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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

There is extensive evidence to support the need for American schools to improve literacy instruction particularly where students from diverse cultures are concerned. For example, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) revealed that at the third, seventh, and eleventh grade levels, certain ethnolinguistic cultural groups such as the African Americans and Hispanic Americans do not read and write as well as their mainstream American counterparts (Applebee, Langer, & Mullis, 1988; Mullis, Owens, & Phillips, 1990). Also, evidence of a consistent "failure" to become literate among urban African Americans and urban Appalachians has been documented (e.g., Appalachian Consortium, 1981; DeStefano, et al., 1982; Erickson, 1987; Grant, 1988; Kendrick, 1985; Ogbu, 1987, 1990). Clearly, the issue of literacy "failure" among ethnolinguistic cultural groups has been subject to debates particularly among literacy scholars. Indeed, there is a legitimate concern over the failure of these children to become literate, whatever that means, and the implications of that failure for their future and the future of
America. Pallas et al. (1989) suggest that with the population trends in the United States, major changes in literacy education need to be anticipated to address the prolific growth of ethnolinguistic cultural group children by the year 2020.

The Problem

Thus, this research study has for its global focus the issue on the disproportionate number of failures (those considered academically "unsuccessful" based on the national education assessment standards) to become literate among the ethnolinguistic cultural groups such as the urban African Americans and urban Appalachians, and the issue of disparity in literacy levels among them and their mainstream counterparts. More specifically, it focuses on that aspect of classroom literacy practice called "writing" in as much as learning to write in a specific kind of way is part and parcel of children's literacy learning expectations, and the ability to write has become a significant criterion in judging one's "success" or "failure" in literacy learning.

It would seem that the view of literacy in the United States covers a wide spectrum of competencies embedded in social and linguistic interaction. For example, the concept of empowerment has become a password among literacy educators. McLaren (1989, p.182) describes empowerment as "not only helping students to understand and engage with the world around them, but also enabling them to exercise the kind of courage needed to change the social order where
necessary." In the same light, Gee (1990, p.49) argues that the traditional conception of literacy as "the ability to read and write is deeply problematic. This traditional notion rips literacy out of any social context and treats it as an autonomous, asocial, cognitive skill with little or nothing to do with human relationships." Thus, a "socioculturally situated alternative formulation" (Gee, 1990, p.49) has replaced the traditional notion of literacy. An expanded definition of literacy goes beyond learning to read and write (Cook-Gumperz, 1986; Heap, 1990; Ogbu, 1985) to include people's willingness to use literacy, the dynamic process of constructing meaning (including the role of cultural schemata and social practices situated in specific sociocultural contexts), and the ability to use these skills to generate new literacy materials and new understandings (Au, 1993; Cook-Gumperz, 1986; Resnick, 1990; Wells, 1986), as in a "social dialogue" (Dyson, 1991b, p.2).

However, such a definition of literacy can pose a major difficulty for a nation rich in diversity. The United States has served as a magnet for cultures, e.g., Europeans, Hispanics, Asians, and others, as well as giving rise to ethnolinguistic cultural groups such as the urban African Americans and urban Appalachians. These cultural groups bring with them their own network of communicating that reflects cultural differences in their ways of thinking, feeling, speaking and listening, including their distinctive social behavior and attitudes (Erickson, 1987). Boundaries exist between the various communication networks,
and these become clearly visible when children representative of each cultural group come to meet in a common literacy learning environment such as the school.

The impact of this variety of cultures in American society is strongly felt in the educational arena where individuals, regardless of color, creed, or class, are expected to achieve a certain level of success in literacy learning in order to survive in American society. For example, a factor attributed to the generally low school achievement of minority students in the United States is cultural differences in communication style between teachers and their students (Baugh, 1987; Cazden, 1988; Erickson, 1987; Gee, 1985, 1989a & 1989b; Heath, 1983; Heath & Mangiola, 1991; Marshall, 1989, 1990; Michaels, 1981; Miller, Potts, & Fung, 1989). Another factor is identified by Ogbu (1978, 1982, 1987, 1988, 1990b) as inequity in access to employment over many generations, causing minority people to become cynical about their life chances in American society. It is argued that this cynicism is communicated to their children and contributes to the children’s failure.

The difficulty and problems children of ethnolinguistic cultural groups experience in their literacy learning efforts because of differences in communication style or the stigma attached to one’s language and culture have been strongly and publicly expressed both through legal battles and professional debates. For instance, the Ann Arbor, Michigan suit filed against the school system in 1977 alleged that "the children’s home and community language impeded their equal
participation in instructional programs and that the school had not taken appropriate action to overcome the barrier" (Lucas & Borders, 1987).

The question is: how does one define literacy and literacy needs in such a diverse cultural and socioeconomic context? It would seem that what may be perceived as the quality of literacy required for one to survive in his or her society can become an ambiguous proposition. It would also seem that to arrive at a consensual definition of literacy and literacy needs, using a set of criteria which can satisfy the nature and character of each culture, is almost next to impossible. Heath (1983) suggests that formal schooling alone is an inadequate basis for defining literacy, as functions of literacy vary from society to society, and culture to culture. Clearly, each culture offers its own definitions of success and creates the conditions for the type and level of literacy that is necessary to succeed in that culture (Scribner & Cole, 1981). Freedman (1990) asserts that literacy is culturally framed and defined, and that members of different cultures will differ in what they view as literate behavior.

But while educational attainment alone is not a sufficient basis for judging or predicting occupational success or upward mobility (i.e., one can be "successful" in the field of manual activity, entertainment, and sports), for the ethnolinguistic cultural groups such as the urban African Americans and urban Appalachians, educational investment seems to be an indispensable factor for socioeconomic success, particularly in gaining access to competitive jobs (Thomas, 1987; Hurn,
1985). Thomas (1987) presents a well-documented discussion of the positive relationship between educational and occupational attainment. Both Blacks and Whites, with 16 or more years of schooling, received higher average incomes than their counterparts with fewer years of schooling. While employment statistics for ethnolinguistic cultural groups have changed tremendously for the better, the fact still remains that those with fewer educational qualifications have less chance for high-paying employment, particularly in a sophisticated metropolitan area. Apparently, becoming literate might ensure for a greater number of ethnolinguistic cultural groups such as the urban African Americans and urban Appalachians more "success" and upward mobility.

In an attempt to address the literacy problem concerning urban African Americans and urban Appalachians, American schools as agents of literacy instruction have opted to represent the world view of mainstream culture and powerful institutions in American society as the social and economic framework for success. For example, teachers are frequently obligated or feel obligated to encourage the use of so-called standard English in school. In American society, there seems to be a correlation between social status and linguistic behavior. "Standard English" is considered the dialect of the rich and powerful. Haugen (1972) notes that it is the so-called standard dialect that is being used in the majority of social circumstances--school, business, church, and government.
Some educators, particularly those concerned about the status of ethnolinguistic cultural groups in becoming literate, have expressed their reservations toward representing the view of mainstream culture as the framework for "success" within and without the classrooms. For example, Hale (1986) asserts that "The American educational system has not been effective in educating Black children... The emphasis of traditional education has been upon molding and shaping Black children so that they can fit into an educational process designed for Anglo-Saxon middle-class children" (p.1). She argues that the system is not working because of the disproportionate number of Black children who are labeled "hyperactive" and who are being given "drugs as tranquilizers"; Black children who are labeled "mentally retarded" and placed in "special classes"; or Black children who are being "suspended, expelled, and 'pushed out' of schools" (p.1). Furthermore, she substantiates her claims by citing the "high Black teenage" unemployment rate and overrepresentation of Black people in the prison population (p.2). Delpit (1990) also suggests that teachers generally do not respect or support any demonstrations of Black English in classrooms. Further, Baldwin (1991) suggests that: "It is not the Black child's language that is in question, it is not his language that is despised: It is his experience" (p. 115). Hochschild (1984) refers to such treatment of Black children as "second generation discrimination." Further, she notes that in many desegregated school districts Black students are suspended more often than Whites; Black students are frequently classified as educable
mentally retarded; and a low percentage of Black students enroll in college preparatory programs. Thornburg (1991) reports that in certain urban school systems the drop-out rate for Black students is as high as 75 percent.

Similarly, Porter (1981) describes Appalachian children as a disadvantaged group in urban schools. In as much as these children are not of the middle class, "they do not bring with them the experiences, standard English verbal abilities, concepts or values which are middle class, and they do not share many cultural understandings with the teacher." Wigginton (1992) shares an experience of a second grade teacher in an Appalachian coal field town of Barbourville, Kentucky, who noted that "the district-mandated basal reader is full of alien elements that kids can not relate to: brick homes, lawns and lawn sprinklers, and dogs that are allowed to come inside the house." As a result of using the district mandated basal reader, these second graders hate coming to school. Unfortunately, the disproportionate number of Appalachian children who do not achieve well are also often labeled as "deficient." Their failure to keep up with the rest in academic standing often confines them to lower-ability groups or special education classes. Further, the nature of such segregation also dictates the type and quality of employment these children might expect to hold in the future--menial and low-income generating jobs.
It would seem then that the idea of using the mainstream culture's definition and expectations of literacy education as criteria for judging "success" or "failure" in literacy learning raises some significant questions, particularly where ethnolinguistic cultural groups such as urban African Americans and urban Appalachians are concerned. Among urban ethnolinguistic cultural groups, there seems to be a vicious cycle--academic failure is correlated with future economic failure.

By most standards of educational success such as dropout rate, percentage of students going to college, and achievement scores, many urban African Americans and urban Appalachians seem to follow a similar pattern of failure. For example, the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, reports high rates of dropouts among its urban Appalachians in the secondary schools as well as high dropout rates in one of its predominantly African American low income neighborhoods (Berlowitz & Durand, 1980; Borman & Spring, 1984). Among reasons cited were high absenteeism, high rate of suspension, and low reading and math achievement. Calestro and Hill (1976) presented a survey administered by the Columbus, Ohio Public Schools to 491 teachers in schools where Appalachian culture student concentration is estimated to be over 50 percent. Results of the survey revealed that Appalachian students have problems in expressing themselves, reading difficulties, and a high dropout rate compared to other students in school.
These data suggest that children of ethnolinguistic cultural groups "fail" in their literacy learning endeavors for reasons that may directly relate to their ethnicity, social class, and/or language. School practices tend to fit better with the experiences and expectations of children from mainstream backgrounds (Snow, 1990), therefore, children of ethnolinguistic cultural groups can find themselves at a disadvantage as they are immersed in "mainstream" literacy practices adopted in the classrooms, such as the use of "Standard English" which is different from these groups' "home" variety. If this were true, there is definitely a legitimate reason to take a closer look into how children of ethnolinguistic cultural groups such as the urban African Americans and urban Appalachians cope with mainstream culture literacy practices.

A very "mainstream culture" literacy practice that has become a significant research focus among educators is "writing." This is because communicative activities as social activities go beyond oral interaction; they also exist as written texts as well.

Relationships between speaking and writing are clearly complex. There are key distinctions between speaking and writing (Akinnaso, 1985; Britton, 1970; Dyson, 1991a & 1991b; Emig, 1977; Kantor & Rubin, 1981), each having its own set of conventions (Smith, 1982). We "shift dimension" when we shift from the oral medium to the graphic medium. This can make the task of writing a text in an appropriate register quite demanding. A statement released by the National
Assessment of Educational Progress (1986) claims that American students suffer from serious writing problems. To quote:

In general, American students can write at a minimum level, but cannot express themselves well enough to ensure that their writing will accomplish the intended purpose (p.9).

Further, the report shows that students are weak in writing specific forms that require argumentative support or persuasive style. This is particularly true of fourth, eighth, and eleventh graders (Applebee, Langer, & Mullis, 1986).

The report might not be so surprising since writing is often difficult for any writer but is perhaps especially so for children since it involves conscious linguistic-cognitive behaviors (Durst, 1987, 1989; Flower, 1989; Smith, 1982). A writer shapes, structures, refines, and evaluates thought. In the process of composing, the writer plans and rehearses, organizes and structures according to various formal conventions (Ackerman, 1991; Britton, 1970; Dipardo, 1990; Emig, 1977; Flower, 1987; Flower & Hayes, 1981; Graves, 1979; Higgins, 1990; McGinley, 1992; Smith, 1982; Spivey, 1990 & 1991; Spivey & King, 1989). This seems to impose an even greater demand on the urban African American and urban Appalachian children who do not only need to deal with the oral conventions within a mainstream context but also with the written conventions as well, for writing operates with a different set of registers from speaking. Children come to school better equipped with a knowledge of the conventions of their oral language
than with the written form and do not have the experience of being exposed to written models of the kinds of language use expected of them. For most, the schools take the responsibility of introducing them to the conventions of the written form. Obviously, the task of teaching children how to write is not easy, nor does it always guarantee rewarding results for those involved.

A series of studies involving fourth through twelfth graders reveal children's lack of effective argument or persuasive traits in writing (i.e., Crowhurst, 1981, 1983a, 1983b, 1987; Kantor, 1987; McCann, 1989). These studies strongly suggest certain characteristic patterns of children's writing development. First and most importantly, children build writing skills on their oral language skills, and creating texts in oral contexts fosters facility in writing (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Dauite & Dalton, 1988; Dyson, 1987 & 1988; Farr, 1985; Heath, 1986). Second, children are generally expected to develop their writing skills by moving from simple narrative expressions to composing extended, more complex organized texts and less frequently used rhetorical structures (Crowhurst, 1981, 1983a, 1983b, 1987; McCann, 1989). Lastly, children need much experience in writing and with written texts in order to learn how to write effectively (Applebee, Langer, & Mullis, 1986; Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Heath, 1986).

In light of these findings, we reflect on the plight of the ethnolinguistic cultural groups, particularly the urban African Americans and urban Appalachians, as they "willingly" or "unwillingly" participate in their classroom writing
experiences. Among these ethnolinguistic cultural groups, their writing proficiency level can be very low in as much as they are not able to produce the kinds of writing that are expected of them within their literacy learning context (Applebee, Langer, & Mullis, 1988; Bryan, 1989). It is possible that the urban African Americans and urban Appalachians suffer from writing difficulty because, as Bereiter and Scardamalia (1982) suggested, their writing literacy experience in the classroom does not allow for a smooth transition from their "oral discourse schemata" to the appropriate "written discourse schemata" (p. 63). Further, Bereiter and Scardamalia (1982) posited that children fall back on their oral discourse schemata for any writing task. Cronnell's (1984) analysis of the errors found in a set of writing samples produced by third and sixth grade urban African American children suggested that a significant portion of the writing errors could be attributed to Black English influence, either directly or through hypercorrections. It could also be possible that, as Bereiter and Scardamalia (1982) further contended, young children experience more difficulty with the more sophisticated tasks because they have not yet developed their appropriate written discourse schemata. Thus, as some research also shows (e.g., Chall & Jacobs, 1983; Kameenui & Carnine, 1982; Prater & Padia, 1983), children will find persuasive or argumentative forms of writing more difficult to produce than the narrative or descriptive forms, particularly (as in the case of urban Appalachian children) if these forms of presentation are not within their oral literacy experience.
At the same time, children's inability to learn to write or to write appropriately on a given writing task is partly blamed on weak and/or inadequate writing instruction. Kantor (1987) cited Moffett's (1985) claim that despite the proliferation of research and theory on the process of developmental writing, writing instruction is still wanting. Moffett (1985) suggested that perhaps literacy scholars have not sufficiently taken into account "the social and cultural contexts in which literacy instruction can take place" and that they have not worked enough in building a "pluralistic curriculum" that will include the varied experiences of ethnolinguistic cultural groups (p.174). To present the ethnolinguistic cultural group children with a writing literacy experience that is so different in values and expectations from their oral literacy experience, for example, may well create what Moffett (1985) calls the "hidden impediments."

It has been suggested that the problem of disproportionate failure to be literate among ethnolinguistic cultural groups is partly reflected in these children's inability to "write." Further, it has been suggested that this inability to produce "appropriate" writings could have been a result of a dramatic shift from their oral-literacy-experience background to the type of writing literacy experience in which they are required to operate. For example, this researcher has observed that the fourth grade writing curriculums already expect children to demonstrate their ability to write expository prose—expository prose being a different genre from narrative prose (Britton, 1978; DeStefano & Kantor, 1988; Guthrie, 1984; Kent, 1984),
which children often find difficult to understand, let alone write (Lorch, 1987; Wong, 1987). It could be possible that it is this transition from the emphasis on narrative writing during the early elementary grades to more expository writing in the upper elementary grades that may have caused "children's progress in writing to decline" (National Assessment of Educational Progress, 1986). In other words, it could be possible that the so-called written versus oral language registers clash among children of ethnolinguistic cultural groups becomes more significant where formal writing is concerned (e.g., children learning to write expository prose), once these children reach the upper elementary grades. On the other hand, contrary to the so-called "register crash" and which could be a more significant matter of concern, is the proposition that perhaps children as they progress through their early elementary grades, develop a wealth of knowledge about language, print, and relationships among language processes that are necessary for them to embark on more sophisticated writing process activities such as expository writing when they reach the upper elementary grades (Raphael, et al, 1989). To extend this further, this wealth of knowledge about language, print, and relationships among language processes, particularly in writing might also be reflected in the writing of children from different ethnolinguistic cultural backgrounds.

Two questions come to mind. 1) When children from different ethnolinguistic cultural groups such as the urban African Americans and urban Appalachians, advance in their literacy level and experience more exposure to the
kinds of "appropriate" writings expected from them (e.g., expository prose via text book material as models), are they able to "bridge the gap" between whatever differences existed initially in their oral-written discourse characteristics so as to produce "appropriate" text for a particular genre, in this case, expository prose? Will the features present in their writing and the frequency of usage be comparable to those that may be found in the mainstream group children's writing? 2) To what extent do the "models" for writing (i.e., text books) children are exposed to influence their own writing in the same genre? Are the features present and the frequency of usage in these text book samples also reflected in children's own writing?

To address the above questions, Halliday and Hasan's (1976) concepts of cohesion, cohesion analysis, and cohesive harmony were selected as the conceptual and analytic framework in looking at the characteristics of children's expository texts and their "models" for expository writing. Cohesion defines a text, it being the "internal unity of texts" (Chapman & Louw, 1986). Halliday and Hasan (1976) have called attention to the cohesive quality of texts. They explain the concept of cohesion as a semantic one which refers to relations of meaning which exist within a text, and that define it as a text. Cohesion exists when the interpretation of one textual element depends upon the interpretation of another element within the same text. The linkages which establish cohesion are called cohesive ties and require the presence of both a referring item and its referent (Moe, 1979). There are five
distinct types of cohesion: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion, plus two major types of chains: identity and similarity. The central hypothesis is that cohesion is an important abstract feature of a text which, when perceived, enables the reader to integrate parts of the text so as to "remake" the author's meaning or the writer to produce his or her own text in a "coherent" manner. Textual cohesion is offered as a framework for looking at the notion of coherence—or at a part of what goes into coherence (DeStefano, 1990). The analysis aims to establish the system of cohesive ties which operate within the text. The ties serve as linguistic linking mechanisms and build up text unity by relating elements within the text to each other (Hasan, 1980).

A more comprehensive concept of cohesion is cohesive harmony. Based on work both by Halliday (1985) and Hasan (1984), cohesive harmony is an extension of their earlier taxonomy of cohesive devices to include not only repetition of semantic information, i.e., via nouns, pronouns, verbs, and ellipses, but also repetition of functional information, i.e., via words having the same grammatical or syntactic function. Hasan (1984) further states that a chain is formed as the author develops a theme, idea, or event which forms cohesive bonds rather than just simple pairs of linked terms. Each type of repetition of information forms the chain. Cohesive harmony analysis addresses how a text’s cohesive noun and verb chains are also related to each other through functional relations, representing a convergence of semantic and syntactic information in a text. In contrast to a
simple count of cohesive ties, an index of cohesive harmony can account for much of the complex linking that writers use and that readers must interpret.

Research on writing has suggested a direct correlation between appropriate use of cohesive devices and writing quality (e.g., Cox & Tinzmann, 1987; Hasan, 1984; Pappas, 1985); also, that cohesive devices vary according to genre (e.g., Cox & Tinzmann, 1987; Cox, Shanahan, & Sulzby, 1990; Cox, Shanahan, & Tinzmann, 1991; Crowhurst, 1987; Martin & Peters, 1985); style (e.g., Gutwinski, 1976); content domain (e.g., Binkley, 1983); and voice (e.g., Cox, Shanahan, & Tinzmann, 1991; Neuner, 1987). Halliday and Hasan (1976) suggest that cohesive devices appear to be critical in determining the clarity, appropriateness, and comprehensibility in writing.

From the cohesion analysis perspective, this research will analyze the differences and similarities which may exist between urban African American, urban Appalachian, and mainstream culture children’s written discourse characteristics as reflected in their expository writing and those found in texts used as "models" for writing in this same genre. The study addresses the question with a focus on the sixth grade urban African American, urban Appalachian, and mainstream culture children. There seems to be considerable evidence that children are motivated by a strong urge to "be in register"; therefore, it would be worthwhile to find out whether in sixth grade, the ethnolinguistic cultural group children may
have already learned sufficient writing strategies for them to be able to write in an expository genre.

Since the first two groups show such disproportionate school failure and literacy learning difficulties, perhaps identifying the written cohesion features these ethnolinguistic cultural groups, as well as mainstream culture children, have already acquired at a given grade level and comparing them with those they are expected to demonstrate in most of their assigned writing tasks, or what they can recognize when they're reading, may suggest "bridges" that teachers can make in the classroom to facilitate literacy learning and particularly expand the written competencies that will ultimately contribute greater literacy "success" for these ethnolinguistic cultural group children.

Thus, viewed from the literacy perspective, results from this research study would hopefully further knowledge on the cohesion characteristics urban African American, urban Appalachian, and mainstream culture children have developed in an advanced grade level and how these translate into or relate to their writing of expository prose. This knowledge may eventually lead to generation of guidelines for further strengthening and expanding of curricular offerings particularly in the areas of language arts and literacy instruction that address children of ethnolinguistic cultural groups. Further, answers to the questions raised in this research investigation might trigger teachers to provide these children with opportunities to develop their ability to switch registers, particularly on occasions
when literacy teaching takes place. It is important to understand the extent to which children of ethnolinguistic cultural groups have an ability and flexibility to switch registers in their writing tasks. Only then can appropriate pedagogical applications be determined in order to strengthen children’s potential for taking meaning from and expressing meaning in written language. More specifically, the research study may help classroom teachers arrive at appropriate instructional decisions and strategies that would facilitate children’s writing of expository prose.

**Research Questions**

The study will investigate the following questions:

1. What are the written cohesion patterns found in the expository writing within each ethnolinguistic cultural group of sixth grade urban African American, urban Appalachian, and mainstream culture children?

2. What are the similarities and dissimilarities in the written cohesion patterns found in the expository writing of sixth grade children across all ethnolinguistic cultural groups?

3. What are the written cohesion patterns found in the expository genre prose of sixth grade text books, which are often the "models" of the genre?
4. What cohesion patterns found in the expository writing of sixth grade urban African American, urban Appalachian, and mainstream culture children are comparable in usage and frequency of usage to those found in sixth grade text books used as children's "models" for expository writing?

a. What comparisons and contrasts will there be between these children's expository writing and samples of expository writing from their text books?
CHAPTER II
RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this section is to briefly examine the various theories and research findings on the nature of the ethnolinguistic cultural groups, particularly the urban African Americans and urban Appalachians, their oral and written language registers, possible causes of their failure to become literate, and suggestions to enhance their literacy learning experience in order to be able to address the research problem. This section will also examine research in writing to include expository writing, cohesion and use of cohesion analysis as they directly relate to the research problem.

Urban African Americans and urban Appalachians as subordinate groups and research with implications on their possible causes of "failure" to become literate.

A comprehensive and systematic explanation of ethnic school failure is Ogbu's "Caste theory" (Foley, 1991). Ogbu (1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1990a & 1990b) attributes the academic failure of minorities to their "castelike" or subordinate status
in society. Members of castelike minorities, which tend to be nonwhite, continue in poverty and social isolation, and linguistic differences only serve to reinforce their impoverished condition (Gee, 1990). In fact, it is argued that economic and social discrimination predisposes ethnolinguistic cultural group children to failure even before they come to school (Baugh, 1987).

African Americans are an example of a subordinated group because African Americans were originally brought to the United States as slaves, relegated to menial positions, and denied true assimilation into the mainstream. African Americans have always borne the burden of both class and racial stratification (Haskins, 1980). Hale (1986) asserts that the de-Africanization experience that converted the African into a Negro is one of the unfortunate results of American slavery. He describes how the newly arrived Africans were "prohibited from using their native language... forced to adopt the English language along with its view of the universe... forced to learn words and systems of thought that defined their color as evil and their culture as heathen and savage... forced to accept new names..." (pp. 1-2). Hale further suggests that it is likely that the de-Africanization of the Africans made them into shrewd survivors, "who absorbed what was necessary while he [or she] resisted complete immersion in American culture"--a characteristic demonstrated by any oppositional culture (e.g., common sense as opposed to book learning).
According to Granat, Hathaway, Saleton & Sansing (1986) urban African American children may uphold the "anti-achievement ethic" because of the stigma associated with being successful in school, since school is seen as an agent of the dominant society (Fordham, 1988 & 1991; Fordham & Ogbu, 1986).

Another example is the concepts of fictive kinship and oppositional identity among urban African American children. Fordham (1988) states that urban African American children learn the meaning of fictive kinship from their parents and peers while they are growing up, and they learn it early enough and well enough that "they even tend to associate their life chances and 'success' potential with those of their peers and other members of the community" (p.57). She cites McLeod (1987), Weis (1985), and Willis (1981) who confirm that "for many Black adolescents... the mere act of attending school is evidence of either a conscious or semiconscious rejection of the indigenous Black American culture" (p.57). For example, this is reflected in their attitude toward learning the so-called Standard English. Jones (1991) writes that for many Blacks, Standard English is "not only unfamiliar, it is socially unacceptable" and for them, "adopting a White man's language is an open betrayal of their culture" (p. 117). Further, African Americans are "confused, frustrated, and at times devastated" by what Kizza (1991) claims to be misconceptions around Standard English such as that "English, which is a basic ingredient in a recipe for success, is a white man's language, that that white man's language is superior to theirs, that in order to learn that white man's language, and
consequently be a success, they must give up a part of their culture" (p.2). Thus, in order to reinforce their belief that they are still legitimate members of the Black community, these students, "wittingly and unwittingly 'create' an environment--for example, through the use of 'Black English'--that reinforces the indigenous culture from which they are separated through the process of schooling" (Fordham, 1988, p.57). These children's use of Black English demonstrates the most vivid and crucial key to their identity. "It reveals a private identity, and connects one with, or divorces one from, the larger public, or communal identity" (Baldwin, 1991, p. 113). However, as Fordham (1988) further suggests, "in recreating their indigenous culture in the school context, they inadvertently ensure their 'failure'" (p.57).

Urban Appalachians, while to many an unlikely subordinated culture, also constitute an "invisible" yet substantial minority group in at least 30 major eastern, northern, midwestern and southern cities (McCoy & Brown, 1981). Cunningham (1987) contends that Appalachians continue to struggle for a valid identity, resulting in their not being themselves but instead a negative version of the dominant group. This search for identity is complicated by a clash in the "structures of meaning" between their mountain culture and the dominant American culture. There also exist secondary cultural language differences among urban African Americans, urban Appalachians, and the mainstream majority.
Wolfram and Christian (1976) describe Appalachian English (AE) or South Midland, as a "nonmainstream variety" of English but one which is "a legitimate, systematic variety of American English." For example, in AE the sound [ɔ] for [o] as in tater [ˈtætər] for potato, and holler [ˈhɒlər] for hollow, does not occur when main stress in a word falls on the syllable containing the ow. Hence there is no er correspondence for a word like below or for one-syllable words such as flow.

Chase (1989) shares some examples of Appalachian's "Mountain Talk" that were written on paper place mats from a restaurant owned and operated by an Appalachian family: you'ns (‘you, you all’); vittles (‘food’); askeered of (‘frightened, afraid of’); et (‘eaten’); and het; doin's; fur piece (‘to become heated or upset’; 'a function'; 'a great distance'). Another regular feature of AE is a-prefixing which combines a with an -ing ('-in') form as in Mr. Frog went a-courtin'. And then, of course, there is the AE double negative as in He don't want no trouble (which is found in BE as well) (Chase, 1989; Wolfram & Christian, 1976).

Between the African Americans and the mainstream majority the cultural language differences are well documented. For instance, it has been noted that one feature of the interactional style of African Americans that conflicts with that of mainstream culture (and is often reflected in school setting) is the attention to "stage setting" that precedes the performance of a task. It seems that the African American students spend much time establishing the context or setting for a task.
performance before engaging in an assignment. In the classroom, the African American students are often viewed as being off-task in as much as they do not begin working on an academic assignment immediately after the teacher has given directions and signal to begin. Furthermore, these students often fail to complete the task within the teacher's given time frame because they do not start immediately. While to the African American students, "stage setting" is a necessary maneuver in preparing for performance, to the teacher it may appear as an avoidance tactic, inattentiveness, disruption, or an evidence of not being adequately prepared to do the assigned task (Gilbert & Gay, 1985).

"Talking" rather than "writing" is another African American orientation that is different from the mainstream orientation. This ability is an essential part of early socialization for the African Americans because their culture places a high value on oral communication. For example, signifying (also called marking, loud-talking, specifying, testifying, capping, sounding, rapping, shucking, and playing the dozens as in "talkin' about yo' mama") (Gates, 1984, 1988; Smith & Hillocks, 1988; Mitchell-Kernan, 1981; Smith, 1989; Smitherman, 1977) is highly valued and widely practiced within the African American community (Gates, 1988; Heath, 1989; Potts, 1989).
Smitherman (1977) describes signifying as follows:

"...indirection, circumlocution; metaphorical-imagistic (but images rooted in the everyday, real world); humorous, ironic; rhythmic fluency and sound; teachy but not preachy; directed at persons or persons usually present in the situational context; punning, play on words, introduction of the semantically or logically unexpected. (p.121)

While it has been proposed that signifying has the potential to serve as a bridge to certain literacy skills within the school environment (Delain, 1985; Gee, 1989 & 1990; Heath, 1989; Lee, 1991a & 1991b), this has not reached a level of acceptance among teachers to impact positively on the African American children’s literacy learning in the classroom (Cazden, 1988; Delpit, 1990; Michaels & Collins, 1984).

Also of equal importance is the African American style of delivery (e.g., dramatic talking). Thus, when African American children are challenged to demonstrate their skills in written form they tend to first engage in a process of translation from an oral expressive mode to the written form. Again, the shift in expressive styles take time away from the task itself and often results in an unfinished assigned task (Gilbert & Gay, 1985; Kochman, 1981; Hale, 1982).

It is argued that urban African Americans and urban Appalachians have developed cultural ways of coping, perceiving, and feeling, to oppose the cultural frame of reference of the mainstream culture (Ogbu, 1985, 1990a; Fordham &
Ogbu, 1986). For example, in response to the value orientations and behavior patterns of mainstream America which are directly in opposition and even at cross-purposes with Appalachian culture, an Appalachian child begins to alienate himself [herself] from the school, results to increasing absenteeism, and either actually or psychologically becomes a part of the dropout statistic (Porter, 1981). Among the urban African Americans, these language and coping strategies evolve for reasons of racial solidarity, and are acquired by children during their preschool years as they learn other aspects of their culture (Ogbu, 1980). "Over many generations the survival strategies have become institutionalized and integrated into black culture. They have contributed to shaping the norms, values, and competencies of black Americans" (Ogbu, 1990, p. 81). Fordham and Ogbu (1986) present a case of African American students in an almost all-African American high school in Washington, D.C. where students' peer culture strongly rejected striving for academic success because it was perceived as "acting white." Among other behaviors associated with high achievement as "acting white" are speaking the so-called standard English, studying long hours, and striving to get good grades. However, there is some evidence that many young African Americans view sport and entertainment, rather than education, as the way to get ahead. Thus, sports and entertainment are acceptable avenues for "success" and African Americans who get involved in these areas are still able to protect their collective and social identity, and to maintain boundaries between them and others.
It is further argued that the apparent resistance of these ethnolinguistic cultural groups to mainstream culture has been generated in part by a negative societal attitude toward their dialect (Baugh, 1987; Nuru, 1980). Both African American and Appalachian speech have been equated with illiteracy and low socioeconomic status (Millender, 1980; Schuster-Webb, 1980). The stigma attached to these dialects could well contribute to their speakers’ critically low level of literacy and high level of dropout rates (Davis, 1982; Labov, 1982; Wolfram & Christian, 1978; Woods, 1983). Darling (1984) reports a high percentage of "undereducated adults" among the Appalachians who place a low value on education in part because of their resistance against a more widespread use of so-called standard English to replace their nonmainstream variety, or even to add to it. As a result of being undereducated, 46 percent of these "functionally illiterate" Appalachian adults are unemployed. Ogbu (1987, 1988, 1990a & 1990b) argues that African Americans often take a fatalistic perspective when it comes to improving their socioeconomic conditions (because of "racism") and therefore reject the possibility that school success might help them break the cycle of poverty. He notes further that the dominated status of a minority group like African Americans exposes them to conditions that predispose children to failure even before they come to school. These conditions include limited parental access to economic and
educational resources, and interactional styles that may not prepare students for typical teacher-student interaction patterns in school (Heath, 1983; Wong-Fillmore, 1986).

There seems to be a consistent pattern of failure to learn in school and dropping out by the subordinated minority groups, particularly the urban African Americans and the urban Appalachians more as a "...form of resistance to a stigmatized ethnic or social class identity that is being assigned by the school. Students can refuse to accept that negative identity by refusing to learn" (Erickson, 1987).

Some factors that might invite "resistance" from ethnolinguistic cultural groups to become literate are expressed in recent studies that find the discontinuity between home and school in matters of literacy related areas: literacy events (e.g., Heath, 1983; Michaels, 1981; Scollon & Scollon, 1981); language use (e.g., Au & Jordan, 1981; Erickson, 1987; Heath, 1983; Michaels, 1981; Scollon & Scollon, 1981); discontinuity between oral language at home and written language in children’s instructional texts (e.g., DeStefano & Kantor, 1988); and learning styles (e.g., Michaels, 1981 & 1986; Erickson & Mohatt, 1982; Hare et al, 1985; Philips, 1983) to be particularly relevant to children’s failure in school.

Erickson’s (1987) thesis on "communication process explanation" is relevant here. The position claims that differences in culturally learned verbal and nonverbal communication styles explain the high rates of school failure by students of low
socioeconomic status and minority ethnic and cultural background. He argues that particularly in the early grades, "when teachers and students differ in implicit expectations of appropriateness in behavior, they act in ways that each misinterprets" (p. 337). He cites various classroom situations in which, as Hymes (1972) also suggests, "cultural differences in ways of speaking and listening between the child's speech network and the teacher's speech network, according to the communication process explanation, lead to systematic and recurrent miscommunication"--situations like differences in ways of communicating to show functional intentions such as sincerity or rapt attention; differences in assumptions regarding how much emotion should be displayed or felt, and how social control should be exercised. For example, if the teacher comes from a speech network in which it is expected that listeners will show attention by direct eye contact while listening, then the teacher may infer that the child who is listening with averted eyes may be bored, confused, angry, or simply being impolite.

Such cultural difference can be a risk factor in the school experience of students and teachers because it usually provides opportunities for trouble which can serve as resources for escalating existing conflict originally brought about by reasons of social classes, genders, or races (Erickson, 1987).

A number of studies that focused on how language patterns are used in different communicative situations both at home and at school have suggested implications for literacy learning experiences of ethnolinguistic cultural group
children in school (e.g., Gee, 1985; Heath, 1983; Millender, 1982; Schultz, Florio & Erickson, 1982). For example, Michaels (1981), examining the discourse styles of urban African American children found they used topic-associating style while mainstream children were topic-centered. Further, she examined how the discourse styles influenced the kind and amount of teacher-student collaboration that occurred. She found that with African American children who used topic-associating style, the result was a disharmonious teacher-student exchange. The teacher had difficulty scaffolding the child's response, and any attempt to encourage the child to explain or elaborate on a topic through the use of questions failed and was instead misconstrued as an interruption.

Further, in Michaels' study (1981) she concluded that with mainstream children who used a topic-centered style, the teacher found it easy to provide a scaffold. Interactive support was evident. The teacher was able to carry on a productive communication exchange with the child; moreover, the child was encouraged to be more explicit and to provide descriptive elaboration on the same topic.

Unfortunately, as revealed in Michaels' (1981) study, the types of language use, literacy events, and learning styles useful to successful literacy learning in school are often not found among children of ethnolinguistic cultural groups (Heath, 1983). To illustrate, Heath (1983) describes the home literacy experiences of Trackton and Roadville children as different from their literacy learning
experiences in school, and therefore creating a stumbling block to their success in
becoming literate. The Roadville children's literacy events at home did not go
beyond book reading. There was no attempt to relate to personal experience what
had been read. While in school, they were expected to retrieve their knowledge
from a familiar to unfamiliar context or "fictionalize events known to them and
shifting them into other frames" (Gee, 1986, p. 739). On the other hand, the
Trackton children did not have book reading as part of their literacy learning
experience at home, but they were in constant verbal and nonverbal interaction with
adults and with their peers. Their verbal and nonverbal communications were
highly contextualized. At school they failed to relate to different literacy learning
situations as well as to adapt to the social interactional climate within school
literacy events.

Heath (1983) notes that Trackton adults' "general way of introducing their
young to 'knowing' differs from that of the mainstream middle class..." (p. 109).
For example, since "Trackton children have almost no practice in having why
questions addressed to them, and when adults use why questions among
themselves, there are often no clues in the situation to the referents of answers...
the children have no experience with answering why questions" (p. 109). Again,
in school, children who are found to be conversant with why questions are deemed
to be more sophisticated in their language use.
Still another type of literacy event mainstream children are exposed to at home and which has a followup in school is bedtime story (Heath, 1983). Heath describes a bedtime story routine as that which includes a "scaffolding" dialogue (Cazden, 1979) between parent and child. The pattern socializes the child at a very early age into the initiation-reply-evaluation sequences typical of classroom lessons (e.g., Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). These characteristics of language use are reflected in many instructional settings, e.g., first-grade sharing sessions (Show and Tell). This also supports the notion that children who have frequent exposure to literacy materials at home arrive at school already socialized into the school-preferred approach to literacy learning (Clark, 1984; Heath, 1982; Morrow, 1983; Teale, 1984).

Given the above findings, some research suggest that perhaps establishing a continuity between patterns of socialization and language learning in the home culture and what goes on at school would facilitate literacy learning among nonmainstream children (e.g., Heath, 1983; Cook-Gumperz, 1986; Ogbu, 1985). Sociolinguistic and ethnographic studies that interpret aspects of classroom activities as "social interaction, communication, and cultural transmission" (e.g., collected works of Gilmore & Glathorn, 1982; Green & Wallat, 1981; Wilkinson, 1981) suggest the same. For example, a study of the Amish literacy and cultural context notes that Amish children never learn to write the third-person formal essay type of composition which is prevalent in mainstream classrooms, not because
Amish children are not college bound but simply because the "third-person singular point of view assumed by an individual is foreign to this first-person-plural society, with thesis, statements, topic sentences, and concepts like coherence, unity, and emphasis similarly alien" (Fishman, 1987, p. 852). Effecting a smooth transition from the ethnolinguistic cultural groups' "social interaction, communication, and cultural transmission" strategies to classroom activities (e.g., providing activities relevant to the ethnolinguistic cultural groups' social context) can be very important because interactional skills are necessary for an individual to demonstrate literacy, once it is learned, and interactions are enhanced within meaningful sociocultural contexts (Cook-Gumperz, 1986; Ogbu, 1985). Language learning and socialization are two sides of the same coin (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984).

For children of ethnolinguistic cultural groups, these studies suggest that children come to school with their own styles of learning, communicating, and interacting with adults and with their peers. On the other hand, the mainstream culture of the classroom provides a different set of expectations for literacy learning among nonmainstream children. A good example is the insistence on the use of so-called standard English in school settings.

Further, communicative activities as social activities go beyond oral interaction; they also exist as written texts as well. This imposes an even greater demand on the urban African American and urban Appalachian children who not only need to deal with the oral conventions within a mainstream context but also
with the written conventions as well, for writing operates with a different set of registers from speaking. Children come to school better equipped with a knowledge of the conventions of their oral language than with the written form. For most, the schools have the responsibility of introducing them to the conventions of the written form, obviously, not always an easy task.

**Research on writing with emphasis on expository writing.**

There is a growing body of work examining writing or the act of composing in which writers create texts. Much current research has looked into writing with emphasis on the semantic, structural, and pragmatic features of their texts. For example, to formulate explanations as to how children write, attention has been given to the study of textual and extratextual entities that allow children to produce coherent texts. Some research have documented children’s writing development from K through 12 (e.g., Berrill, 1990; Calleros, 1990; Cazden, 1972; Daiute, 1990; Dyson, 1991; Graves, 1979; Klein, 1981; Kroll, 1990; McWhinney, 1989; Petty, 1978; Sandmann, 1991); others have described children’s oral narratives, the narratives they write, and the narratives they read (e.g., Beck, McKeown, & Gromoli, 1989; Beck, McKeown, Sinatra, & Loxterman, 1991; Britton, 1970; Bridge & Winograd, 1982; Dipardo, 1990; Hicks, 1990; Irwin, 1983; Kletzein, 1991; Spivey, 1990 & 1991; Walker & Meyer, 1980); others have established relationship between reading, comprehending, and composing (e.g., Ackerman,
1991; Crowhurst, 1990, 1991; Daniels, 1990; Dressel, 1990; Konopak, Martin, & Martin, 1990; Petrosky, 1982; Schumacher & Nash, 1991; Taylor & Beach, 1984; Tierney & Leys, 1984; Tierney & Pearson, 1984; Tierney, Soter, O'Flahavan, & McGinley, 1989); others have looked into the role of oral language and/or verbal interaction in writing (e.g., Faulkner, 1990; Gasser, 1991; Washington, 1991); others have focused attention on the process of writing itself (e.g., Olson, 1990; ), practices in writing instruction (e.g., Dyson & Freedman, 1990; Fear, 1990;), and assessment (e.g., Applebee & Langer, 1990; Farr, 1989; Kerchner, 1989; Samosir, 1991); and a number of studies have recently called attention to the use of computer technology, e.g., word processor, in children's writing (e.g., Bonk & Reynolds, 1990; Hall-Molina, 1990; Laframboise, 1991).

Knowledge of expository forms and elements is important in creating expository texts that will be able to communicate meaning effectively to an audience. Meyer (1975) categorizes ways in which text structures are organized in expository prose as: comparison/contrast, collection or enumeration, sequence, and problem/solution--these text structures signaled in text by their various semantic and syntactic techniques.

It can be argued that children who lack familiarity with written text registers, including expository text registers, may experience "register crash" (Chapman & Louw, 1986), characterized primarily by "retreat from print" (Lunzer & Gardner, 1979). Generally, children come to school with none or virtually minimal
awareness of the conventions of written texts, particularly certain text genre such as expository writing (e.g., Langer, 1984). For example, an examination of children's use of text structure in writing by Englert, et al., (1988) revealed that students' ability to comprehend and compose expository text depends on their awareness of the text structures. Generally, the younger the child the less knowledge he [she] has of text structures; for the most part, the knowledge he [she] has does not apply to the writing of expository text. Nevertheless, as early as the third grade children are already exposed to expository writing, and this demand increases as they advance in academic years, e.g., writing term papers (Baker & Stein, 1981; Englert, C. et al., 1988).

Another example is Englert and Hiebert's (1984) study which found that students made the greatest gains from third to sixth grade in their ability to write descriptive prose, but they found comparison and contrast as one of the more difficult text structures to follow. In fact, among upper-elementary students, comparison and contrast was one of the most difficult text structures to compose, whereas the sequence or explanation text structure was the easiest (Raphael, Englert, and Kirschner, 1986).

McCann (1989) examined the ability of students at Grades 6, 9 and 12 to write argumentative prose. He found that both the elementary and high school students know a little about argument, but their overall argumentative writing quality differed depending on their grade level--the ninth and twelfth grade students
scored significantly higher than the sixth grade students in their argumentative writing. Specifically, he found the grade six students less effective in "stating claims and using warrants," thus revealing a lack of argumentation traits that would ensure quality argumentative writing.

A series of studies done by Crowhurst (1981, 1983a, 1983b, 1987) also focused on the differences between elementary and high school students' attempts to produce argumentative prose. She noted that fifth and seventh graders are still very dependent on their familiarity with narrative form of writing in producing their own writing. Thus, there was a tendency for them to produce a greater proportion of reporting sentences.

Some research claims that for young children, expository writing is difficult (Britton, 1978) compared to narrative writing--narrative form being a more appropriate description of our way of thinking (Sarbin, 1986). Even with children in the upper elementary grades, expository writing can still pose major difficulty. For example, Moffett (1985) notes that young children display very little skill in the use of argumentative and persuasive discourse mainly because it is too abstract for them. At the same time, their limited exposure to such forms of writing during their early years in school hamper their opportunity to develop appropriate written discourse schemata to write an effective persuasive or argumentative discourse when they are tested. The NAEP (Applebee, Langer, & Mullis, 1986) assessment of children's writing reported a continued difficulty with persuasive writing tasks
among students in grades 4, 8, and 11. Students demonstrated particular weakness in supporting their ideas as opposed to simply presenting general ideas (Applebee et al., 1986).

Although there have been research studies that show young children’s attempt at incorporating some elements of exposition in their writing (e.g., Bissex, 1980; Dyson, 1988; Newkirk, 1987), some research studies strongly suggest that children find expository writing difficult because of the very nature of its organizational structure when it is rooted in classical rhetoric which is a "learned" rather than "acquired" rhetoric (e.g., Anderson & Armbruster, 1984; Britton, 1978; Garner, et al. 1986; Langer, 1986; Olson, 1990). For example, in exposition, rhetorical structures are at the top level of the hierarchy of organizing frames (Langer, 1986).

While knowing more about expository texts and children’s ability to write them is relevant in being able to address children’s difficulty in writing exposition, very little research has been done on children’s knowledge of the critical features of expository writing (Garner, et al. 1986; Voss & Bisantz, 1985; Cox, Shanahan, & Tinzmann, 1991), especially how children use them in their own expository writing (McCutchen, 1987; Cox, Shanahan, & Tinzmann, 1991). Also largely unexamined are the similarities and differences between children’s written discourse modes and types of writing tasks as well as models of writing presented to them, e.g., basal texts, and others, in their literacy instruction. Limited research has been
done on children's comprehension of expository texts. For example, Englert's (1984) and Duffelmeyer's (1987) studies focus on how the nature of expository writing affects children's comprehension of expository texts. Duffelmeyer (1987) notes that children find it more difficult to understand an expository text from their content text books than understanding the narrative text in their basal readers. Analyzing these literacy materials is important, because in order to facilitate children's acquisition of skills in expository writing, they should be immersed in texts that would provide them with experience in that particular written genre (Root, 1985; Turbill, 1987). Doake (1987) suggests that writing in expository form will rarely develop naturally. He maintains that if students need to use "various expository schemas as part of their writing and learning, then they have to be reading texts that are written using this variety of genre" (pp. 47-48).

**Research on text analysis with emphasis on cohesion and cohesion analysis.**

Martin (1983) asserts that to arrive at a meaningful description of the development of genre in children's written language, one must accept descriptive responsibility for four critical features of language use. First, that the basic unit of analysis in genre study is the text, not the sentence. Descriptions must be provided for the ways in which lexicogrammar is structured to create text.
Two good examples of looking at children's texts and the texts that they read are Martin's (1983) systemic-functional model and Halliday and Hasan's (1976) cohesion analysis.

Using the systemic-functional model, Martin (1983) discusses reference as a semantic system whereby participants are identified in English text. It draws a basic distinction between participants that the writer thinks his reader knows the identity of and those he introduces for the first time. Use of demonstratives, definite article, and pronouns identify "given" participants from the "new" participants, presented in indefinite nominal groups.

The "given-new" Reference system is coded either as presenting a new participant or referring to one already known to the reader. Retrieval of the "given" participant's identity is coded either as retrieved from the context of culture or retrieved from the context of situation of a text. The context of culture is that which refers to information taken for granted by the writer that is not derived from the immediate situation of the text. The context of situation is categorized either as directly or indirectly retrievable. The identity of the "given" participant is directly retrievable when the participant in question has been mentioned before in the text. When, however, the identity of the participant is implied but not directly realized, then the reader must infer his [her] identity. Indirect retrieval of a "given" participant is also referred to as bridging (Clark & Haviland, 1977).
Martin (1983) also suggests a *Means for the Analysis of Reference*, nominal groups that presume information are referred to as *phoric*. Reference to the context of culture is termed *homophora*. Reference to a context of situation is termed *endophora*. Nominal groups presuming information directly from the preceding verbal context is termed *anaphora*; indirect retrieval is referred to as *bridging*.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) provide a description of the text-forming resources of a language using another structural or organizational property of text called cohesion. The central hypothesis is that cohesion is an important abstract feature of a text which, when perceived, enables the reader to integrate parts of the text so as to remake the author’s meaning or the writer to produce his [her] own text in a "coherent" manner. Textual cohesion is offered as a framework for looking at the notion of coherence - or at a part of what goes into coherence (DeStefano, 1988 & 1990).

Halliday and Hasan (1976) provide a coding scheme for analyzing text in terms of number and types of cohesive ties. This allows for the quantification of total number of cohesive ties and the identification of types of cohesive ties in a text. *Cohesion analysis* is dependent upon the thesis which views language primarily as socially relevant and thus essentially functional. The analysis aims to establish the system of cohesive ties which operate within the text. The ties serve as linguistic linking mechanisms, and build up text unity by relating elements within the text to each other (Hasan, 1980).
Various researchers have used cohesion analysis in their work, e.g., Chapman, 1981; Cox, Shanahan, & Sulzby, 1990; Cox, Shanahan, & Tinzmann, 1991; DeStefano, 1990; DeStefano, Pepinsky, & Sanders, 1982; DeStefano & Kantor, 1988; King & Rentel, 1979; Irwin, 1986; Philips & Zinan, 1980; and Rutter & Raban, 1982. Cohesion, applied as a text analysis system, has been suggested to be able to serve as an index of textual coherence (Frederiksen, 1977; Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978; Marshall & Glock, 1978). Although there are those who argue against the cohesive view of coherence, supporters of the notion of cohesion as an index of textual coherence maintain that if a text displays cohesion, it follows that coherence in the mind of the reader will be more easily established than if little or no cohesion exists, e.g., Carrell, 1982; Freebody & Anderson, 1981; Morgan & Sellner, 1980; Nash-Webber, 1977; Steffensen, 1981; and Tierney & Mosenthal, 1981. It is theorized that if a text is not coherent, inferences must be made to supply the missing cohesive links, and that this leads to increased processing demands and comprehension difficulties (Irwin, 1980b; Kintsh & Vipond, 1978; Marshall & Glock, 1978). For example, it has been argued that cohesive ties provide focal points for a reader in integrating meaning from the text, e.g., Garrod & Sanford, 1977; Kintsch, 1974; Lesgold, 1974. When the reader is unable to create coherence from the text, the comprehension process does not appear to be as easily facilitated.
A number of studies have attempted to establish this link between cohesion and comprehension (e.g., Bridge, Thomas, & Evers, 1981; Chapman, 1982; Irwin, 1982; and Moe, 1979). Chapman's (1982) research project undertaken in England shows that the perception of cohesion is an important factor in comprehending (also Bridge & Evers, 1981). Failure to realize the cohesive tie, to recover its referent, implies loss of meaning and a breakdown of coherence for the recipient of the communicative act (Chapman, 1982; Moe, 1979). In fact, Chapman (1986) has found "register crash", a phenomenon of comprehension failure when children switch from reading narrative material to expository prose in which cohesive devices differ greatly.

Other significant points established by research on cohesion include: 1) children even at an early age, i.e., at least five years old, use all 5 groups of cohesive ties in their oral language production (Garber, 1980); 2) children further develop cohesion strategies as they mature (King & Rentel, 1979; Rutter & Raban, 1982); and 3) children apply their knowledge of cohesion strategies in comprehending text (Chapman, 1981). The results of research relating various cohesive relations to comprehension are consistent, e.g., a highly cohesive text is generally more comprehensible than one that is not very cohesive. Further, models of comprehension and inference make the related assumption that comprehension involves integrating a text into a patterned semantic representation, and cohesive relations contribute to this (Irwin, 1980a; 1980b).
Cohesive harmony is a more comprehensive concept of cohesion. Based on work both by Halliday (1985) and Hasan (1984), cohesive harmony is an extension of their earlier taxonomy of cohesive devices to include not only repetition of semantic information, i.e., via nouns, pronouns, verbs, and ellipses, but also repetition of functional information, i.e., via words having the same grammatical or syntactic function. Seven types of verbs or processes that can carry information are identified: verbs of material action, verbs of mental action, verbs of verbal action, verbs of behavior, verbs of existence, verbs of identity, and attributive verbs. According to Halliday (1985) and Hasan (1984), use of two or more verbs from the same semantic category of the verb implicitly determines the functions, or case grammar roles, of nouns that fill certain syntactic slots, such as the subject or object in an English sentence. For example, in the sentence *Bees collect pollen from flowers*, the verb *collect* is classified as a goal-oriented material action. The subject-noun *Bees* is implicitly and automatically assigned the case grammar role of actor, and the object noun *pollen* is automatically assigned the case grammar role of the goal, which is achieved by the action and is a lasting effect. Cohesive ties also exist between words (or phrases) with the same case grammar role.

A body of growing research suggests that cohesive harmony can distinguish well written and coherent text (Cox, Shanahan, & Sulzby, 1990; Cox, Shanahan, & Tinzmann, 1991; Hasan, 1984; Pappas, 1985). However, there is still much room for research on the descriptive power of cohesion analysis and cohesive
harmony to identify children’s knowledge of the nature of expository texts and how they apply this knowledge in their own writing, particularly with children of ethnolinguistic cultural groups, such as urban Appalachians and urban African Americans.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH DESIGN

This study is designed to investigate sixth grade urban African American, urban Appalachian, and mainstream culture children's ability to use cohesive relations that would reflect their knowledge of text structures identifiable with the expository genre. Expository articles from children's text books that served as their models of writing were also investigated, using the same approach to children's expository writing for the purpose of comparison. Cohesion analysis (Halliday & Hasan, 1976) was used to identify children's use of cohesive devices to tie their text's ideas together into a meaningful whole. Similarities and dissimilarities in the use of cohesive relations were then established across all ethnolinguistic cultural groups. Comparisons and contrasts between these children's expository writing and samples of expository writing from their text books were also identified. To further strengthen the analysis, measures of density of cohesive ties and cohesion index were applied.
DATA COLLECTION

Research Participants

The major institutional setting for the study was a Middle School in a large midwestern urban school system. The school has a predominantly African American and Appalachian culture student population. The participants in this study met the following criteria: (a) The children were in grade 6 at the start of the study; (b) They were classed as somewhat below-average or somewhat above-average students, as measured by records of their academic performance, standardized tests, and teachers’ recommendations; and (c) They were eligible for the free-lunch program at school (except for the mainstream culture children), based on the family’s per capita income. From the two sixth grade classes (a total of 45 students) with the same teacher, 4 male and 4 female urban African American children, 4 male and 4 female urban Appalachian children, and 4 male and 4 female mainstream culture children were selected, for a total of 24 children who satisfied the criteria mentioned above. Sixth grade children were chosen in order to provide an opportunity to identify the distinct characteristics and developmental changes in children’s expository writing. Sixth graders can provide some measure of the structural knowledge students possess at the point just prior to entering a junior high curriculum that focuses almost exclusively on expository materials. Furthermore, sixth grade children were selected in as much as the National Assessment of Educational Progress (1986) reports that the difference in
levels of literacy as defined by grade level norms between middle- and working-class children becomes more glaring at a higher level (e.g., grade 4-up) when more complex skills in reading and writing become crucial to school success.

In order to verify ethnolinguistic cultural group membership, sentence repetition tasks for the South Midland dialect (commonly known as Appalachian English) (developed by Rentel) and Black English (developed by DeStefano) were administered to the children (cf., DeStefano, et al., 1982). Children revealing use of either set of forms in their speech formed the pool from which the nonmainstream participants were selected, except for the mainstream participants who used no "marked" dialect forms in their speech. Dialect forms in speech have proven to be a reliable and valid measure of ethnolinguistic group membership (DeStefano, 1978). A family history form including information on the geographic origin of their parents, grandparents, and even great-grandparents that the class completed as part of their social studies assignment was also used.

Children from low-income families were also focused upon because, as a group, children from these families tend not to achieve as well in reading and writing as their mainstream counterparts (Baugh, 1987; Gee, 1985)--in the United States, class and caste tend to be synonymous. Identification of children from low-income families was based on those who are in the school's free-lunch list. Each student's official documents, including personal information folder, Master Education-Writing Validation Test Student Report of March, 1990, Comprehensive
Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) Individual Test Record, Progress Report, and Elementary Writing Portfolio were closely examined.

After the first list of potential participants was drawn, the teacher was consulted for further information on the children's background. She was also asked to nominate children whom she perceived as either "successful" or "not successful" in literacy learning. The ability to write has been one of the criteria used to evaluate children's "success" in literacy learning. Identifying the similarities and dissimilarities in the use of cohesive relations between children perceived as academically "successful" or "not successful" provided some insight in validating the use of children's writing ability as a measure of their "success" in literacy learning. This also provided insight into teacher's literacy-related attitude toward ethnolinguistic cultural group children. The teacher was also asked for her suggestions regarding the choices made to ensure that all the participants selected were staying for the completion of the academic year (student transfer at any time of the academic year was not unusual). Two children—one boy and one girl—were selected from each of the two ends of the "success in literacy learning" continuum for each of the two ethnolinguistic cultural groups and from the mainstream group as well. This provided an opportunity to illustrate the similarities and differences in the use of cohesive relations and cohesive harmony in children's writing of expository prose, between male and female children; and finally, those perceived as "successful" and "not successful" children in literacy learning. Meanwhile, the
remainder of the children in the sixth grade class served as a backdrop for a
descriptive analysis of the kinds of literacy learning experiences participants were
involved in (e.g., teacher's prewriting activities, peer evaluation of students' writing, group sharing/report) that may have had direct or indirect bearing on their
expository writing performance.

**Children's Writing**

Samples of participants' expository writing were collected with the help of the classroom teacher. A total of four written products per participant--two written products at the beginning and two written products toward the end of the year--were selected from the participants' folders for analysis. Preference was given to written materials that were within the 100-300 word length (although participants tended to write short prose), and definitely no less than 50-word length to allow a more in-depth analysis of the individual's writing. Attention was given to the wholeness of a given passage as that which constitutes a text (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). There was a total of 96 writing samples.

The written products were on topics ranging from *freedom: what it means and why it is important, Martin Luther King, Jr. and the significance of his "I Have a Dream", why should one discourage vandalism and what are ways to prevent it, what makes your goal in life special, why do you hate pancakes to why stop drug abuse.*
**Literacy Materials**

Four samples of expository articles from sixth grade commercially produced reading materials, e.g., from social studies and science texts, which serve as models of expository writing for children, were selected for analysis. The text samples were selected on the basis of instructional use approximately at the same time children’s written samples were done. Preference was given to text samples to which children might have responded in writing. The full text of expository articles were used for analysis, ranging from 488-543 words in length. Analyzing use of cohesive relations and cohesive harmony in commercially produced literacy materials used by children as their models of writing allowed for a better look at children’s consistency and "growth" in their use of the same in their expository writing.

The selected expository articles were: *What Are the Dangers of Drug Abuse*, *Why Leaves Change Color*, *How do People Provide a Clean Environment*, and *About Space*.

**Teacher-Students and Peer-Peer Literacy Learning Environment**

Classroom literacy practices involving both the teacher and students particularly during children’s expository prewriting, writing, and postwriting activities (e.g., use of text articles, brainstorming for ideas, mapping, peer evaluation, etc.) were carefully noted, some videotaped, twice a week during the
year. The idea was to capture the set of meanings established by both the teacher and the students in "teaching" (on teacher's part) and "learning" (on students' part) "how" to write expository prose, for example—what phonological, syntactic, and semantic patterns of language do teacher and students "use" to "teach" (on teacher's part) and "learn" (on students' part), or teach and learn within the peer groups, about the language that later reflected on the students' productive competence (written mode). A total picture of the classroom literacy learning practices involving both teacher-students, and peer-peer interaction served as a source for descriptive analysis and discussion of children's expository writing, and recommendations for enhancing their knowledge of organization, cohesive relations, and cohesive harmony in written exposition.

**Data Analysis**

The first step in scoring was to parse texts into modified T-units (smallest terminal unit in a sentence: Hunt, 1965), with dependent clauses attached (Cox, 1987; Pappas, 1981). To determine the types of cohesive relations present in the children's expository writing, as well as in the sample expository articles from the children's textbooks, each T-unit within the texts was coded using Halliday & Hasan's (1976) coding scheme to determine instances of the following factors: 1) type of cohesive relations--reference (pronominal, demonstrative, comparative), substitution and ellipses (nominal, verbal, clausal), conjunction (additive,
adversative, causal, temporal); lexical cohesion--reiteration (repetition, synonym/near synonym, superordinate, general word) and collocation, 2) number of ties per communication unit, 3) cohesive item within the text, and 4) presupposed item. After the coding, the following descriptive data was collected for each expository text: 1) percentage of reference ties, 2) percentage of substitution ties, 3) percentage of ellipsis ties, 4) percentage of conjunctive ties, and 5) percentage of lexical ties.

To examine the density of cohesive ties within the expository text, the following data were collected from each text: 1) total number of ties, and 2) total number of words. Using these measures, cohesive density was computed by dividing the number of words by the number of ties.

Descriptive data concerning the percentage of occurrence among cohesive relations within the same category was also computed for each text using the following: 1) total number of occurrences for each category, and 2) number of occurrences for each subcategory. Results were obtained by dividing the number of occurrences of a cohesive item for each subcategory by the total number of occurrence of cohesive items for each category. Coreferential cohesive devices (i.e., pronouns, comparatives, and ellipsis) were coded either as 1) unambiguously used devices, and 2) ambiguously or unclearly referenced devices. In an unambiguously or appropriate cohesive tie set, both members were clearly referenced within the text so that an adult reader can easily retrieve the meaning;
in an ambiguous or inappropriate cohesive tie set, one member was so distant from
the other that the reader finds difficulty in retrieving meaning even as a conscious
task, or the meaning is not explicit in the writing. The coreferential cohesion
scores for each text were transformed to indices by dividing the total number of
coreferential cohesion devices by the total number of T-units in each text. This
provided: a) a Cohesion Index (proportion of unambiguous use of cohesion devices)
and b) an Inappropriate Cohesion Index (proportion of ambiguous or poorly
referenced cohesion device for which meaning was difficult to retrieve). These
indices represent the proportion of devices in each text for which meaning was
either clearly and readily retrievable or was not by this researcher.

In summary, the research study involved a total of 24 sixth grade children
from two ethnolinguistic cultural groups--urban African Americans and urban
Appalachians, as well as the mainstream culture selected from two sixth grade
classes in a Middle School in a large midwestern urban school system. It also
included 96 expository writing samples (four written products per participant)
collected during one academic year as well as four samples of expository articles
from sixth grade commercially produced reading materials in social studies and
science text books which serve as "models" of expository writing for these
children; and a documentation of classroom literacy practices involving both the
teacher and students particularly during children's expository prewriting, writing,
and postwriting activities.
The data analysis used Halliday and Hasan's (1976) cohesion analysis which included identifying the type of cohesive relations--reference, substitution+ellipses, and lexical cohesion; examining density of cohesive ties; and computing of the Cohesion Index.

This approach to data collection and analysis is appropriate for "shedding light" on the research questions in part because cohesion analysis has been extensively used in other studies and has shown its ability to differentiate among students' writing, among genres, and so on.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Types of Cohesive Relations

The study investigated the written cohesion patterns found in the expository writing of sixth grade urban African American, urban Appalachian, and mainstream culture group children within each and across all ethnolinguistic cultural groups. The results showed that each major type of cohesive tie--reference, substitution, conjunction, and lexical cohesion--was found in the written expository prose of urban African American, urban Appalachian, and mainstream group children. The study further investigated the written cohesion patterns found in the expository genre prose of sixth grade text books which are often used as the "models" for the genre. The results also showed that each major type of cohesive tie--reference, substitution, conjunction, and lexical cohesion--was found in these expository genre prose samples. However, as the research looked more closely into the similarities and dissimilarities in the use of cohesive relations between each and across ethnolinguistic culture group children's expository writing, and between children's expository writing and the text book expository genre prose, it was found that the
frequency by which children use cohesive relations varied from child to child, and from group to group.

Table 1 shows the differences in the percentage of each category of cohesive devices identified in each sixth grade urban African American children’s four expository writing samples.

**TABLE 1. MEAN PERCENTAGE OF COHESIVE TIES ACROSS FOUR EXPOSITORY WRITING SAMPLES OF SIXTH GRADE URBAN AFRICAN AMERICAN CHILDREN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban African American Children</th>
<th>Type of Cohesion</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Sub.+Ellip.</th>
<th>Conj.</th>
<th>Lexical Cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>29.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>27.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>23.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>22.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>25.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>29.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>15.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>23.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>24.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, these eight children’s use of repetition within their four expository writing samples ranges from 15.68 percent to 29.88 percent; use of references ranges from 6.64 percent to 13.88 percent. All of the eight children used lexical cohesion the most, and substitution+ellipses, the least. Four sixth grade urban African American children have reference as their second most used cohesion.
device ranging from 6.64 percent to 11.82 percent, and conjunction as their third most used cohesion device, ranging from 6.02 percent to 11.41 percent. The other four children have conjunction as their second most used cohesive device ranging from 10.39 percent to 14 percent, and reference as their third most used cohesive device ranging from 8.56 percent to 13.88 percent.

Table 2 shows the differences in the percentage of each category of cohesive devices identified in each of the eight sixth grade urban Appalachian child’s four expository writing samples.

**TABLE 2. MEAN PERCENTAGE OF COHESIVE TIES ACROSS FOUR EXPOSITORY WRITING SAMPLES OF SIXTH GRADE URBAN APPALACHIAN CHILDREN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appalachian Children</th>
<th>Type of Cohesion</th>
<th>Lexical Cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>17.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>16.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>8.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, except for two, all children have repetition as the most used cohesive device in their expository writing ranging from 14.86 percent to 30.10
percent, followed by references ranging from 9.14 percent to 13.23 percent, and then, conjunction ranging from 6.72 percent to 10.83 percent. One urban Appalachian child’s four expository writing samples have 17.29 percent use of substitution+ellipses, (which is the second highest percentage of use of substitution+ellipses among all the ethnolinguistic cultural and mainstream group children’s expository writing), and only .11 percent use of repetition.

TABLE 3. MEAN PERCENTAGE OF COHESIVE TIES ACROSS FOUR EXPOSITORY WRITING SAMPLES OF SIXTH GRADE MAINSTREAM AMERICAN CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstream Children</th>
<th>Type of Cohesion</th>
<th>Lexical Cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>13.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>8.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 shows the differences in the percentage of each category of cohesive devices identified in each of the eight sixth grade mainstream group children's four expository writing samples.

For example, except for two, all children have repetition as the most used cohesive device in their expository writing ranging from 19.52 percent to 32.53 percent, followed by references ranging from 10.03 percent to 16.04 percent. One mainstream group child's four expository writing samples have substitution+ellipses (25 percent) as the most used cohesive device, (the highest percentage use of substitution+ellipses among all ethnolinguistic cultural and mainstream group children's expository writing, and also an unusual frequency of occurrence), repetition, second (21.82 percent), followed by references (12.31 percent), and finally, conjunction (9.79 percent).

Each of the four sample expository articles taken from the children's text books and which serve as "models" for children's own writing also demonstrate varying mean percentages of use of each category of cohesive devices. For example, Table 4 shows that all four expository articles differ in their percentages of use of repetition ranging from 28.07 percent to 42.56 percent; references ranging from 12.08 percent to 15.88 percent; conjunction ranging from 4.5 percent to 10.12 percent; and substitution+ellipses ranging from 1.22 percent to 3.48 percent. No use of collocation (collocation defined as lexical cohesion that is not covered by what could be classified as reiteration) was recorded.
However, all four articles have repetition as the most used cohesive device; followed by references; then conjunction; and finally, substitution+ellipses.

**TABLE 4. MEAN PERCENTAGE OF COHESIVE TIES ACROSS FOUR SIXTH GRADE TEXT BOOK EXPOSITORY ARTICLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Book Expository Articles</th>
<th>Type of Cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangers of Drug Abuse</td>
<td>12.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why Leaves Change Color</td>
<td>13.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a Clean Environment</td>
<td>15.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About Space</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>13.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows the mean number (and standard deviation) of the cohesive ties produced respectively by urban Appalachian, urban African American, mainstream group children, and the expository articles from their text books.

Even though each type occurred in their writing, children relied mainly on reference, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. They hardly used any substitution+ellipses. As shown in Table 5, for all three groups, lexical cohesion occurred the most frequently, followed by use of reference and then finally, use of conjunction. The mainstream group children have the highest percentage of occurrence for all types of cohesion--reference (11.95%), substitution+ellipses
(04.85%), conjunction (09.61%), and lexical cohesion (26.02%); the urban African American children have second highest percentage of occurrence for lexical cohesion (25.41%) and conjunction (09.35%), and lowest percentage of occurrence for reference (10.39%) and substitution+ellipses (03.84%); the urban Appalachian children have the second highest percentage of occurrence for reference (04.51%) and substitution+ellipses (05.25%), and lowest percentage of occurrence for conjunction (08.04%) and lexical cohesion (22.08%). Finally, the four samples of expository articles taken from the children’s text books show the order of frequency of occurrence among cohesive relations as follows: lexical cohesion (34.71%), reference (13.53%), conjunction (07.54%), and substitution+ellipses (02.31%). In

TABLE 5. MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF COHESIVE TIES ACROSS EXPOSITORY WRITING SAMPLES OF SIXTH GRADE CHILDREN, BY ETHNOLINGUISTIC GROUPS (STANDARD DEVIATION IN PARENTHESIS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Appalachian</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>0.1171 (0.0451)</td>
<td>0.0525 (0.0266)</td>
<td>0.0804 (0.0320)</td>
<td>0.2208 (0.0849)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban African American</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>0.1039 (0.0319)</td>
<td>0.0384 (0.0176)</td>
<td>0.0935 (0.0249)</td>
<td>0.2541 (0.0755)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>0.1195 (0.0510)</td>
<td>0.0485 (0.0314)</td>
<td>0.0961 (0.0530)</td>
<td>0.2602 (0.0950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Book Samples</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>0.1353 (0.0164)</td>
<td>0.0231 (0.0093)</td>
<td>0.0754 (0.0232)</td>
<td>0.3471 (0.0596)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
comparison, lexical cohesion and reference across samples of expository articles taken from the children's text books have a higher mean percentage of occurrence than those in the urban African American, urban Appalachian, and mainstream group children's expository writing; however, the text book samples have a lower mean percentage of occurrence for conjunction, substitution+ellipses than found in the children's writing samples.

Using Halliday & Hasan's (1976) classification scheme at a more detailed level, a range of subtypes used within each of the major categories of cohesive ties was determined as follows:

Reference. Table 6 shows that all the written exposition contained examples of each of the three subtypes of reference ties--pronominal, demonstrative, and comparative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNOLINGUISTIC GROUPS</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Type of Cohesion: Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pronominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Appalachian</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>0.0350 (0.0301)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban African American</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>0.0237 (0.0229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>0.0369 (0.0308)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Book Samples</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>0.0118 (0.0037)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To illustrate, children's expository texts on the significance of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have a Dream," demonstrated appropriate use of pronominalization as in he, him, and his referring to Martin Luther King, Jr.; they, their, and them referring to Blacks, Whites, people; and it referring to Martin Luther King, Jr.'s death. For example:

The message that Dr. King tried to send was that Blacks get their freedom just like the Whites.

Martin Luther King fought for freedom - freedom for Blacks. Even when they bombed his home he still fought for freedom. He even was threatened to be put in jail but he still fought for freedom.

Martin Luther King was a Black leader for the rights of everyone. He had a dream for nonviolence, peace, and freedom for the whole world. His message gives us peace.

Martin Luther King was killed after his "I Dream" speech. It was a loss that will be remembered.

Martin Luther King will be remembered for his speech. It will stay in everyone's heart.

In Martin Luther King's speech, he said he wanted all four of his little black kids to join hands with little white girls and boys and his dream came true. If he was alive today, he would be very, very happy.

After a while the Blacks got fed up. They were tired of using dirty bathrooms.

The following are examples of use of pronominalization from the expository articles taken from children's text books (they/them= pigments, it=leaf; their=communities, factories; it=outer space):
What are pigments? They are chemicals that color almost all living things. Without them, both you and the leaves of a tree would be pale and colorless.

The leaf is the food maker for the tree. During the spring and summer, it uses a green pigment called chlorophyll to turn moisture and carbon dioxide from the air into sugar and starch. Chlorophyll acts as an antenna to trap energy from the sun. As winter comes, the leaf's work ends. It stops making food; and the chlorophyll begins to dissolve. The green color starts to disappear.

To reduce the amount of water pollution, most communities in the United States pipe their sewage to wastewater treatment plants, commonly called sewage treatment plants. Many factories have their own sewage treatment plants.

Scientists do not agree on how many miles away from earth outer space begins. Some say it begins fifty miles away.

Evidence of use of demonstrative reference from children's expository writing (i.e., the speech=a speech; the time=a time; dream=a dream) is as follows:

Dr. King gave a speech about two months before he died. The speech was called "I Have A Dream."

Martin Luther King had a speech. The speech said, "Life is to live, love is to love, and your heart is your dreams."

Dr. King said there's a time to be free. And when the time comes Blacks and Whites no longer have to be separated.

Martin Luther King, Jr. had a dream. He was killed after his "I Have a Dream" speech. He believed in peace and freedom. He gave very good reasons to be free in his speech. It will stay in everyone's heart. ... We all remember Martin Luther King, Jr., and we carry the dream.
Sample expository articles from children’s text books also show use of demonstrative reference (i.e., these=why/what questions; the leaf=the leaf, the green color=a green pigment, the chlorophyll=a chlorophyll; the abuser=a person; the drug=a drug; that person’s, the person, the person=a person; the sleeping pill=a sleeping pill) as follows:

Leaves change color each autumn. Why? What causes the yearly show of scarlets and oranges and yellows? Even modern science can’t fully answer these questions.

The leaf is the food maker for the tree. During the spring and summer, it uses a green pigment called chlorophyll to turn moisture and carbon dioxide from the air into sugar and starch. Chlorophyll acts as an antenna to trap energy from the sun. As winter comes, the leaf’s work ends. It stops making food, and the chlorophyll begins to dissolve. The green color starts to disappear. (Why Do Leaves Change Color?)

Tolerance occurs when a person’s body gets used to a drug. The abuser must use more and more of the drug to get the same effect. For example, suppose a person starts the bad habit of taking a sleeping pill every night to fall asleep. That person’s body will soon build tolerance to the sleeping pill. Then two pills might be needed to make the person sleepy. As tolerance continues to build, the person might need three or four pills each night to fall asleep. (What Are the Dangers of Drug Abuse?)

Demonstrative reference has the highest percentage of occurrence in the mainstream group children’s samples (.0586), followed by the urban African American children’s (.0564), and finally, in the urban Appalachian children’s writing samples (.0269). Both the urban Appalachian and mainstream group children’s expository writing had pronominal reference as the second highest
percentage of occurrence. On the other hand, the urban African American children’s text samples and those taken from their textbooks had comparative reference second, and pronominal reference third. Comparative reference occurred mostly in the subcategories of quality and numerative, both under particular comparisons expressing comparability between things in respect to a particular property which may be a matter of quantity or quality. If the comparison is in terms of quantity, it is expressed in the numerative element in the structure of the nominal group such as the use of a comparative quantifier in the following examples from an expository article from the children’s text book (i.e., more=more drugs) and children’s expository writing (i.e., more=freedom, more=opportunities), respectively:

Tolerance occurs when a person’s body gets used to a drug. The abuser must use more and more of the drug to get the same effect.

Martin Luther King, Jr. was an American hero telling us about the American ideas of freedom, justice and opportunity. ... We are free now partly because of what he did. He fought to bring Blacks and Whites together and when he did that we had more freedom and justice in this country. An example is that there are more opportunities for Blacks in the government now.

If the comparison is in terms of quality, it is expressed either by use of a comparative adjective as in the following examples from an expository article from the children’s textbook (i.e., thinner=air) and from children’s expository writing
(i.e., better, cleaner, healthier=environment; nicer, more presentable=neighborhood), respectively:

Close to the earth the air is thick. It has lots of oxygen in it. We breathe easily. But the farther away from earth we go, the thinner the air becomes.

Children also can grow up in a better environment, which means it would be cleaner and healthier. The neighborhood will look a lot nicer and more presentable.

or by a comparative adverb as in the following examples from expository articles from the children’s textbooks (i.e., better=taste; more difficult=to stop):

To make water safe and pleasant for drinking, communities use water treatment plants. ... In some communities, the water is then sprayed into the air. This process adds oxygen to the water to make it taste better.

Dependence is the need for a drug. The need might be mental or physical. A mentally dependent person thinks he or she needs the drug to function or make it through the day. With physical dependence, a person’s body needs the drug to avoid feeling sick. ... Sometimes a person who is physically dependent on a drug stops taking it. ... Usually, after a short withdrawal period, the body learns to function without the drug. Physical dependence stops. Mental dependence, on the other hand, is often more difficult to stop.

Substitution+Ellipses. Table 7 shows that nominal substitution occurred much more frequently than the verbal and clausal substitution in all sample expository writing including those taken from the children’s text books. Clausal
substitution hardly ever occurred in all the children's expository text samples and did not occur at all in the expository articles taken from the children's text books.

**TABLE 7. MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF COHESIVE TIES = SUBSTITUTION+ELLIPSIS, ACROSS EXPOSITORY WRITING SAMPLES OF SIXTH GRADE CHILDREN, BY ETHNOLINGUISTIC GROUPS (STANDARD DEVIATION IN PARENTHESIS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNOLINGUISTIC GROUPS</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Type of Cohesion: Substitution+Ellipsis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Appalachian</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>0.0320 (0.0192)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban African American</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>0.0218 (0.0149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>0.0247 (0.0230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Book Samples</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>0.0203 (0.0100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is an example of the use of nominal substitution in an expository article on drugs and space from the children's textbooks, followed by examples of the use of nominal substitution and verbal substitution in urban African American sixth graders' exposition on Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have a Dream" and vandalism, respectively:

The abuse of drugs can produce many harmful effects. Some of these effects are immediate... Others include headache, sleeplessness, high blood pressure, vomiting, and even death if a person takes too much of the drug. (nominal substitution: some, others=effects)
Our earth is traveling in space, and so are the sun, the moon, the planets, and the stars. (nominal substitution: so=traveling in space)

He fought to bring Blacks and Whites together and when he did that we had more freedom and justice in this country. (nominal substitution: that=fact that he fought to bring Blacks and Whites together)

Friends should help their friends to stop vandalism. If they don’t then they’re not true friends. (verbal substitution: don’t=help their friends to stop vandalism)

I don’t want all the money in the world because if I did no one would have any money to buy food. (verbal substitution: did=want all the money in the world)

Nominal, verbal/clausal ellipses were a very small percentage of the total number of cohesive ties in all written exposition. (See Table 7). Use of nominal ellipses is demonstrated in the following text of a sixth grade mainstream child: To become a successful track runner you have to accomplish three things and many more. The elliptical nominal group much more presupposes a previous one that is not, three things, thus, "much more what?" would become many more things. Verbal/clausal ellipsis is used in the following sixth grade Appalachian children’s texts: One of my long term goals is to become a popular writer. I can accomplish this by doing a lot of writing and I will. The elliptical verbal group I will presupposes I will be doing a lot of writing. Another example is as follows: Rosa Parks was one Black lady who stood up for what she believed in. One time a
White person wanted her to give up her seat but she wouldn't. She wouldn't is a verbal ellipsis presupposing she wouldn't give up her seat.

**Conjunction.** Table 8 shows that each of the subtypes of conjunctive ties--additive, adversative, causal, and temporal--was used extensively in all the writing samples.

**TABLE 8. MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF COHESIVE TIES = CONJUNCTION, ACROSS EXPOSITORY WRITING SAMPLES OF SIXTH GRADE CHILDREN, BY ETHNOLINGUISTIC GROUPS (STANDARD DEVIATION IN PARENTHESES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNOLINGUISTIC GROUPS</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Type of Cohesion: Conjunction</th>
<th>Additive</th>
<th>Adversative</th>
<th>Causal</th>
<th>Temporal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Appalachian</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>0.0528 (0.0251)</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>0.0079</td>
<td>0.0121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban African American</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>0.0651 (0.0223)</td>
<td>0.0026</td>
<td>0.0103</td>
<td>0.0154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>0.0611 (0.0351)</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
<td>0.0123</td>
<td>0.0188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Book Samples</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>0.0466 (0.0147)</td>
<td>0.0102</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.0180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Urban African American children relied mostly on conjunctive additive cohesion (06.51%), followed by causal conjunctions (01.03%), with very little temporal conjunctions (01.54%) and conjunctive adversative (00.26%). Similarly, the mainstream group and urban Appalachian children's expository writing demonstrated a high percentage of occurrence for conjunctive additive (06.11% and 05.28%, respectively), followed by temporal conjunctions (01.88% and 01.21%,
respectively), then, causal conjunctions (01.23% and 00.79%, respectively), and finally, conjunctive adversative (00.38% and 00.76%, respectively). Samples of expository articles from the children’s textbooks also have conjunctive additive as its highest percentage of occurrence (04.66%), although this percentage is lower compared to those of the three ethnolinguistic cultural group children’s expository writing. On the other hand, the textbook samples have higher percentage of occurrence for conjunctive adversative (01.47%) than those found in children’s expository writing. Mostly, children relied on the conjunctive additives and and or and the causal relations because and so.

Examples of children’s use of conjunctive additive and and or are as follows:

The Supreme Court banned segregation. And the Blacks have more freedom. And all races and ethnic groups can get a good education.

Vandalism is not fun if you come home and you found your house spraypainted and your windows busted or things stolen.

Vandalism only hurts worse when you blame it on your friends and your friends get mad. And then they get revenge.

Examples of children’s use of causal relation because and so are as follows:

Most people will have no place to live because of houses being torn down.

Running keeps you fit and it’s safe. I like the sport because all my friends like it and I do too.
Countries like Africa, Russia, and Saudi Arabia have dictators. So they do not have freedom. I feel sorry for those people. Some children do not even have homes because of dictatorship and madness in the world.

Martin Luther King, Jr. emphasized freedom. He wanted to wipe out racism, poverty, and prejudice so the whole world could be free.

The Supreme Court banned segregation so we could all be free to live and learn together.

Adversative relation through the word but, as shown in examples below taken from an expository article from children's text book and children's own expository writing, was also a frequent occurrence.

The treated wastewater is clean enough to send to a river or lake, but, of course, the water is still not safe to drink. (text book)

The first amendment is freedom of the press, which means you can say what you want to but you can't. Sometimes you have to say what you're told to say. (mainstream)

Martin Luther King fought for freedom - freedom for Blacks. Even when they bombed his home he still fought for freedom. He even was threatened to be put in jail but he still fought for freedom. (urban Appalachian)

When Martin Luther King, Jr. died everyone thought the dream was dead too, but he still lives on in each and everyone's heart singing, "Free at last. Free at last. Thank God Almighty, I am free at last!" (urban Appalachian)

Temporal sequential then, first, second, and so on, as well as temporal simultaneous at the same time mostly represent the occurrence of temporal relations
in children’s texts. However, while temporal relations had the lowest percentage of occurrence among the three groups of children’s writing samples, it was the second highest percentage of occurrence in the text book samples.

The following examples illustrate use of temporal sequential then and simultaneous at the same time in children’s expository writing, followed by examples of temporal sequential first, next, and finally in an expository article from children’s text book:

About 366 years ago, 20 Black Africans came to America. Then, our country was segregated. (urban African American)

All races have the right to learn and get a good education. At the same time, by using school busses students from different neighborhoods can go to school. (mainstream)

I thought of several things that you and I could do to stop vandalism. First, we could make posters against vandalism and hang them up all over our neighborhood. Secondly, we could report to the police when we see someone vandalizing other people’s property. If they run, try to get a description of what they look like. Another thing is, we could start a watch patrol in our neighborhood. These are some ways we can help S.W.A.T. brake vandalism. (urban Appalachian)

First, sewage is piped through screens that remove sticks and other large objects. Next, the sewage moves into settling tanks where small, solid materials settle out.... Finally, the treated sewage is pumped to a nearby river, lake, or other body of water. (text book)

**Lexical Cohesion.** Table 9 shows that use of lexical cohesion in their own expository writing was clearly demonstrated by all groups of sixth graders.
However, the mainstream group children used more lexical cohesion in their expository texts (26.02%) than did the urban Appalachian (22.08%) and urban African American children (25.41%). The table further shows that all subtypes of lexical cohesion which are forms of reiteration—repetition, synonym or near synonym, superordinate, or general word—occurred in all text samples.

**TABLE 9. MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF COHESIVE TIES = LEXICAL COHESION, ACROSS EXPOSITORY WRITING SAMPLES OF SIXTH GRADE CHILDREN, BY ETHNOLINGUISTIC GROUPS (STANDARD DEVIATION IN PARENTHESIS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNOLINGUISTIC GROUPS</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Type of Cohesion: Lexical Cohesion</th>
<th>Reiteration</th>
<th>Collocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>Superordinates</td>
<td>Synonym or Near Synonym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Appalachian</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>0.1361 (0.0560)</td>
<td>0.0540 (0.0354)</td>
<td>0.0159 (0.0141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban African American</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>0.1434 (0.0507)</td>
<td>0.0583 (0.0337)</td>
<td>0.0332 (0.0244)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>0.1461 (0.0578)</td>
<td>0.0585 (0.0368)</td>
<td>0.0278 (0.0228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Book Samples</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>0.2036 (0.0230)</td>
<td>0.0865 (0.0261)</td>
<td>0.0569 (0.0248)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following text samples from children's expository writing demonstrate their use of reiteration:

**Same identity:** (hero, Dr. King, and the man=Martin Luther King, Jr.)

*Martin Luther King, Jr.* was an American hero. He believed in having peace for everyone. We are free now partly because of what he did. He fought to bring Blacks and Whites together and when he did that we had more freedom and justice in this country. *Dr. King* emphasized freedom. He tried to tell us that we should not be prejudice toward each other. *The man* wanted to make sure we all have the freedom to say what we feel and what we think is right.
We should tell our friends not to vandalize. It is the "uncoolest" thing to do. We should tell them instead to preserve what we have.

He had a dream that the whole world unite and we all be as one. His message was for peace and nonviolence, not war. He wanted a day for love, not hate. A day for all races to join together.

We don’t have to drink from separate water fountains or play in separate parks. We are now free to live and learn together.

Martin Luther King encouraged nonviolence and taught that violence was wrong. He wanted to wipe out racism, poverty, and prejudice. Instead, he wanted justice and opportunity for all people, whether you’re black, white, yellow, or red. He fought to bring Black and White together in harmony. He believed that all races have to be free.

The last paragraph above also shows examples of superordinates (i.e., black, white, yellow, or red; Black and White=races).

Use of repetition had the highest percentage of occurrence, followed by superordinates. In fact, repetition had the highest percentage of occurrence among all cohesive ties in children’s texts and expository articles from their text books. For example, the word drug was repeated nineteen times in an African American sixth grade child’s 176-word essay on drugs; sewage was repeated eighteen times in the 513-word expository article from a children’s text book on how people help provide a clean environment; and in a mainstream group sixth grade child’s 94-word expository writing on freedom, freedom was repeated thirteen times.
To illustrate, below is an excerpt from an essay on vandalism by an African American sixth grade child. The word vandalism is used at least once in every sentence, twice in the second sentence:

I can stop vandalism by telling my friends to stop vandalizing. Vandalism only hurts you and your state even when you think vandalism is fun. Vandalism wouldn't be fun if you come home and found your house destroyed. Vandalism hurts worse when you blame it on your friends and then they get mad at you.

Another example is the following excerpt from an Appalachian sixth grade child’s essay on freedom. Similar to the excerpt on vandalism, the word freedom is also repeated in every sentence of the paragraph.

I have freedom to go where I want to go. I have freedom to read what I want to read. We should never forget the symbols of our freedom: the Statue of Liberty and the flag. When we talk about freedom we should never forget the Declaration of Independence which brought everybody to freedom. Now, people have freedom to own their houses and mow their lawn. People have freedom to vote for their own president.

Martin Luther King fought for freedom - freedom for Blacks. Even when they bombed his home he still fought for freedom. He even was threatened to be put in jail but he still fought for freedom.

As mentioned earlier, repetition also has a high frequency of occurrence in expository articles from children’s text books. Below are paragraphs from articles on space, drug abuse, and how to provide a clean environment. The words space and earth in the article on space; drug, tolerance, and person in the article on drug
abuse; and sewage in the article on how to provide a clean environment are frequent occurrences in the text:

What is Space?
Space is the vast and limitless expanse that is all around us. Our earth is traveling in space, and so are the sun, the moon, the planets, and the stars. There are many millions of heavenly bodies in space. Some are little particles like specks of dust. Others are so big that, compared to them, the earth would seem very tiny.

Where Does Space Begin?
Our earth is a whirling body in space. And because you live on the earth, you are living in space. But when we talk about out into space we mean traveling far, far away from earth into what is sometimes called outer space. Scientists do not agree on how many miles away from earth outer space begins. Some say it begins fifty miles away. Some say eight hundred. But scientists agree that to reach outer space we must go beyond our atmosphere. (About Space)

Tolerance occurs when a person’s body gets used to a drug. The abuser must use more and more of the drug to get the same effect. For example, suppose a person starts the bad habit of taking a sleeping pill every night to fall asleep. That person’s body will soon build tolerance to the sleeping pill. The two pills might be needed to make the person sleepy. As tolerance continues to build, the person might need three or four pills each night to fall asleep. (What Are the Dangers of Drug Abuse?)

What is Sewage? Sewage, or wastewater, from factories, houses, and other buildings threatens the safety of the drinking water supply. Sewage from your home might include human wastes, bits of food that go down the kitchen drain, and water you use to wash your hands. Factory sewage, like that shown in the river, often includes oil, grease, and poisonous chemicals. All sewage usually contains bacteria and viruses, which can cause disease. Sewage also contains sticks, rags, and other large objects that drain into sewers from city streets.

How Do Treatment Plants Improve a Community’s Water? To reduce the amount of water pollution, most communities in the United States pipe their sewage to wastewater treatment plants, commonly called sewage treatment plants. Many factories have their own sewage treatment plants. The drawing shows how some
harmful substances are removed from sewage at such a plant, although not all plants use all these processes. First, sewage is piped through screens that remove sticks and other large objects. Next, the sewage moves into settling tanks where small, solid materials settle out. The remaining sewage then might go to aeration tanks. Bacteria in the tanks feed on the sewage. Air is pumped into the aeration tanks to keep the bacteria alive. In another settling tank, the bacteria clump together and settle out. Next, chlorine gas is added to kill harmful bacteria and some viruses. Finally, the treated sewage is pumped to a nearby river, lake, or other body of water. Notice the difference between the sewage that enters the treatment plant and the sewage that leaves it. (How Do People Help Provide a Clean Environment?)

All the three groups of children's expository writing, as well as samples from their text books revealed the same rank order of percentage of occurrence of lexical cohesion: 1) repetition, 2) superordinates, 3) synonym or near synonym, 4) general word, and 5) collocation. (see Table 9).

**Gender differences.** Tables 10 and 11 show a comparison of the mean percentage of cohesive relations in four expository writing samples of each group of sixth grade female and male urban African American, urban Appalachian, and mainstream group children. Across the three groups, the female group--21.88% (Appalachian), 25.78% (African American), and 28.38% (mainstream)--obtained a higher percentage of reiteration than the male group--11.30% (Appalachian), 23.60% (African American), and 21.99% (mainstream). (See Tables 10 and 12). The African American female group had a higher mean percentage of cohesive
relations in all categories than their male counterpart. On the other hand, both the urban Appalachian and mainstream male groups had higher mean percentage of reference--11.37% (Appalachian), 12.22% (mainstream)--, conjunction--9.48% (Appalachian), 9.77% (mainstream)--, and substitution+ellipses--10.85% (Appalachian), 6.97% (mainstream--than their female counterparts--reference (10.61%-Appalachian, 10.03% mainstream), conjunction (6.88%-Appalachian, 8.85%-mainstream), and substitution+ellipses (4.36%-Appalachian, 6.97%-mainstream).

### TABLE 10. MEAN PERCENTAGE OF COHESIVE TIES ACROSS FOUR EXPOSITORY WRITING SAMPLES OF EACH GROUP OF SIXTH GRADE FEMALE CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnolinguistic Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Type of Cohesion</th>
<th>Repetition</th>
<th>Collocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>8.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian3</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian4</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean</td>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>10.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American3</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>11.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American4</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>11.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean</td>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>11.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>9.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream3</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream4</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>11.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean</td>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>8.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>12/48</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>9.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 shows that the sixth grade male and female children used all types of cohesion in the same order of frequency of occurrence from highest to lowest as follows: lexical cohesion, reference, conjunction, and substitution+ellipses. However, they differ in the frequency of occurrence of these ties in their expository writing. For example, the female group has a higher frequency of occurrence for reference over the male group (11.56% and 11.14%, respectively), as well as in lexical cohesion (26.30% and 22.71%, respectively). On the other hand, the male
group has a higher frequency of occurrence for conjunction over the female group (09.33% and 08.67%, respectively).

**TABLE 12. MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF COHESIVE TIES ACROSS FOUR EXPOSITORY WRITING SAMPLES OF SIXTH GRADE CHILDREN, BY GENDER (STANDARD DEVIATION IN PARENTHESIS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Type of Cohesion</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Sub. + Ellip.</th>
<th>Conj.</th>
<th>Lexical Cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>12/48</td>
<td>0.1156 (0.0438)</td>
<td>0.0475 (0.0268)</td>
<td>0.0867 (0.0460)</td>
<td>0.2630 (0.0832)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>12/48</td>
<td>0.1114 (0.0436)</td>
<td>0.0454 (0.0259)</td>
<td>0.0933 (0.0300)</td>
<td>0.2271 (0.0866)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 12, both gender groups demonstrated use of all the major types of cohesive devices in the same order of preference as reflected in the rank order of frequency of occurrence among the cohesive devices used. There is little difference in the percentages of frequency of occurrence for each cohesive device between the two gender groups. This suggests that gender differences do not clearly manifest itself as a factor that may strongly influence the nature of children's expository writing.

**"Successful" versus "Unsuccessful" students.** As shown in Table 13, sixth grade children perceived as academically "successful" or "unsuccessful" used all types of cohesion in the same order of frequency of occurrence from highest to lowest as
follows: lexical cohesion, reference, conjunction, substitution+ellipses. Substitution+ellipses were hardly ever used (04.52%-"successful", 04.78%-"unsuccessful").

However, the two groups differ in the frequency of occurrence of these ties in their expository writing. For example, those perceived as "successful" in their class academic work showed a higher frequency of occurrence of lexical cohesion and reference (26.19% and 11.44%, respectively) over those perceived as "unsuccessful" in their class academic work (22.82% and 11.26%, respectively). However, conjunction and substitution+ellipses have a higher percentage of occurrence across the expository writing of those perceived as academically "unsuccessful" (09.13% and 04.78%, respectively) over the expository writing of those perceived as academically "successful" (08.87% and 04.52%, respectively). For both groups the use of repetition was highest in frequency of occurrence, and use of reference, second.
TABLE 13. MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF COHESIVE TIES ACROSS EXPOSITORY WRITING SAMPLES OF SIXTH GRADE CHILDREN PERCEIVED TO BE ACADEMICALLY "SUCCESSFUL" AND "UNSUCCESSFUL" (STANDARD DEVIATION IN PARENTHESIS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEIVED ACADEMIC STATUS</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Type of Cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>12/48</td>
<td>0.1144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0408)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>12/48</td>
<td>0.1126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0465)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 14 and 15 show that while in both groups perceived as academically "successful" or "unsuccessful," lexical cohesion had the highest mean percentage of occurrence across categories of cohesive relations, followed by reference (except for the African American "unsuccessful" group which had conjunction second, and reference, third), the difference between each mean percentage of cohesive relations between those perceived as academically "successful" or "unsuccessful" within the same group varies from one ethnolinguistic group to another. Those perceived as academically "successful" in the African American group had a higher mean percentage of cohesive relations in all categories—lexical cohesion (27.97%), reference (11.30%), conjunction (10.05%), and substitution+ellipses (4.20%)—than their "unsuccessful" counterparts—lexical cohesion (21.42%), reference (9.53%),
TABLE 14. MEAN PERCENTAGE OF COHESIVE TIES ACROSS FOUR EXPOSITORY WRITING SAMPLES OF EACH GROUP OF SIXTH GRADE CHILDREN PERCEIVED TO BE ACADEMICALLY "SUCCESSFUL"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnolinguistic Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Type of Cohesion</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian Female1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>28.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian Female2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>18.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian Male1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian Male2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>17.29</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean</td>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>19.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Female1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>29.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Female2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>27.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Male1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>25.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Male2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>29.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean</td>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>27.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Female1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>20.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Female2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>32.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Male1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>21.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Male2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>12.21</td>
<td>19.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean</td>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>23.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>12/48</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>23.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conjunction (9.98%), and substitution+ellipses (3.69%). On the other hand, the mainstream "unsuccessful" group had a higher mean percentage of lexical cohesion (26.75%) than the mainstream "successful" group (23.62%), and even the urban Appalachian "successful" group (19.30%). However, in categories of reference and conjunction, the mainstream "successful" group had higher mean percentages than
TABLE 15. MEAN PERCENTAGE OF COHESIVE TIES ACROSS FOUR EXPOSITORY WRITING SAMPLES OF EACH GROUP OF SIXTH GRADE CHILDREN PERCEIVED TO BE ACADEMICALLY "UNSUCCESSFUL"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnolinguistic Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Type of Cohesion</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian Female1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian Female2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>23.19</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian Male1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian Male2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean</td>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Female1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>23.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Female2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>22.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Male1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>15.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Male2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean</td>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Female1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>34.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Female2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>25.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Male1</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Male2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean</td>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>12/48</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>20.76</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mainstream "unsuccessful" group. The urban Appalachian "unsuccessful" group had a higher mean percentage of conjunction (8.45%) than their "successful" counterparts (7.91%), but fell below the urban Appalachian "successful" group in lexical cohesion, reference, and substitution+ellipses.

The pattern that emerges as shown in Tables 14 and 15 above, suggests that in general, those perceived as "successful" use more cohesive devices in their expository writing than those perceived as academically "unsuccessful". This is particularly evident among the urban African American ethnolinguistic cultural
group children—the "successful" group had higher percentage of usage of all types of cohesive devices than their "unsuccessful" counterparts. In the two other groups—urban Appalachian and mainstream—those perceived as academically "successful" maintained a higher percentage of usage of most of the cohesive devices than their "unsuccessful" counterparts. However, a closer look into the types of cohesive devices that frequently occurred across the four expository writing of each child within the "successful" and "unsuccessful" groups revealed quite an interesting pattern. Across the four expository writings of children perceived as academically "successful", a degree of selectivity in the types of cohesive devices they use on the different kinds of expository genre prose they are asked to write becomes evident. For example, reference was observed to be occurring more frequently in the Martin Luther King, Jr. texts; conjunction in the vandalism texts; and repetition in the freedom texts. On the other hand, with the group perceived as academically "unsuccessful", no such pattern is evident. The children simply demonstrated use of all types of cohesive devices across their four expository writings in the same rank order of frequency of occurrence—lexical cohesion, reference, conjunction, and substitution+ellipses.

**Density of cohesive ties.** Table 16 below shows the average cohesive density scores in four expository writing samples of each sixth grade urban Appalachian, urban African American, and mainstream children, as well as in four expository
articles from their textbooks. An average density score for each group was also computed. A cohesive density score (Witte, 1980) was computed by dividing the number of words per text by the number of cohesive ties per text. In this case, instead of computing for cohesive density score per child’s expository writing, an average density score for four expository writing of each child was computed as follows: first, the number of words in each of the four expository writings per child were added; second, the cohesive ties for all the four expository writings of each child were also added; and finally, the total number of words for the child’s four expository writings was divided by the total number of cohesive ties identified in the same four expository writings to produce an average density score for each child’s expository writings. For example, if the total number of words in four expository writings of an Appalachian child is 827 words, and the total number of cohesive ties in the same four expository writings is 470 cohesive ties, the average cohesive density score for the child’s writings gained by dividing 827 (total number of words) by 470 (total number of cohesive ties). The resulting score (1.76) indicates the average number of words separating each tie. Thus, a low cohesive density score suggests a more frequent occurrence of ties within the text; a high cohesive density score suggests that more words are in between two ties.

After the average cohesive density score was computed for each member of the ethnolinguistic cultural groups, an average group cohesive density score was also computed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Appalachian</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Mainstream</th>
<th>Text Book Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Group Density</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that the expository writing of urban Appalachian children produced density scores from 1.56 to 2.35, with an average of 2.03; the urban African American children’s exposition had density scores of 1.65 to 3.26, with an average of 2.11; density scores for mainstream group children’s texts ranged from 1.67 to 2.87, with an average of 1.98; and the text book expository articles showed density scores of .62 to 2.04, for an average of 1.46. In rank order, with the low scores indicating less number of words occurring between each instance of a tie, the text book expository articles showed the greatest density of ties, followed by
expository writing of the mainstream group children, urban Appalachians, and then the urban African Americans.

**Cohesion Index.** Expository text samples by urban Appalachian, urban African American, and mainstream group children, including the four expository articles from their text books, were coded to identify unambiguously or clearly used coreferential cohesion devices, and ambiguously or unclearly used coreferential cohesion devices. Coreferential devices included pronouns, comparatives, and ellipses. For example, use of a pronoun was coded as unambiguous by this researcher if it succeeded in maintaining a relationship of identity with its referent as in the following example:

> When **people** take drugs they can be in serious trouble. Drugs can cause **them** their life. I don't believe people must take drugs.

The use of **they**, **them**, and **their** refers back to **people** and is an example of reference; the relationship between **they** and **people** is termed coreferent; so are **them** and **people**, **their** and **people**. The coreferential relationship is clearly established within the text, therefore **they**, **them**, and **their** can be coded as unambiguously used devices. On the other hand, if this researcher found it difficult
to identify the interpretive source of a cohesion device, that cohesive device is coded as ambiguous or unclear. For example:

Drug dealers sell marijuana and cocaine and tobacco and cigarettes.
I feel that people should avoid them. It causes disease.

In this case, the pronouns them and it do not clearly lead to the referent. Them could possibly refer to drug dealers or marijuana and cocaine and tobacco and cigarettes. It does not have any clear interpretive source either. This researcher coded them and it as ambiguous use of cohesive devices.

Expository text samples by urban Appalachian, urban African American, and mainstream group children showed a high percentage of unambiguously used coreferential cohesion devices and a low percentage of ambiguously referenced devices. To compute for a *Cohesion Index*—proportion of unambiguous or clearly referenced cohesion device—and *Inappropriate Cohesion Index*—proportion of ambiguous or poorly referenced cohesion device—the coreferential cohesion scores for each text were transformed to indices by dividing the total number of coreferential cohesion devices by the total number of T-units in each text. Tables 17 and 18 below show the range of *Cohesion Index* and *Inappropriate Cohesion Index* for each group of children’s expository writing samples.
### TABLE 17. MEASURE OF COHESION INDEX ACROSS FOUR EXPOSITORY WRITING SAMPLES OF SIXTH GRADE URBAN APPALACHIAN, URBAN AFRICAN AMERICAN, MAINSTREAM GROUP CHILDREN, AND THEIR TEXTBOOK EXPOSITORY ARTICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Urban Appalachian</th>
<th>Urban African American</th>
<th>Mainstream</th>
<th>Text Book Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean Index</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 18. MEAN INAPPROPRIATE COHESION INDEX ACROSS FOUR EXPOSITORY WRITING SAMPLES OF SIXTH GRADE URBAN APPALACHIAN, URBAN AFRICAN AMERICAN, MAINSTREAM GROUP CHILDREN, AND THEIR TEXTBOOK EXPOSITORY ARTICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Urban Appalachian</th>
<th>Urban African American</th>
<th>Mainstream</th>
<th>Text Book Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>8/32</td>
<td>4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Mean Index</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A high *Cohesion Index* of 2.10 for mainstream group children's expository writing, a low of 1.87 for the urban African American children's exposition, and a 2.03 for the urban Appalachian children's expository texts, are noted. On the other hand, the urban African American children’s expository texts have the highest mean *Inappropriate Cohesion Index* of .09 compared to the urban Appalachian children’s .06, and the mainstream group children’s .05. Meanwhile, the text book expository articles are all clearly referenced, having a *Cohesion Index* ranging from 1.74 to 3.36, a mean of 2.59.

**STATISTICAL ANALYSES**

To determine whether ethnolinguistic group membership, gender, and/or academic status would yield different mean proportion of occurrence for each type of cohesive devices, various repeated measures analysis of variance were performed. Using p-value > 0.05 as significance level, results showed basically no significant differences in the mean proportion of occurrence of the use of cohesive devices across children's expository writing as well as in the expository articles from their text books; across ethnolinguistic cultural groups; between gender differences; and between those perceived as academically "successful" and "unsuccessful." However, in the subcategories of cohesive relations, statistical results showed significance below .05. For example, between groups of those perceived as "successful" and "unsuccessful" the mean proportion of occurrence of the use of reference across
texts varied \(F(3,17)=3.2776, \ p\text{-value}=0.0466\), particularly with the use of pronominalization \(F(3,17)=5.0497, \ p\text{-value}=0.0111\). The mean proportion of occurrence of the use of comparatives varied across these children’s expository writing \(F(3,17)=3.4221, \ p\text{-value}=0.0411\), as well as in the mean proportion of usage of reiterative superordinates across their own texts \(F(3,17)=8.314, \ p\text{-value}=0.0013\), and the mean proportion of occurrence of reiterative superordinates between the two groups \(F(1,19)=4.80, \ p\text{-value}=0.0411\). Across ethnolinguistic cultural groups the mean proportion of occurrence of the use of conjunctive adversative differed \(F(2,19)=4.54, \ p\text{-value}=0.0245\); these groups also differed in the mean proportion of occurrence of the use of reiterative synonyms and/or near synonyms \(F(2,19)=4.74, \ p\text{-value}=0.0214\). At \(p\text{-value} > 0.05\), the urban Appalachian children’s expository writing has a significantly higher mean proportion of occurrence of conjunctive adversative than the urban African American and mainstream group children’s writings. The urban African American and urban Appalachian children’s expository writings differ significantly in the mean proportion of occurrence of reiterative synonyms and/or near synonyms. The mainstream group children’s expository writings have a significantly higher mean proportion of occurrence of substitution+ellipses than the urban Appalachian and urban African American children’s expository writings.
Compared to the samples of expository writing from the children's text books, the mean proportion of occurrence of demonstrative reference in children's expository writing is significantly lower, an estimated difference of between (-0.0766, -0.0091). The urban Appalachian and mainstream group children's expository writings have a significantly lower mean proportion of occurrence of reiterative synonyms and/or near synonyms; however, there is no significant difference between the expository samples from text books and the urban African American expository writing samples.

Table 19 below is a summary of statistical results that showed level of significance.

**TABLE 19. SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL RESULTS WITH LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE ON SUBCATEGORIES OF COHESIVE DEVICES USING ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategories of Cohesive Devices</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>P-value (&gt;0.05 as significance level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Between &quot;Successful&quot; and &quot;Unsuccessful&quot; Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Reference Across Texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Use of Pronominalization</td>
<td>F(3,17)=3.2776</td>
<td>0.0466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Use of Comparatives</td>
<td>F(3,17)=5.0497</td>
<td>0.0111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Superordinates</td>
<td>F(3,17)=3.4221</td>
<td>0.0411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F(3,17)=8.3140</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Across Ethnolinguistic Cultural Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Use of Conjunctive Adversative</td>
<td>F(2,19)=4.54</td>
<td>0.0245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Use of Synonyms and/or Near Synonyms</td>
<td>F(2,19)=4.74</td>
<td>0.0214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLASSROOM LITERACY LEARNING PRACTICES

Observations and documentation of classroom literacy practices involving both the teacher and students particularly during children's expository prewriting, writing, and postwriting activities were made. The purpose was to capture the set of meanings established by both the teacher and the students in "teaching" (on the teacher's part) and "learning" (on students' part) "how" to write expository prose that later would reflect on the students' language in the written mode.

The urban Appalachian, urban African American, and mainstream group children had a process oriented approach to writing. The teacher provided them with opportunities to read about their topic, join small group discussions, and share the information they have gathered about the topic, take down notes, and ask questions. While the class used the basal reader mostly as their source and model for writing, the teacher encouraged the class to use library resources for gathering more information about their topic. The teacher also invited the class to develop a content outline and usually walked the class through a collaborative writing, before they withdrew to their "quiet" space (Calkins, 1990) to begin their first draft. The teacher also spent time with each student in conference as the class went through the writing process. Peer sharing and evaluation were encouraged. Children's finished products were shared with the class, displayed in the hallway, and a few of the children's writing were submitted to a writing contest.
The results of this study did not show much significant differences in the similarities and dissimilarities in the use of cohesive devices between urban African American and urban Appalachian children's expository writing, as well as in the expository writing of their mainstream counterparts and the expository genre prose from text books that serve as "models" for their writing. All the sixth grade children regardless of their ethnicity, gender, and "success" or "lack of success" in their academic tasks, demonstrated a certain degree of familiarity with cohesive devices to allow them to be in "register" when writing an expository genre for a particular purpose, e.g., to argue against vandalism. The results of the cohesion analysis of these children's use of cohesive devices showed practically the same rank order of frequency of occurrence of each major cohesive device in their writing; the same rank order of frequency of occurrence matches those found in the expository articles taken from their text books which serve as their "models" of writing. For example, in all expository writing, including the text book sample expository articles, the most frequently used cohesive devices were lexical cohesion particularly repetition, reference, and conjunction. Substitution and ellipses were hardly ever used, neither was collocation. Among the four expository articles taken from children's text books which serve as their "models" of writing, collocation was not found. A measure of density of ties across the four writing samples of each sixth grade urban African American, urban Appalachian, mainstream group children, and their text book expository articles showed that the text book
expository articles had the greatest density of ties, followed by the expository writing of the mainstream group children, urban Appalachians, and then the urban African Americans. Ambiguously used coreferential cohesion devices were a rarity as was confirmed by the results of computing the cohesion index. The results also showed that while all major cohesive devices were found in the ethnolinguistic cultural group children’s expository writing, as well as in the expository writing of their mainstream counterparts, and the expository articles taken from their text books, the mean percentage of frequency of occurrence of each cohesive device varied from child to child, from piece to piece written by the same child, and group to group. Further, a significant difference in the types of cohesive devices used across the four children’s expository writing was found between those perceived as academically "successful" and "unsuccessful". Part of the research study also provided a documentation of the literacy learning practices particularly in writing that the sixth grade ethnolinguistic cultural group children, as well as the mainstream children, experienced with the same teacher. A positive process oriented approach to writing was identified in these children’s classroom literacy learning environment.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Littlefair (1991) discusses expository writing as a genre characterized by registers that are different from those used by writers of a literary genre. This is because an expository genre is purpose related, as in to explain, persuade, describe, or argue. Perera (1984) describes expository writing as one that focuses more on abstraction—processes and concepts. A good deal of the writing in an expository genre is non-chronological, structured by linguistic features such as the use of passive voice in science text books, and a number of reiterations in an effort to explain quite complex new ideas in few words (Perrera, 1986; Christie, 1985). The use of appropriate linguistic features that characterize an expository genre can be measured by using cohesion analysis. Thus, cohesion analysis was used in looking at the two ethnolinguistic cultural groups, and mainstream children’s expository writing, as well as the expository genre prose from their text books that serve as "models" for their writing.

Research (e.g., Chapman, 1983, 1987; Cox, et al., 1990; DeStefano, et al.; DeStefano & Kantor, 1988; Pappas, 1985) that looked into children’s writing from
a cohesion analysis perspective suggests that indeed, cohesion helps create text by providing "texture" through its variety of cohesion linking mechanisms and semantic devices. To a certain degree, the sixth grade ethnolinguistic cultural group children, as well as their mainstream counterparts, were able to put together texts into a meaningful whole by using cohesive devices, mostly repetition-reiteration, followed by references and conjunctions.

Research also suggests that cohesion is but one part of the text-forming components of the linguistic system. In fact, some studies that examined the relationship between cohesion and writing quality—whether texts high in use of cohesive ties are automatically better written and more comprehensible by adult readers than those with fewer cohesive ties (e.g., Cox, Shanahan, & Sulzby, 1990; also Cox, Shanahan, & Tinzmann, 1991), were not conclusive in their suggestion that texts high in use of cohesive ties are better written and more comprehensible by adult readers than those with fewer cohesive ties. Thus, although some expository writing of ethnolinguistic cultural group children, their mainstream counterparts, as well as the expository articles taken from their text books were high in use of cohesive ties, this did not necessarily suggest that these expository writings were better written and more comprehensible than those expository writings with fewer cohesive ties.

The results of this study indicate that the sixth grade urban Appalachian and urban African American children made use of all principal types of cohesive ties
in their written expository prose as did their mainstream group counterparts. The
ttempt to employ major text-forming strategies in keeping with the characteristics
of the expository genre was found among all groups of sixth grade children with
the differences lying more in the frequency of occurrence of the type of cohesive
ties in each piece of writing.

The children’s expository writing revealed familiarity with the types of
cohesion devices that would satisfy the purpose for which they were doing a
writing activity. For example, on topics that required them to explain or to reason,
the conjunctive causal because had a high frequency of occurrence within the text.
For examples:

We have to break vandalism because we need to keep our place
safe and clean. Vandalism hurts because people can get into some
serious trouble when others vandalize.

In some instances, children demonstrated appropriate use of conjunctions of
comparison or contrast such as on the other hand or instead to emphasize ideas.
For example:

Here in our country we enjoy a lot of freedom. On the other hand,
some peoples don’t have freedom in their own countrys.

Martin Luther King, Jr. preached about peace. He told Black
people to be nonviolent instead of fighting.
Expository signals such as *I mean* and *for example*, *in other words*, as well as temporal sequential such as *first, second, then, next*, or *finally* to explain a procedure were also evident in these children’s writing. For examples:

> Stopping vandalism is important to us and it is against the law. *I mean* you can go to jail or pay big money for it.

> I think we should arrest or tell on people who vandalize. There never should be a thing such as crime. The ones that vandalize just laugh and think of it as fun. *For example,* kids threw a pop can at me in the bus and said I threw it at them. When I got off they started to pencil fight. They broke the pencil and threw it on the ground.

> If I want to succeed in my goal *first* I have to study hard. *Then* I need to practice to improve myself. The more I try the better I get at my work. My goal is going to be reached as long as I pay attention and get all my work done.

While the design of their instructional expository articles may be described as a bit contrived (*for example*, too much attention seems to be given to *repetition* as opposed to *reiteration*) to ensure readability as in the following:

> To reduce the amount of water pollution, most communities in the United States pipe their *sewage* to wastewater *treatment plants*, commonly called *sewage treatment plants*. Many factories have their own *sewage treatment plants*. The drawing shows how some harmful substances are removed from *sewage* at such a *plant*, although not all *plants* use all these processes. First, *sewage* is piped through screens that remove sticks and other large objects. Next, the *sewage* moves into settling *tanks* where small, solid materials settle out. The remaining *sewage* then might go to aeration *tanks*. Bacteria in the *tanks* feed on the *sewage*. Air is pumped into the aeration *tanks* to keep the bacteria alive. In another settling *tank*, the bacteria clump together and settle out. Next, chlorine gas is added to kill harmful bacteria and some viruses. Finally, the treated *sewage* is pumped to a nearby river, lake, or other body of water.)
students made frequent use of a variety of lexical ties, particularly repetition, synonyms, near synonyms, superordinates, and collocation; general words, such as those stuff referring to anything or everything that has to do with drugs—marijuana and cocaine and tobacco and cigarettes, were very rarely used. The types of cohesive devices that children paid more attention to in their expository writing seemed to match the types of cohesive devices that frequently occurred in their text book expository articles which serve as their "models" of writing. For example, children depended much on repetition to explain a point in their expository writing which is also the type of cohesive device frequently found, for example, in expository articles in their science text book. Use of collocation as opposed to reiterative cohesion devices was not evident in children’s expository writing, just as collocation was not found at all in the four expository articles taken from the children’s text books. Again, the influence of the kinds of writing children are exposed to and which serve as their "model" of writing was clearly demonstrated in children’s preference of cohesive devices in their own writing.

While the expository articles from children’s text books did not offer much "modelling" for a variety of registers appropriate for different genres, the sixth grade ethnolinguistic cultural group children and their mainstream counterparts were somehow able to effect a more cohesive text by developing more meaning related ties between t-units, as in the following urban African American’s expository writing:
I don’t know why people quit school. It seems so stupid for them to just throw their whole life away just because they don’t want to go to school. They just want to not be able to read and write. All their life they will not be able to get a job and be a trash picker. They will sleep on a bench or on the ground all their life.

Appropriate use of coreferential cohesive devices them, their, and they to refer to people. Another example is the following urban Appalachian’s essay on Martin Luther King, Jr.:

Martin Luther King, Jr. was an American hero telling us about the American ideals of freedom, justice and opportunity. He believed in having peace for everyone. We are free now, partly because of what he did. He fought to bring Blacks and Whites together and when he did we had more freedom and justice in this country. One example is that there are opportunities for Blacks in the government now.

In reading the text above, one can keep track of Martin Luther King, Jr. via the appropriate use of a coreferential cohesive device he referring to Martin Luther King, Jr. However, as Hasan (1984) suggests, for a text to be a "regular" text—one from which a reader is able to gain a good idea of its overall content--using one type of cohesive device is not sufficient. By the writer’s use, for instance, of reiteration and the association between lexical items (as shown in the above text sample), co-extension is established that allows the reader to successfully decode the text. The text used as an example in this case demonstrates use of lexical cohesion as a semantic linking-mechanism or chain. Reiteration is achieved via the following lexical ties (repetitions underlined):
Martin Luther King, Jr. was an American hero telling us about the American ideals of freedom, justice and opportunity. He believed in having peace for everyone. We are free now, partly because of what he did. He fought to bring Blacks and Whites together and when he did we had more freedom and justice in this country. One example is that there are are opportunities for Blacks in the government now.

Although not a part of cohesion but still of significance as far as children’s knowledge of expository writing is concerned, it was noted that children’s expository writing also showed their understanding of the appropriate functions for, and audiences of, exposition. For example, nonparticularization as in the use of the general exophoric "we" and "you" were found in their writings. Halliday & Hasan (1976, p. 53) explain the general exophoric use of the generalized personal pronouns such as one, we, you, or they in which the interpretive source of these pronouns may be any general group of human beings, e.g., one can never tell what the future holds; or a particular group of individuals with which the speaker wishes to identify himself, e.g., we better do something about it before it’s too late. The following passage from an urban African American child’s expository writing makes this type of use of we as general exophora:

Martin Luther King’s main idea was to make the world nonviolent. We should fulfill that dream by supporting it. We should do our best.
We can keep his message alive by loving one another and to agree with one another. We don't have to fight because one will not agree with another. There are many things to teach our future leaders. If we don't stop killing our brothers and sisters this world will fall apart.

I think freedom is very special and we must take it seriously. That's why we have laws to protect our rights.

The use of exophoric you-your, and we are demonstrated in the following text of an urban Appalachian child:

Remember your neighborhood will be so much better without vandalism. To stop vandalism, you should encourage your parents to join Block Watch. Do not let your friends talk you into vandalizing. If you know one of your friends or anyone else is doing vandalism, report them to the police, even if they might not like you anymore.

I thought of several things that you and I could do to stop vandalism. First, we could make posters against vandalism and hang them up all over our neighborhood. Secondly, we could report to the police when we see someone vandalizing other people's property. If they run, try to get a description of what they look like. Another thing is, we could start a watch patrol in our neighborhood. These are some ways we can help S.W.A.T. brake vandalism.

The sixth grade children from ethnolinguistic cultural groups as well as the mainstream group children had important similarities and differences in the use of cohesive devices in their expository writing. Most children's expository writing demonstrated use of all cohesive devices at varying mean proportions of frequency of occurrence within a text, but the rank order of cohesive ties from highest to
lowest frequency of occurrence remained constant across cultural groups. For
instance, all groups had lexical cohesion as the highest frequency of occurrence and
substitution+ellipses with the lowest, or hardly any frequency of occurrence. An
interesting difference was between those perceived as academically "successful"
and "unsuccessful." The type of cohesive ties found to be frequently occurring
within a given text depended on the content and purpose for writing the text. This
was true of the expository writing of the "successful" group.

On the other hand, the "unsuccessful" group had practically the same types
of cohesive devices regardless of the nature of the writing experience. For
example, pronominalization had a higher frequency of occurrence in the
"successful" group children's expository writing on Martin Luther King, Jr. than
their use of demonstrative or comparative references; the use of conjunctive
adversative and causal was more frequent in their expository writing on vandalism,
than their use of conjunctive additive; and their use of lexical cohesion, particularly
repetition, was more often found in their expository writing on freedom. On the
other hand, the "unsuccessful" group did not have varying types of cohesive device
across their four expository writing samples. For example, repetition was the most
frequently used cohesive device regardless of whether the topic was on Martin
Luther King, Jr., vandalism, or freedom.

The cohesion patterns demonstrated by those perceived as academically
"successful" suggest some notions about the use of cohesion and coherence. It
could be that the "successful" group exercised selectivity in their choice of the types of cohesive devices they were to use for certain kinds of expository writing, and their choices reflected an understanding of the genre they are writing, in this case, expository prose. On the other hand, it could also be that the "unsuccessful" group did not have an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge of the use of appropriate cohesive devices because they had very little understanding of the expository genre to begin with, and/or they lacked sufficient information to write about (such as to provide supporting details for an argument) to enable them to use the necessary cohesive devices.

It would also seem that a high frequency of occurrence of cohesive devices does not necessitate comprehensible writing (e.g., Carrell, 1982; Tierney & Monsenthal, 1981). For example, the "unsuccessful" group children's expository writing that demonstrated high frequency occurrence of repetition did not necessarily suggest more comprehensible writing. Therefore, knowledge of the use of appropriate cohesive devices is a necessary but not sufficient condition for judging "quality" writing.

In general, the students' expository writing showed that the sixth grade children have been introduced to expository genre and are familiar with the expectations related to writing in that genre. Most of their expository texts showed an attempt at providing interpretation and speculation of results. To illustrate, note
the following excerpts from urban Appalachian, urban African American, and mainstream group children’s supportive arguments on why freedom is important:

Freedom is a way of life. In America, you’re free. In other countries, you’re not. In America you’re free to go anywhere you want. People in jail do not have freedom; they gave it up when they committed a crime. (mainstream group)

In other country’s other than the United States, freedom is much different. For example, in some country’s people do not have the right to vote. In some country’s they do not have the right to wear clothes they want. Sometimes they’re not allowed to do something they want to. More or less, their freedom is restricted. (urban African American)

In the United States there are a lot of different colored people. There are also a lot of prejudice people who don’t care who’s feelin’s they hurt. People should’t hold the color of a person against them. People should try to get along with all kinds of different colored people. (urban Appalachian)

To a certain degree, these children used opposing arguments and a response to the opposition in their expository writing. However, these components of argument still needed supportive details. While they were able to offer a series of claims, usually they did not follow them up with sufficient supporting data. The results support Bereiter and Scardamalia’s (1982) analysis of immature writer’s failure to provide the needed elaboration in their writing. The results can also be related to research that suggests that awareness of register of written texts is developmental. As such, it can not be said that because a writer displays awareness of the register of one type of writing, s/he is capable of the same level
of awareness when writing in a different genre. Children expand their written "registers" as they are exposed to a variety of genres and a rich writing environment. Thus, as in the case of the children in this study, they were weakest in offering and interpreting data and in recognizing and responding to opposition most probably because they are still in their developmental writing stages as far as genres and registers are concerned and the kinds of "models" of writing they are exposed to are not sufficient for them to be able to communicate effectively in expository writing. For example, in arguing for the importance of stopping vandalism, a child wrote:

Vandalism is the malicious defacement of private or public property. Vandals can be sent to jail for a couple of years. Vandalism is a very important crime. It has to be stopped. Some people choose to vandalize. Seventy percent of vandals are under the age of nineteen. If vandalism gets worse there will be a lot of crimes committed. Cops can't catch many people who vandalize because there is vandalism everywhere in the world.

The example paragraph presents an argument as to why vandalism needs to be stopped. However, there are no sufficient supporting details to elaborate the argument further in order for the writer to accomplish his purpose of persuading the reader into agreeing with his argument. It seems that most of their expository writing still straddled between narrative and non-narrative style. Their expository writing reflected a lack of textual prompts to guide the elaboration that will assist the reader in understanding the argument.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study is based on a specifically selected groups of student samples. The results are not generalizable to the entire population of school children at this grade level. However, it does seem that by analogy, students who are the same grade level and exposed to similar literacy-learning approaches to writing could produce expository texts similar to those described in this study.

This study provides useful information to researchers and/or teachers because it suggests that children at a certain grade level, regardless of their ethnolinguistic cultural background, can gain insight into and knowledge about expository texts and reflect them in their own writing, as long as they are provided with sufficient literacy learning experiences, particularly in expository writing. While relationships between writing and speaking are complex, and the task of writing in an appropriate register quite demanding particularly for ethnolinguistic cultural group children such as the urban African Americans and urban Appalachians, because they bring with them a language variety different from what is used and expected of them in their classroom literacy learning context, it appears that these children do "learn" the appropriate registers for specific genres if provided with a rich and nurturing writing environment. For example, as observed and documented during this researcher's visits to the classrooms of children in this study during their literacy learning sessions that particularly related to their later expository writing, the urban Appalachian, urban African American, and mainstream group children
had a process oriented approach to writing in which there were ample opportunities for them to read about their topic, share and discuss the information they had gathered about the topic either as a class or in small groups, take down notes, ask questions, formulate content outline, and even experience collaborative writing prior to their first draft. While the class used the basal reader mostly as their source and model for writing, children also used the library resources to gather more information about their topic. Conferencing was part and parcel of the ongoing writing process and peer sharing and evaluation were encouraged. Putting children's finished written products on display, even submitting a few to writing contests, added a positive dimension to children's writing experience.

It could be said that the urban Appalachian, urban African American, and mainstream group children in this study learned to write exposition at least to a certain degree of complexity, through their text book samples, exposure to good samples, teacher-students interaction, and teacher's feedback. To move them forward and have them write exposition using more complex text-forming strategies, it would seem wise then to provide children with substantial opportunities to read and use a variety of well written expository texts, other than the ones found in their instructional text books. Clearly, having children depend on their instructional text books as "models" of writing is very limiting. Results in this study show how children's choices of cohesive devices match those found in the expository articles taken from their text books. Thus, the cohesive devices that
occur more frequently in these "models" of writing are most likely the cohesive devices that will turn up in the children's writing. The cohesive devices such as collocation that are hardly or not used at all will most likely not show in the children's writing as well. While the choices of use of cohesive devices do not necessarily dictate writing "quality", having children exposed to different ways by which cohesive devices can be used for a variety of writing purposes would enhance children's growth in writing, particularly in expository writing. Further, providing children with substantial experiences in writing for a variety of expository-appropriate audiences and functions would facilitate their knowledge and understanding of expository writing. Planning, composing, and revising activities that focus on expository writing might be an effective way to help them extend their knowledge of use of cohesive relations and organizational structure that are found in exposition.

In conclusion, this research study focussed on the issue of disparity in literacy levels among the ethnolinguistic cultural group children--the urban African Americans and urban Appalachians, and their mainstream counterparts. More specifically, it focussed on "writing" and writing expository genre taking into consideration some suggestions about the possible reasons for the difficulty ethnolinguistic cultural group children are challenged with as part of their literacy learning experience. First, that perhaps the ethnolinguistic cultural group children experience more difficulty in dealing with the written conventions particularly in
expository writing because of their home literacy environment that may have limited or no access to print, or even if different kinds of print are available, children may not necessarily pay attention to them. Second, more so than their mainstream counterparts, ethnolinguistic cultural group children do not have the experience of being exposed to written models of the kinds of language use expected of them when they come to school. Third, ethnolinguistic cultural group children’s home language variation, being different from the language used in school, may cause children to "retreat from print" (Lunzer & Gardner, 1979). In other words, the failure of ethnolinguistic cultural group children to produce "appropriate" writings could have been a result of the "dramatic shift" from their oral-literacy-experience background to the type of writing literacy experience in which they are required to operate.

The research study probed further to include a contrary possibility that children (regardless of their ethnolinguistic cultural background) develop a wealth of knowledge about language, print, and relationships among language processes particularly in writing as they advance in their literacy learning experiences in school, and that they "learn" sufficient writing strategies to enable them to produce "appropriate" texts. More specifically, the study proposed to find out whether as children from different ethnolinguistic cultural groups such as the urban African Americans and urban Appalachians advance in their literacy level within a school setting, and as they experience more exposure to the kinds of "appropriate" writings
expected from them (e.g., expository prose via text book material as models), they are able to "bridge the gap" between whatever differences existed initially in their oral-written discourse characteristics so as to be able to produce "appropriate" text for a particular genre, in this case expository prose. A corollary to this is that children’s inability to learn to write or to write appropriately on a given writing task can be partly blamed on weak and/or inadequate writing instruction (Moffett, 1985).

To address the above issues of concern, the research study investigated the written cohesion patterns found in the expository writing within each ethnolinguistic cultural group of sixth grade urban African American, urban Appalachian, and mainstream culture children. It looked into the similarities and dissimilarities in the written cohesion patterns found in the expository writing of sixth grade children across all ethnolinguistic cultural groups. It also looked into the written cohesion patterns found in the expository genre prose of sixth grade text books which are often the "models" of the genre. The cohesion patterns found in the expository writing of sixth grade urban African American, urban Appalachian, and mainstream culture children were then compared in usage and frequency of usage to those found in sixth grade text books used as children’s "models" for expository writing. Comparisons and contrasts were made between these children’s expository writing and the samples of expository writing from their text books.
The results suggested that ethnicity, gender, and language variation do not play a major influence in the writing of children in the upper grades, e.g., sixth grade. Results also suggested the importance of children's classroom literacy learning experiences, particularly those that relate to their later writing activities, for them to be able to write "appropriate" texts. This was evident in the similarities found in the children's use of all major types of cohesive devices—reference, substitution, conjunction, and lexical cohesion—and the rank order in the frequency of occurrence of each cohesive devices in their expository writing. The same findings were also evident in the sample expository articles taken from the children's text books used as "models" for their writing, which suggested the influence "models" of writing may have on children. Therefore, the quality and kinds of "models" of writing introduced to children may be crucial to developing their skills in writing.

The significant difference noted between the types of cohesive devices used by children across groups that were perceived to be academically "successful" and "unsuccessful" suggested two possible explanations. One is that the academically "successful" group had a better knowledge of the expository genre and sufficient information about the topic being written that "appropriate" registers were selected as reflected in the choices of cohesive devices used among their four expository writing samples. The second is that the academically "unsuccessful" group had less familiarity with the expository genre and/or insufficient information about the topic
written as shown in their lack of elaboration or presentation of supporting arguments in their writing. Thus there was no opportunity for them to demonstrate clearly their knowledge of "appropriate" use of cohesive devices. Nevertheless, both suggest that the more exposure these children have to the kinds of writing expected of them, the better opportunity they have to produce "appropriate" writing. As children progress through school and are increasingly expected to produce "appropriate" forms of writing for different purposes, those who have a clear understanding of how meaning is created, e.g., argumentatively, descriptively, persuasively, are advantaged; those who do not have a good knowledge of the meaning linking mechanism that produces "appropriate" forms of writing will be limited by their own inadequacy and will not be able to express their "meanings" in effective communication manner. The demands on the teacher can not be underestimated. A prerequisite is teacher's knowledge of how genres and registers work together so that s/he can model forms of writing and call attention to how genres are structured and what appropriate registers are needed in order to enhance children's use of language in writing more effectively.

The four major questions posed in this research study were answered by using cohesion analysis. Important information that would be helpful to teachers of ethnolinguistic cultural group children particularly sixth grade urban African Americans and urban Appalachians include: 1) Sixth grade ethnolinguistic cultural group children develop written cohesion patterns to include major cohesive devices
just like their mainstream counterparts; 2) There are more similarities than dissimilarities in the types of cohesive devices sixth grade children across ethnolinguistic cultural groups and within groups use as demonstrated in their expository writing; 3) The cohesion patterns found in the expository writing of sixth grade urban African American, urban Appalachian, and mainstream group children are comparable in usage and frequency of usage to those found in the expository articles taken from their sixth grade text books which serve as their "models" of writing; and 4) The frequency of usage of cohesive devices varies from child to child, and group to group.

The findings in this study are not sufficient basis to generate conclusive statements about the knowledge urban African American and urban Appalachian children have about writing, genres, and registers, particularly expository writing. While cohesion analysis succeeded in gaining information about the cohesive devices these two ethnolinguistic cultural groups have a level of familiarity with to be able to produce expository prose, as well as compare and contrast their use of cohesive devices with their mainstream counterparts including those found in the expository articles taken from their text books which serve as their "models" of writing, the information does not say much about the "quality" of children’s writing. The types of cohesive devices used and the frequency of occurrence of cohesive ties across children’s writing do not serve as determinants of clarity, appropriateness, and comprehensibility in writing as Halliday and Hasan (1976)
suggested. For the purpose of looking into "quality" of children’s writing, perhaps cohesion analysis, including cohesive harmony, can be used along with other measures that would provide more qualitative description of children’s writing.
APPENDIX A

COHESION ANALYSIS CODING SCHEME
((Halliday & Hasan, 1976)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Cohesion</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pronominals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstratives and definite articles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Comparatives</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substitution</strong></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Nominal substitutes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Verbal substitutes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clausal substitutes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ellipses</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Nominal ellipses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Verbal ellipses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clausal ellipses</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conjunction</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Additive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adversative</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Causal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Temporal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Same item</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Synonym or near synonym (incl hyponym)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Superordinate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. General word</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Collocation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

COHESION ANALYSIS OF A SIXTH GRADE
URBAN AFRICAN AMERICAN EXPOSITORY PROSE

1. I like to be drug free.
2. Many people think drugs are cool.
3. It’s stupid to take drugs.
4. I don’t know why people think that drugs aren’t harmful.
5. Drugs are used to kill people.
6. Drug dealers sell marijuana and cocaine and tobacco and cigarettes.
7. I feel that people should avoid taking drugs.
8. It causes disease.
9. Why do people take drugs?
10. Drugs take human minds.
11. When people take drugs they end up dead.
12. Drugs usually destroy a lot of bodies.
13. Why does the law let the drug dealers get away?
14. The drug dealers keep coming back to sell more drugs.
15. The law is responsible for their crimes.
16 It is not normal to take drugs.
17 I feel that drugs shouldn’t be allowed at all.
18 I hate it when people die of drug addiction.
19 Two million people die of drugs.
20 Drugs can kill you.
21 I don’t understand why people are not put in jail for selling drugs.
22 Shouldn’t people take only drugs that are not harmful?
23 I feel that drugs shouldn’t be allowed in this country.
24 I know that drugs are harmful.
25 I feel that drugs can be stopped from being sold.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence number</th>
<th>No. of ties</th>
<th>Cohesive item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Presupposed item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>drugs</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>it</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>to take drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>drugs</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>harmful</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>harmful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>drugs</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>people</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kill</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>harmful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>marijuana</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cocaine</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tobacco</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cigarettes</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>drugs</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>taking drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>drugs</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>drugs</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>human minds</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>drugs</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>they</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>drugs</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bodies</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>the drug dealers</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>drug dealers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>drug dealers</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>drug dealers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14 3 the drug dealers R2 drug dealers
more L1 drug dealers R3 drugs

15 3 the law R2 law
their L1 law R1 drug dealers

16 2 it R1 to take drugs
drugs L1 drugs

17 1 drugs L1 drugs

18 3 it R1 when people die...
people L1 people
drug addiction L5 drug free

19 3 people L1 people
die L3 destroy
drugs L1 drugs

20 2 drugs L1 drugs
kill L3 destroy

21 2 people L1 people
drugs L1 drugs

22 3 people L1 people
drugs L1 drugs
harmful L1 harmful

23 1 drugs L1 drugs

24 2 drugs L1 drugs
harmful L1 harmful

25 1 drugs L1 drugs
APPENDIX C

COHESION ANALYSIS OF A SIXTH GRADE URBAN APPALACHIAN EXPOSITORY PROSE

1 Stopping vandalism is very important because schools and other places will not have to spend so much money replacing the things people vandalize.

2 They will not have to spend so much of their time cleaning it up.

3 Children also can grow up in a better environment, which means it would be cleaner and healthier.

4 Your neighborhood will look a lot nicer and more presentable.

5 So remember, your neighborhood will be so much better without vandalism.

6 To stop vandalism, you should encourage your parents to join Block Watch.

7 You could report someone if you see them vandalizing.

8 It is bad!

9 Do not let friends talk you into vandalizing.

10 If you know one of your friends or anyone else is doing vandalism, report them to the police, even if they might not like you anymore.

11 A Block Watch program can show you how to do these things.
12 If vandalism happened to you, how do you think you would feel?
13 I think my family and I would be very sad if someone wrote on our garage or caught our garbage can on fire.
14 No matter what is damaged, it makes you feel unhappy.
15 Vandalism is wrong and it means you are destroying somebody else's property.
16 How it hurts!
17 One way it hurts is if you commit the crime, you have to pay.
18 How do you think you would feel if you got caught for vandalizing someone's property?
19 I think you would not feel good about yourself because I know how I would feel.
20 I would feel very ashamed.
21 It hurts and especially when it happens to you.
22 I thought of several things that you and I could do to stop vandalism.
23 First, we could make posters against vandalism and hang them up all over our neighborhood.
24 Secondly, we could report to the police when we see someone vandalizing other people's property.
25 If they run, try to get a description of what they look like.
26 Another thing is, we could start a watch patrol in our neighborhood.
27 These are some ways we can help S.W.A.T. brake vandalism.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence number</th>
<th>No. of ties</th>
<th>Cohesive item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Presupposed item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>because</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>stopping vandalism is very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vandalize</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>schools</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>other places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>schools, other places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>it</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>things vandalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>better</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>which means</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>a better environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>it</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cleaner</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>healthier</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nicer</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more presentable</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>stopping vandalism...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>better</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vandalism</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>vandalism</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>if you see...</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>report someone...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vandalizing</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>them</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>vandalizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>vandalizing</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>vandalizing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10  6  if you know...  S3  report them...
even if  C2  they might not...
them  R1  friends/anyone else
they  R1  friends/anyone else
vandalism  L1  vandalism
friends  L1  friends

11  2  Block Watch  L1  Block Watch
these  R2  things (reporting)

12  2  if vandalism...  S3  how do you...
vandalism  L1  vandalism

13  2  family  L3  friends
if someone...  S3  wrote on...

14  3  damaged  L3  vandalism
it  R1  vandalism
unhappy  L2  sad

15  3  vandalism  L1  vandalism
it  R1  vandalism
destroying  L2  damaged

16  1  it  R1  vandalism

17  4  it  R1  vandalism
if you commit...  S3  you have to pay
crime  L2  wrong
hurts  L1  hurts

18  5  if you got...  S3  how you would feel...
vandalizing  L1  vandalizing
property  L1  property
feel  L1  feel
someone  L1  someone

19  4  feel  L1  feel
good  L3  bad
because  C3  vandalizing
feel  L1  feel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Word(s)</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Word(s)</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>feels</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>feel</td>
<td>L3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ashamed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>vandalism</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hurts</td>
<td></td>
<td>feeling hurt</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>vandalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>vandalism</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>vandalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>ways to stop vandalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vandalism</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>vandalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>make, hang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>them</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>posters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>secondly</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>ways to stop vandalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>police</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vandalizing</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>vandalizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people's</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>property</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>someone</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>someone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>if they...</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>get a description...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>someone vandalizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>another thing</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>ways to stop vandalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>watch patrol</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Block Watch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>these</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>ways to stop vandalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.W.A.T.</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Block Watch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brake</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>stop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vandalism</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>vandalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

COHESION ANALYSIS OF A SIXTH GRADE MAINSTREAM EXPOSITORY PROSE

1 Dr. Martin Luther King was a good man because of his dream we are all freer today.

2 There is less fighting, fewer wars, and not so many beatings in the street.

3 Now, we are all free to go to restaurants together and not be judged by our color.

4 We don't have to drink from separate water fountains or play in separate parks.

5 The Supreme Court banned segregation so we could all be free to live and learn together.

6 All races and ethnic groups can get a good education which lead to good jobs.

7 All groups of people have the right to listen and learn together at the same time.

8 By using school busses, students from many different neighborhood can go to school together.

9 Many races of children can make friends.

10 Our schools are better because of Dr. King’s message.

11 Before, races weren't allowed to vote.
When Abraham was voted president he let all the slaves go.

When he was a child he went to a different country where there was a slave sale.

He saw how they were being tortured.

When he got back to his country he told everyone in his country about the slaves.

He wanted to be a lawyer so he read a law book.

After that he won for president.

After all that hard work he went through he became president.

The slaves were already free.

When Martin Luther King arrived he joined in.

Martin Luther King made the slaves even freer.

Then one day as he was doing a speech he got shot.

That’s how we got Martin Luther King’s Day.

Everybody kept his dream for him.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence number</th>
<th>No. of ties</th>
<th>Cohesive item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Presupposed item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Martin Luther King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>because</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>result is freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>his</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Martin Luther King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>fighting</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>wars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wars</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>beatings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>less</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>fighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fewer</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>wars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>now</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>as opposed to past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>restaurants</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>free</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>freer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fountains</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>separate</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>separate</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>play</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>segregation</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>free</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>live</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>live, learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>together</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ethnic groups</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>races</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>good</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>races</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>color</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
groups L1 groups
people L3 groups
listen L1 listen
learn L1 learn
together L1 together
at the same time C4 all groups...

school L2 education
students L3 school
different L2 separate
neighborhood L3 street
together L1 together

races L1 races
children L3 students
friends L3 children

schools L1 school
better R3 schools
because C3 Dr. King’s message
Dr. King’s L1 Martin Luther King

before C4 as opposed to now
races L1 races

voted L2 vote
he R1 Abraham
slaves L3 people

he R1 he, Abraham
child L1 Abraham
he R1 he, Abraham
different L1 different
country L5 people, races
slave L1 slaves

he R1 he, Abraham
they R1 slaves
tortured L2 beatings
15  7  he  R1  he, Abraham  
  his  R1  he, Abraham  
  country  L1  country  
  he  R1  his, Abraham  
  his  R1  he, Abraham  
  country  L1  country  
  the slaves  R2  slaves  

16  5  he  R1  his, Abraham  
  lawyer  L1  he, Abraham  
  so  C3  read law book  
  law  L3  lawyer  
  book  L3  read  

17  4  after that  C4  becoming a lawyer  
  he  R1  Abraham  
  president  R1  president  
  won  L3  voted  

18  4  after all that  C4  working hard...  
  he  R1  Abraham  
  he  R1  Abraham  
  president  L1  Abraham  

19  2  the slaves  R2  the slaves  
  free  L1  free  

20  2  M.L.King  L1  Martin Luther King  
  he  R1  Martin Luther King  

21  4  M.L.King  L1  Martin Luther King  
  the slaves  R2  the slaves  
  even  C2  freer  
  freer  L1  freer  

22  5  then  C4  after freedom...  
  he  R1  Martin Luther King  
  speech  L2  message  
  he  R1  Martin Luther King  
  shot  L3  tortured  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Annotator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>how we got...</td>
<td>Martin Luther King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.L.King's</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Luther King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Martin Luther King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dream</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>dream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>him</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Martin Luther King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

COHESION ANALYSIS OF AN EXPOSITORY ARTICLE
FROM CHILDREN'S TEXT BOOK

1 The proper use of medicine helps millions of people around the world every day.

2 Some people, however, use medicines and other drugs in harmful, dangerous ways.

3 The intentional use of drugs for reasons other than health is drug abuse.

4 The abuse of drugs can produce many harmful effects.

5 Some of these effects are immediate.

6 They occur within a few minutes or hours after taking the drug.

7 A sick feeling in the stomach is one common immediate effect of drug abuse.

8 Others include headache, sleeplessness, high blood pressure, vomiting, and even death if a person takes too much of the drug.

9 Some dangerous effects of drug abuse occur after a period of continued abuse.

10 These long-term effects include tolerance and dependence.

11 **Tolerance** occurs when a person's body gets used to a drug.

12 The abuser must use more and more of the drug to get the same effect.
For example, suppose a person starts the bad habit of taking a sleeping pill every night to fall asleep.

That person's body will soon build tolerance to the sleeping pill.

Then two pills might be needed to make the person sleepy.

As tolerance continues to build, the person might need three or four pills each night to fall asleep.

These larger amounts of sleeping pills might lead to an overdose— an amount of a drug too large for the body to use.

An overdose can cause serious health problems.

Dependence is the need for a drug.

The need might be mental or physical.

A mentally dependent person thinks he or she needs the drug to function or make it through the day.

With physical dependence, a person's body needs the drug to avoid feeling sick.

A person can be both mentally and physically dependent on a drug.

Sometimes a person who is physically dependent on a drug stops taking it.

The person might then suffer from a sickness called withdrawal.

The symptoms of withdrawal can vary, depending on the drug that had been used.

Withdrawal symptoms can be unpleasant and dangerous.

Usually the person becomes nervous, depressed, or panicky.

Other symptoms include chills, fever, vomiting, and severe aches and pains.
People withdrawing from certain drugs often need to be hospitalized for a short time.

Usually, after a short withdrawal period, the body learns to function without the drug.

Physical dependence stops.

Mental dependence, on the other hand, is often more difficult to stop.

A person can overcome dependence, but he or she must be willing to get proper help and find healthier, more constructive ways to deal with problems.

The picture shows one way of dealing with drug-related problems.

A person who wants help is talking with someone who has special training and experience in helping others with their problems.

Some organizations in your community probably provide such counseling.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence number</th>
<th>No. of ties</th>
<th>Cohesive item</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Presupposed item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>people medicines drugs however dangerous</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>people medicines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L1 medicines</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>medicines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C2 help vs. harmful</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>harmful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>intentional use drugs other than health drug abuse</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>proper use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L1 drugs</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3 medicines, drugs</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>intentional use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>the abuse of harmful</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>drug abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L1 harmful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>some effects</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L1 effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>they within a few... after minutes the drug</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3 immediate</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>taking the drug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4 hours</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2 drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>immediate effect drug abuse</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L1 sick feeling</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L1 drug abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>others headache sleeplessness high blood pressure vomiting even person the drug</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3 sick feeling</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>immediate effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3 immediate effect</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L2 people</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>the drug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Word(s)</td>
<td>Location(s)</td>
<td>Translation(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>dangerous effects</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>dangerous effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drug abuse</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>drug abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after a period</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>continued abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abuse</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>occur</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>occur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>these long-term tolerance</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>dangerous effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tolerance</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>dependence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>tolerance</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>tolerance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>occurs</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>occur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>person's body</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drug</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>drug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>abuser</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more and more drugs</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>drugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the drug</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>a drug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>effect</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>for example</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>a person...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>person</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the bad habit taking pills</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>taking pills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pill</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>drug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>person's body</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tolerance</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>tolerance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the sleeping pill asleep</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>a sleeping pill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>sleeplessness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>then pills the person</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>after a pill...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sleepy</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>asleep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as tolerance... C4 continues to build...

the person R2 the person

pills L1 pills

asleep L1 asleep

build L1 build

these...pills R2 three or four pills

larger R3 amounts of pills

an amount R2/L1 overdose/amounts

large L2 larger

drug L1 drug

body L1 body

an overdose R2 overdose

serious L2 intentional

health L1 health

dependence L1 dependence

the need R2 need

drug L1 drug

the need R2 the need

physical L3 mental

mentally L2 mental

dependent L2 dependence

person L1 person

he or she R1 person

the drug R2 the drug

make it L2 function

physical L1 physical

dependence L1 dependence

person’s L1 person

body L1 body

the drug R2 the drug

feeling sick L2 health problems
person mentally physically dependent drug

person mentally physically dependent drug

person who physically dependent drug

the person suffer then sickness

withdrawal symptoms varying depending the drug

withdrawal symptoms unpleasant dangerous

the person nervous depressed panicky
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Term 1</th>
<th>Level(s)</th>
<th>Term 2</th>
<th>Level(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>symptoms</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>symptoms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chills</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>sick feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fever</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>sick feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vomiting</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>vomiting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>severe</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>serious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aches</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>sick feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pains</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>aches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>withdrawing</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>withdrawal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>drugs</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>withdrawal</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>withdrawal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the body</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the drug</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>the drug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>short time</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>physical dependence</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>physical dependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stops</td>
<td>L1/L3</td>
<td>stop/continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>mental dependence</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>mental dependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on the other hand</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>mental/physical...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more difficult</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>mental/physical...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>person dependence</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>person dependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>but</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>overcome/willing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>he or she</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proper</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>proper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>healthier</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>ways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more constructive problems</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>ways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>problems</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>dealing</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>problems</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>drug-related</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>drug abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36 6 person L1 person
who... S1 person...
who... S1 someone...
experience L2 training
their R1 others
problems L1 problems

37 2 community L3 organizations
counseling L3 help
REFERENCES


Campbell, K.E. (1991). "Bad English" and "Slang": Students' perceptions of dialect in writing. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (42nd), Boston, MA


Dyson, A.H. (1991b). *The word and the world: Reconceptualizing written language development, or, do rainbows mean a lot to little girls?* *Research in the teaching of English*, 25, 97-123.


Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. (1986). *Black students' school success: Coping with the burden of "acting white."* *The urban review,* 18, 176-206.


Kress, G.R. (1986). *Reading, writing and power*. In C. Painter and J.R. Martin (Eds.), *Writing to mean: Teaching genres across the curriculum*. Papers and workshop reports from the 'Writing to Mean' Conference held at the University of Sydney.


Simon, R. Empowerment as a pedagogy of possibility. Language arts, 64(8), 370-383.


Stumbo, C. (February 1989). *Teachers and teaching (Beyond the classroom).* HER, 59(1), 87-107.


