 | ST.5 | ST.6 | ST.7 | ST.8 | ST.9 | ST.10 | ST.11 | ST.12 | ST.13 | ST.14 | ST.15 | ST.16 | ST.17 | ST.18 | ST.19 | ST.20 |
|----------------|-------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Q.1 | 18 | 22 | 23 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 29 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 40 | 29 | 25 | 21 | 43 | 20 | 20 | 26 | 19 | 20 |
| Q.2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Q.3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Q.4 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Q.5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1&2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Q.6 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 12 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| Q.7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Q.8 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Q.9 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Q.10 (week) | 60 Mins. | 300 Mins | 0 Mins | 840 Mins | 840 Mins | 240 Mins | 240 Mins | 180 Mins | 120 Mins | 175 Mins | 180 Mins | 840 Mins | 180 Mins | 120 Mins | 180 Mins | 420 Mins | 240 Mins | 240 Mins | 300 Mins | 240 Mins |
| Q.11 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Q.12 (week) | 0 | 180 Mins. | 0 | 240 Mins. | 840 Mins. | 840 Mins. | 0 | 120 Mins. | 0 | 30 Mins. | 0 | 420 Mins. | 0 | 600 Mins. | 60 Mins. | 0 | 105 Mins. | 60 Mins. | 420 Mins. | 0 |

Questionnaire Data Analysis, Personal Information (Sec.1)

| Part. Items | ST.1 | ST.2 | ST.3 | ST.4 | ST.5 | ST.6 | ST.7 | ST.8 | ST.9 | ST.10 | ST.11 | ST.12 | ST.13 | ST.14 | ST.15 | ST.16 | ST.17 | ST.18 | ST.19 | ST.20 |
|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Q.13 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Q.14 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Q.15 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| Q.16 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Q.17 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 4 |
| Q.18 | 3 | | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| Q.19 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Q.20 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 4 |
| Q.21 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Q.21.1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Q.22 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |

Appendix 3:

Table K.a: Participant`s English text sample (student 1)

Nowadays, media is an inalienable part of modern life. The impact of media on our life can be specified by looking at our dependence to media for performing daily affairs. people use media for different purposes and it`s related to their occupation and their level or position in a society. But, in gender, media is used for making tasks essay. on the other hand, someone use media for academic purpose.

To determine the positive and negative effects of media on people and their behavior, derision-making and their life, media is not only a disincentive but also is the main reason of progress. for instance, media is playing a significant role in communication between different cultures and nations. Moreover, media`s role in globalization and the high rate of people`s awareness is known for everyone. On the other hand media can effects someone`s life negatively, but people should control their using themselves in order to avoid negative aspect of media.

In conclusion, media has changed the way of living during the recent decades. And this changed has led to many progresses for human beings. Consequently, media has been an effective factor for our success till now.

Table K.b: Participant's English text sample (student 8)

Media is a way of communication to different groups of people. It can be advertising or news. Advertising is used to encourage people to do something or an action. Nowadays after developments in technology or in this case which is media, there are more effects, which is media, there are more effects done by media on people such as new generation. In my opinion it can both guide or mislead them because media has the power of changing the truths or showing part of it.

I said media can guide audience especially new generation by some programs of general knowledge or other useful programs, articles and etc.

Also media can mislead audiences because in news part, it can change the truth or in advertising parts, it can go beyond just showing the benefits of the advertised object. For example, an advertisements for moribolo cigarette shows that the smoker is seeked by female and it makes him special or unique. This advertisement has negative effect on young generation.

To sum up, media can both guide or mislead the young generation. Because young generation have been exposed to different medias which favor their ideas. So new generation can be confused in the true concept of the media.

Table K.c: Participant`s English text sample (student 10)

Nowadays, we are all in touched with new and wide amount of development in any field of humans life, and of course media is one of the most signification ones. These new progresses obviously, have their own negative and positive effects on youth.

In this century everyone have easy access to wide range of public media, such as magazines Television, satellite and etc., and by living in information Age, we are all being bombard with huge and massive amount of information everyday.

To be optimistic, easy access to information could help our young generation to increase their knowledge about different topics, and they are now some youngsters who are able to understand issues which are still hard for their elders and parents to realize them. Also, It helped them in a way that they can easily adopt themselves to new technologies come to the markets, which are all as a result of accessible information with the help of media growth, and it can be count as its advantages.

On the other hand, lots of available data and information provided by media, specially by satellite channels and internets, have some disadvantage. As an example, nowadays there is more possibility for children and youngsters to be in touched with immoral and inappropriate information, such as violent or sexual issues, which can affect them negatively, which is serious matter related to media growth, and also one Of it`s negative points.

To sum up, I strongly believe that media growth has both positive and negative effects on society, and especially on young generation, and governments have to increase the knowledge of their citizens about disadvantages.

Table L.a: Participant`s Persian text sample (student 1)

رشد سریع تکنولوژی در دنیای امروزیک امر عادی و آثار آن بر زمینه های مختلف کاری و علمی نیز یکی از پر اهمیت ترین فواید پیشرفت تکنولوژی است. رسانه یکی از زمینه هایی است که تاثیرهای بسیاری از پیشرفت تکنولوژی گرفته است، به طوری که رسانه کاملا با تکنولوژی ادغام شده و نام تکنولوژی همیشه در کنار رسانه خودنمایی می کند.

آثاری که این پیشرفتها بر افراد گذاشته است عموما مثبت و باعث پیشرفت و تسهیل کارهای آنان گردیده است. البته این پیشرفت در رسانه آثاری هم بر روی جامعه دارد و آثار آن معطوف به شخص خاصی نمی شود. اما عمدتا این آثار موجب موفقیتها و پیشرفتهای زیادی شده است. برای مثال رابطه ای که بین مردم برقرار گردیده است و تبادل نظر، فرهنگ و غیره موجب پیشرفت مختلف شده و گهگاه زمینه رشد و تعالی آنها را فراهم کرده. آثار منفی رشد رسانه بستگی به افراد دارد و شخص می تواند با کنترل خود رابطه ای منطقی بین خود و رسانه برقرار کند تا از آن متضرر نشود.

در کل، آثار مثبت رسانه و فواید رسانه بسیار بیشتر از آثار منفی آن است، چنانکه آثار منفی آن گاهی به چشم می آید و ما میتوانیم با استفاده بهتر از رسانه از فواید آن منفعت بیشتری ببریم.

Table L.b: Participant`s English text sample (student 8)

امروزه با توجه به رشد تکنولوژی و گسترده شدن رسانه ها ، این پیشرفت باعث تاثیرگذاری بیشتر بر روی افراد جامعه اعم از جوانان توسط رسانه ها می شود . این تاثیر گذاری ها هم می توانند به صورت منفی و مثبت پدیدار شوند و این بستگی به مطلق و هوش شنونده دارد ، تا بتواند حقایق را تشخیص دهد و یا دقت خود را صرف برنامه های مفیدتری بکند. مثلا شنونده ها می توانند از برنامه های علمی تلویزیون که از رسانه ها به حساب می آید ، بهره مند شوند و یا با مقایسه کردن شبکه های خبری متفاوت به حقایق بیشتری دست پیدا کنند. رسانه های مختلف در جهت اهداف خود عمل می کنند و به همین دلیل ممکن است در اخبار حقایق را عوض کنند یا حقایق را به صورت دیگری نمایش دهند. همچنین ممکن است در تبلیغات ، از منابعی استفاده کنند تا جوانان را به سمت اهداف خود ببرند و جوانان به دلیل نداشتن زمینه و تجربه کافی ممکن است تصمیم اشتباهی بگیرند . در کل به دلیل تاثیرگذاری بالای رسانه ها و گسترده بودن آن در زندگی جوانان می توان تغییر بزرگی حتی در یک جامعه به دلیل تغییر در نسل جدید به وجود آورد . همانند یک جمله که هر روز آن را تکرار کنی و آن را برای مدت طولانی به خاطر می سپاری ، رسانه ها نیز می توانند دیدگاه انسان ها را در مدت زمان طولانی و اندک اندک تغییر دهند .

Table L.c: Participant's English text sample (student 10)

نقش و تاثیر رشد رسانه بر پیشرفت یا عقب ماندگی نسل جوان در جهان امروز، جوامع بشری هر روز و شاید بهتر باشد بگوییم ((هر لحظه)) شاهد رشد و پیشرفت در تمامی جنبه های تکنولوژی می باشند، و رسانه نیز از این قبیل پیشرفتها مستثنا نیست. رشد و توسعه رسانه ارتباط جمعی در قالب وسایلی همچون رادیو، مجلات، ماهواره، اینترنت و بسیاری دیگر به خوبی نمایان است. آنچه در این میان اهمیتی دو چندان دارد، تاثیرات مثبت و منفی این توسعه بر روی جوامع و به خصوص قشر جوان، خصوصا در عصر اطلاعات که جنگ نرم جای خود را به جنگ سنتی داده و سایتهای اینترنتی و شبکه های ماهواره ای جایگزین توپ و تانک و خمپاره شده اند می باشد. آنچه واضح است، این است که رشد و توسعه در زمینه رسانه، به مانند هر زمینه ای تاثیرات مثبت و منفی خود را ماکدا بر قشر جوان دارد.

اگر از جنبه مثبت به قضیه بنگریم، پیشرفت در دنیای ارتباطات، زمینه ای بس وسیع و گسترده ای از اطلاعات مفید را در ارتباط با علوم گوناگون فراهم کرده و در اختیار قشر جوان گذاشته و عطش نوجوان و جوان را در دستیابی به علم و دانش روز سیراب می کند، که این مسئله نقش به سزایی در رشد و پیشرفت تحصیلی این قشر فعال جامعه نیز دارد.

جنبه دیگر این قضیه، تاثیرات منفی و مخرب این حجم وسیع اطلاعات فراهم شده توسط رسانه است. به خصوص در دنیای امروز که جهان غرب، ماشین آلات سنتی جنگی خود را کنار گذاشته و با تجهیزات جدیدی همچون شبکه های ماهواره ای و سایت ها و وبلاگهای اینترنتی به بمباران عقیدتی جوامع سنتی و علی الخصوص اسلامی می پردازد. برای مثال، مسئله امنیت اخلاقی در فضای مجازی، از موضوعات مهم مورد بحث در رابطه با جنبه منفی توسعه رسانه ارتباط جمعی است، که در خصوص نادیده گرفته شدن یا کم اهمیت شمرده شدن آثاری مخرب بر فرهنگ و عقاید نسل جوان خواهد گذاشت.

به عنوان سخن پایانی، در دنیایی که تب دسترسی هر چه سریعتر به اخبار و اطلاعات در میان قشر جوان و نوجوان بالا گرفته، دولتها و بالاخص در ممالک اسلامی باید با بصیرت و آگاهی، زمینه ای را برای جوانان در

کسب اطلاعات مفید و سازنده فراهم کرده و از تمام توان خود برای مبارزه با چنگ فرهنگی و اطلاعاتی به راه افتاده علیه قشر جوان جوامع متدین توسط سردمداران دول غربی استفاده نمایند .