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Abstract

The present study is a work on cohesion and how it contributes to coherence of texts. Cohesion of text samples on road traffic accidents from the academic text category is compared to that of samples on the same theme from the reportage text category.

The study follows the descriptive framework by Halliday and Hasan (1976) to identify and describe the cohesive devices present in the samples. Later, these cohesive devices are reclassified according to Hartner (1986) into those that achieve staticness and those that achieve dynamism in a bid to find out which of the two text categories is more coherent than the other.

Perhaps a major contribution of this study is the revelation that, using cohesion as the yardstick, academic texts used in this study are found to be more coherent than texts from the reportage text category. The study however recommends that research should be carried out using more data than that used here to prove whether Hartner's (1986) model will determine their coherence.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

Text

In this work, the word text has been used to refer to written rather than spoken language. This distinction is a necessary one since some writers use text generally to refer to both written and spoken discourse. Text is a semantic unit above the sentence that has the function of communicating a message. The sentences of the text together make a communicative whole/unit. The texts under study here were taken from reportage and academic text categories.

Reportage text Category.

These are texts that are relatively informal narrative descriptions of incidents drawn from newspaper reports. The specific newspaper reports dealt with are those describing road traffic accidents.

Academic Text Category.

They are texts that are relatively formal and discursive in nature, written for academic purposes and especially after following strict academic research procedures. They include theses and published works as found in journals and books. Text samples from this category were drawn from road traffic accident reports.

Cohesion
Cohesion is defined here as the unity of a text. Those formal devices that link one part of a text to another making it a unified logically flowing whole are referred to as cohesive devices (or cohesive features). Halliday and Hasan (1976) consider cohesive devices as the necessary reins that hold the clauses of a text together.

**Tie**

When through the use of a cohesive device there is a semantic bond between this device and some other member in the textual environment, the two elements so linked form a cohesive tie. A single instance of cohesion therefore signals a kind of two-ness.

**Static cohesive ties.**

These are those cohesive ties that maintain the reader's attention on what has been said earlier. They are inherent in the language and remain unchanged.

**Dynamic cohesive ties.**

They are often ties that are a manipulation of the writer. They develop the logic of the discussion unlike static ties which merely hold the reader's attention on past discussions. The writer uses the particular kind of dynamic tie that signals to the reader the intended interpretation of the text.

**Coherence**
Whenever it occurs in this study, coherence is that property by which the textual world is not only relevant, but also accessible and acceptable to the reader. Thus the text hangs together and makes meaning.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

1.1 Background to the problem

This study is an investigation of the nature of cohesion and cohesive devices in academic and newspaper text types. Cohesion, one of the processes which function to realise a text in its communicative role, refers to those surface structure features linking different parts of a text and making it flow logically. These grammatically marked surface structure features are termed as cohesive devices (Halliday and Hasan, 1976) found inherent in the language for writers to manipulate to suit their purposes. A writer has to decide, for example, whether a word is to be repeated, whether a synonym is to be used or if a pronoun can be used instead of an entire item. How should relationships among parts of a text be represented? These decisions are based on the extent of shared writer-reader knowledge and on the writer’s ability to develop understanding through text patterns.

The research problem in this study stems from text linguistics, an area that found prominence in the 1970s. Since this period, much linguistic research e.g Lovejoy (1991), Hartnet (1986) has focused on the use of language in its context. This functional approach has meant that the conventional linguistic studies of the sentence have been extended to studying larger stretches of text. Text linguistic studies in the past two decades have aroused interest in text consumers and
producers alike. One of the greatest challenges facing researchers today is to examine how both linguistic and non-linguistic resources are used in text production and processing to produce different types of texts. Comparative examinations of academic and non-academic texts as in this study have also been given priority.

As an area of study, text linguistics emphasizes the use of naturally occurring language data in its context exploring text as the primary object of inquiry. Text as defined in this study is exemplified in written forms drawn from newspaper reports and academic writing.

Texts can be classified into various text types depending on their style or genre. Every genre has its own discourse structure (Halliday and Hassan 1976: 327): for instance, poetic writing is known for its condensed but elevated style. Press reports on the other hand display the highlighting of consequences before details; academic reports display full development of issues which are often discussed critically. Such reports are usually more cohesive than poetry. As stated below, our study focuses on cohesive features found in academic and newspaper text types.
1.2 Statement of the problem

In this study, a comparative approach is adopted to describe the nature of cohesion in road traffic accident reports drawn from newspaper articles and excerpts of written academic (learned) texts. Halliday and Hasan's (1976) cohesive categories have guided the study to identify and describe these features in our text samples (c.f chapter 3). Hartnet (1986:144) argues that it is possible to analyse cohesion in texts as it contributes to coherence in prose through a reclassification of Halliday and Hasan's (1976) cohesive categories into static and dynamic cohesive classes. Static cohesive features are those cohesive features that hold attention on a topic without changing it in any way. They refer the reader to what has already been encountered, by use of, for instance repetition, and pronouns. Dynamic cohesive ties on the other hand, specify how a writer manipulates an internal representation. They are crucial because they forge a text ahead, e.g temporal and clausal conjunctions. Unlike static devices which must remain unchanged according to the rules of the language e.g reference items he, she, the writer has the prerogative to use the particular dynamic cohesive ties that develop his message best. Consider,

1. Where is Zack?

1.1. He has gone to hide because he doesn't want to

meet your father.

In example 1.1 above, he is a static cohesive tie as it is a pronoun referring us to Zack, whereas because is a dynamic one informing the reader to move forward. It can be substituted by other conjunctions like since, as or for. The
area of focus in this study is how static and dynamic cohesive ties contribute to the overall coherence of each of the two different text categories under investigation.

In an attempt to highlight whether it is possible to account for the overall unity of the texts in terms of the categories of cohesion used, the study seeks to address the following questions:

a. What set of cohesive devices define similarities and differences between the reportage and academic text categories?

b. Using the distinctions of static and dynamic cohesive ties, to what extent can one text category be gauged as more coherent than the other.

1.3 Objectives of the study

The research objectives are:

1. To identify and describe the type of cohesive features used in two types of text categories: newspaper reportage and those used in the discussion section of learned (academic) writing on road traffic accidents.

2. To explain the use of various categories and subcategories of cohesive devices in the two text categories so as to determine their coherence.

3. To compare how static and dynamic cohesive ties are used in the two text categories.
1.4 **Research assumptions.**

The research was based on the following assumptions:

1. Newspaper and learned writing utilise cohesive devices for various purposes.
2. The learned text category utilises dynamic cohesive ties more than texts in the newspaper category, which utilise more of the static ones.

1.5 **Scope and limitations.**

Text linguistics is a relatively new area of linguistic study in which, at the moment, only few text types have been studied in detail e.g Lovejoy (1991), Bazerman (1981) and Hartnet (1986). Text samples from the academic category have formed the scope of such studies. This study however, extends the scope of data by focusing on two text categories: reportage and academic. The study determines the nature of cohesion in text samples drawn from the three dailies in Kenya (*the Daily Nation, the East African Standard* and *the Kenya Times*), and from three scholarly reports.

Newspapers carry varied features like news, advertisements and competitions. Our investigation specifically chooses and deals with road traffic accident reports. Such road traffic accidents are quite frequent in Kenya and receive coverage in both the print and electronic mass media. Text samples containing an accident reported on 9th April 1995 have been used as they are readily available.

Extracts from only the discussion sections of three academic reports provide data
for the analysis in the learned text category. Analysing a whole lengthy report tends to result in the omission of significant details, notwithstanding the time limit for the study.

Although text samples containing diagrams and photographs may have a strong visual impact on the reader, the study uses data from samples without such features as the main focus of the study is cohesion. It is probable however, that such features in a text do not seriously affect the flow of the text. Consequently, they do not form the scope of analysis in this study.

1.6  **Rationale of the study.**

A study of cohesion in various text types is important because cohesive features create unity in texts. Their proper manipulation not only makes the text flow well, but also enhances easy reading. A detailed analysis of the use of static and dynamic cohesive features reveals which devices contribute significantly to the unity of the text, and hence a text’s overall communicative effect.

All forms of newspaper reportage rely heavily on language in use. Such reports need not only be continuous, but unambiguous as well. This study explores those cohesive resources used in academic and press reportage. It is hoped that it provides some insight within the broad field of text linguistics.

A review of related literature on studies based on data drawn from the Kenyan
context reveal a tendency for emphasis to be laid on a formal approach to dwell on theoretical linguistic levels lower than the sentence e.g. Njoroge (1996). In this study however, a functional approach (i.e. language in its communicative natural context) is adopted with the hope that it will provide some insight on issues regarding supra-sentential structures.

Evidence shows that almost every copy of the daily newspapers in Kenya carry news on tragic road traffic accidents. For example in August 1995, a report on an accident involving a school bus and a lorry dominated the three dailies. In another report in May 1997, a fatal accident also claimed a record 33 people in a multiple road traffic accident (the three daily newspapers 5-5-97). The problem of road safety therefore is of concern to everyone: the public, the government and even to non governmental organizations like the Road Safety Network of Kenya. A total 2130 people were reported dead in road accidents in 1995 (Kenya Times 1-1-1996). In 1996, the figure soared to 3000 people (according to the then deputy commissioner of police Mr. Kimanthi). In the domain of academia, this implies that there is need for detailed studies not only of issues contributing to this phenomenon, but also on how the information regarding it is presented. It is hoped that this study with a linguistic perspective, albeit a theoretical one, will contribute some insight into the linguistic strategies adopted by both the news media and scholars.

Apart from being a national crisis not only due to large numbers of people
involved, but also due to frequent occurrence, there is a practical need for knowledge on road traffic accidents from all sectors of society. This theme has long been of interest to the researcher who was personally affected when she lost her father to such an accident early in her life. The theme, thus helped us to determine the genres to compare in this study. It is possible to get literature on road traffic accidents in newspaper reports since they are the immediate print forms that inform the public whenever such accidents occur. They are also readily available due to the nationwide circulation in large numbers. Academic texts on road traffic accidents were thought comparable to newspaper reports because the academic genre is a long established writing community touching on almost every aspect of society; even road traffic accidents. There is therefore need for studying it.

1.7 Research Design

1.7.1 Sampling Procedure and Data collection.

For the purpose of identifying cohesive features for the study, three news articles one from each of the three English language daily newspapers in Kenya, namely the *Daily Nation*, the *East African Standard* and the *Kenya Times* were used. It is argued that such variety of sample source would be more representative of the newspaper genre than drawing from only one of the dailies. It was felt as in other studies like Lovejoy (1991) and Bazerman (1981) that three articles are sufficient for a study of cohesion.
Reports of a single tragic road traffic accident drawn from the three dailies are used to provide the data for the reportage text category (RTC). This accident occurred on 9th April 1995 and was reported by all the three newspapers. To arrive at this particular report, it involved first getting the month that had the highest number of accidents in the year. A review of reports from this sample revealed that the month of June did not have all the three newspapers having a long enough report. The month of April which had the next high number of accidents was considered for providing the sample. The accident reported on 9th April was used since the report carried by all the newspapers had 300 words and above. Longer articles are likely to show greater evidence of cohesion unlike one paragraph, twenty word news briefs.

The study, in addition utilised three text extracts drawn from the discussion section of various reports in the academic category. A literature search in the university and other relevant library catalogues revealed that there are hardly any published scholarly works on road traffic accidents in particular. Consequently, the study worked with three such reports i.e. Agoki (1988), Baerwald (1973) and Jacobs and Fouracre (1977) selected by judgemental sampling from the few available ones. The discussion sections of these texts had no diagrams at all that distort their cohesive flow. The texts were judged for continuous prose so as to see how the sentences connect to form a communicative whole. Listed points would not provide continuity of sentences, and thus wouldn’t have the cohesive devices this study set out to analyse.
The length of excerpts used from both text categories was equal, each category having 56 sentences. As in other studies e.g Lovejoy (1991), it has nevertheless, been felt that using a higher number of words or sentences for one text than the other does not affect the results of such analyses.

1.7.2 Data analysis.

The data for the present study was analysed by first rewriting the individual sentences of each text excerpt in the scrap book. This was in order to lay emphasis not only on the cohesive devices, but also on the cohesive ties (two-ness) occurring in the texts. It has been observed that this approach enables the sentences of the text to be separated as a methodological procedure before any analysis begins. This then enables the identification of the cohesive features in the excerpts, and the listing of these into the two categories; static and dynamic cohesive features as explained (c.f 1.2). The frequencies of occurrence and the percentages of all types of cohesive devices in each text category were calculated. The distribution of the cohesive devices in the text samples was used then in comparing how frequently the categories and sub-categories of cohesive ties are used in each text category. A further analysis involved a comparison between the use of static and dynamic cohesive features in the two text categories.
1.8 Theoretical Framework.

There are various models of cohesion, like Hasan's (1984) point to point model of cohesion, and Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) procedural model of text analysis (1.8.1 ff). However, a broad descriptive framework developed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) provides the scope for the identification and description of the cohesive devices in this study. This model is particularly suitable in this study as it is descriptive in nature. It has been used (e.g. Lovejoy (1991)) to study cohesion in academic texts. Lovejoy, (1991:327) for example observes that "...the descriptive model should prove to be useful in comparative studies of writing in different disciplines". Within this framework, it is possible to identify and describe cohesive features which are then classified into reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. Each class has several sub-classes as shown in Table 1 in this section. Central to this method of analysis is the argument that cohesive devices enable the meaning of elements in the preceding part of the text to be reiterated by elements in the following sentences. The interpretation of an element cannot be effective except by recourse to an earlier one. Cohesion therefore, creates formal links among the various sentences in a text, which add to unity in the text. Consider the following example:

2. Many of the survivors were taken to the district hospital.

Encountering such a sentence, one is left with several questions: Survivors of what? Which district hospital? For interpretation, the reader needs to refer back to the preceding text because both instances of the referent the imply that the
identity of **survivors** and **hospital** is within the text for retrieval.

Table I below gives an outline of the cohesive categories as described by Halliday and Hasan (1976) and which have been used in analysing the data in this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>pronominals</td>
<td>her, him, it, they, us, him, them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demonstratives</td>
<td>this, that, these, those.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>definite article</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comparatives</td>
<td>different, equal, same, highest, than, increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution/</td>
<td>nominal</td>
<td>same, one, zero, ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ellipsis</td>
<td>verbal</td>
<td>be, so, have, do, zero.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clausal</td>
<td>so, not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>additive</td>
<td>and, furthermore, or, for example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adversative</td>
<td>yet, but, however, instead of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>causal</td>
<td>so, hence, because, since, therefore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>temporal</td>
<td>Then, finally, firstly, soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>repetition</td>
<td>bus-buses, test-testing-tested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>synonymy</td>
<td>leave-depart, screams-wails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>superordinate</td>
<td>vehicle-matatu, bus, lorry, car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collocation</td>
<td>sheep-wool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>general word</td>
<td>human being-boy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted from Halliday and Hasan (1976) pages 242-322-329
According to the Halliday and Hasan (1976) framework, five different categories of cohesive devices may be identified. These are: reference, ellipsis/substitution, conjunctions and lexical organisation.

1. Reference

This is a semantic relation where a lexical item points to a referent within the text for its interpretation. In this case, there is an identity of meaning between the two. Cohesion is created when the meaning of an item is retrieved from its referent within the text. The reference may be anaphoric where an item points to an already mentioned referent, or it may be cataphoric, looking forward to an item to be established in due time. Within this framework, Halliday and Hasan (1976) consider only the anaphoric items as being cohesive. As in other studies e.g. Hasan (1984) the present study views both the anaphoric and cataphoric instances as cohesive since in both cases one has to retrieve the information from the text. Examples of reference items are pronominals, the definite article, demonstratives and comparatives which occur in the following examples:

3. A bus collided head-on with a matatu and burst into flames.

3.1 The burnt shells of both vehicles were still smouldering.

3.2 The bus was heading towards Nairobi.

In example 3 above, there is reference to a bus and then to the bus in 3.2. The gives specification that this is the same bus earlier referred to. Comparative
reference is shown in example 4 below, taken from Halliday and Hasan (1976:79).

4. Gerald Middleton was a man of mildly but persistently depressive temperament. Such men are not at their best at breakfast.

Such in this particular example likens Middleton to men with mildly but persistently depressive temperament.

2 Substitution / Ellipsis

These are essentially the same grammatical relations within the text. Substitution is the replacement of one item by another, while ellipsis is the replacement of an item by a zero element, or the omission of an item altogether. In either case, cohesion is created when the meaning of the ellipted (substituted) element is retrieved from the text. The form substituting another must preserve the grammatical function of the presupposed item. A substitute for a noun must be a noun, and similarly, a form substituting for a verb must be a verb. Subcategories within this broad category therefore include: nominal, verbal and clausal substitution (ellipsis). In this study, the sign \( \ldots \) will be adopted to indicate ellipsis. Example 5 below illustrates nominal substitution.

5. His bus owned by Akamba Bus Service collided with another one owned by Crossline about 10 kilometres from Mombasa town.
One is a substitute for bus and this is recoverable from the text. That \( \Phi \) for shows nominal ellipsis of the word prediction in example 6 below.

6. Hence judging the models by slope and intercept criteria revealed that the prediction for pedestrians came nearest the ideal line followed by that \( \Phi \) for passengers and then the one for motorcyclists.

Clausal substitutes include 'so' and 'not'. We have zero clausal ellipsis when the whole clause has been omitted, yet the text is still interpretable.

3 Conjunctions

These cause cohesion when conjunctive elements are used to link one clause to another in order to mark the semantic relation holding between them. Conjunctions are divided into additive, adversative, causal and temporal. Consider:

7. Therefore, drivers were found to be potentially responsible for 49% of those killed whereas pedestrians have a share of 45%.

In example 7 above, therefore is used as a causal conjunction and whereas an additive one.

4 Cohesion by Lexical organisation.

Cohesion is created when there is a semantic relationship between various
vocabulary items in the text. The later derive their meaning clarification from one other. Since the text focuses on a particular theme, the lexical items used have some semantic relation. They could be synonyms or outright repetitions of the same lexeme. The writer may use the general term e.g human beings or a superordinate term like females to refer to both girls and women. In example 3 above, there is reference to a bus and then the bus in 3.2, exemplifying lexical repetition of bus. Burnt in 3.1 is synonymous with burst into flames and smouldering. Vehicles in sentence 3.1 is a superordinate term for bus and matatu in 3.

The four categories as described above, were used as a basis for the identifying and classifying of similar features in this study data. In addition, the framework developed by Hartner (1986) which recategorises these cohesive devices into the distinctions of static and dynamic cohesive features was used to define the study further. Hartner's (1986) sample of compositions shows that in textual organisation of prose, static and dynamic ties perform distinct functions. She observes that while static ties connect stretches of text, dynamic ones, on the other hand, advance the logic of a discourse. In this study, text samples from the reportage and academic text categories, have been used to investigate further how static and dynamic ties contribute to textual coherence. This is following Hartner's (ibid) argument that cohesion in writing contributes to coherence in prose.
1.8.1 Review of Related Literature

It was noted in the introduction to the study (c.f 1.1) that the present study falls under the relatively new area in linguistics, that is, text linguistics. Text linguistics grew from various disciplines, among them linguistics, semiotics, psychology, anthropology and sociology (McCarthy, 1991). It follows a functional approach to language use as propagated by M. Halliday (1985) which maintains that language is used to fulfil a communicative function. It also relates to perspectives in systemic linguistics which views language as composed of different but interrelated systems. Choices from one system may co-occur with choices from within other systems (Buttler, 1985). Within this approach, meaningfulness is regarded as a very essential aspect of language and therefore should not be divorced from its context.

Text grammarians like Halliday and Hasan (1976), Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) regard text as language elements strung in relationships that can be defined. Studies in this field necessarily imply the study of writing, be it as a product, a process, or as an interaction. As a product, good writing is given a more physical view as it is embodied in terms of accuracy in spelling and correct use of grammar, and not in the communication and composition ability of the writer. It looks at the end results of the written article. As a process, the cognitive processes involved in the development of composing ability are given priority (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981). This study considers writing as an interaction between product and composing, as it focuses on how cohesive
features create unity in the texts and hence how they enhance textual coherence. Writing involves selecting appropriate linguistic elements from the resources available within a particular language system and fashioning them into different patterns to realise different meanings. This results in text, an aspect of multiple semantic choices made in a particular social situation.

The study of discourses and texts has faced a lot of controversy. Beaugrande (1985) argues that these two fields of study have sometimes been considered identical, sometimes opposed and even unrelated. Identical because they both originate from rhetorics and involve the study of language above the sentence in its context. Van Dijk (1985), Hoey (1983) and Edmondson (1981) all agree that the two terms are often used interchangeably. Linguists such as Cook (1989), and Crystal (1987) however argue that the two are different. Discourse analysis focuses on the structure of naturally occurring spoken language data as found in conversations and speeches. Text analysis, on the other hand, focuses on the structure of naturally occurring written language in texts like essays, diaries and notices. This is the view taken in this study although the distinction between text linguistics and discourse analysis is not necessarily hard and fast. Indeed Hoey (1983) acknowledges that this distinction is a necessary one to maintain for some purposes. For other purposes, it may obscure similarities in the organisation of spoken and written communication.

There are ample publications to date on studies focusing on the analysis of
written texts. For example, cross disciplinary studies (Lovejoy 1991, and Bazerman 1981) reveal that beliefs about good writing are not necessarily shared by writers in other disciplines. In such works, it is argued, for instance that a well written academic paper may not appear superb to a journalist, just like a news article considered well written in journalistic circles may not appeal to an academician. Consequently, it has been hypothesised that rules governing writing are not the same across the curriculum (Lovejoy, 1991). For instance, Ogutu (1996:267) argues that discursive texts like those found in the academic text category in this study, need encapsulation and prospection signals to direct them and reinforce their point of view. Narrative texts, on the other hand, have inbuilt schema based on the chronology of events that unfold. The reader perceives the continuity of the narrative text based on this chronology. In this study, more of the differences in cohesive signals used by such argumentative and narrative texts are revealed.

According to Lovejoy (1991), writers and readers who share the same views, beliefs and practices (i.e world view) about a discourse community are more accommodating to one another than those who do not. For instance, the journalistic discourse community has been argued to have distinct styles of journalese within it (Crystal and Davy 1969). However, journalists will tolerate one another more than they will tolerate a lawyer who operates within the linguistic conventions of legal discourse community. Thus, due to differences in texts of various discourse communities, some studies like Bazerman (1981) and
Lovejoy (1991) focus on the similarities and differences in writing in different academic and even non academic disciplines. In Bazerman's study for instance, the literature review in the three academic disciplines studied varies because of the different assumptions made by writers within the disciplines. The biology writer cites evidence that has immediate impact on the research, while the sociology writer reconstructs the literature to establish a context for the ensuing discussion. More differences are given by Lovejoy (1991), who notes more lexical reiterations in the biology passage because the discussion is on a very limited specific topic, unlike the history passage. Evidence from the analysis of text samples in this study support this observation as will be noted in chapter 3.

In their study of how corporate culture might affect writers' use of superfluous nominalisation and inappropriate narrative structures, Brown and Herndl (1986) observe that despite business writers' knowledge that nominalisation makes text processing slower, they continue to nominalise all the same, instead of using strong verbs as they are encouraged to. They also note that nominalisation goes up when writing up the corporate hierarchy. When writing for people at low levels, it goes down. Superfluous nominalisation, it is observed, is motivated by the corporate environment, e.g. job security and vulnerability. It correlates with degree of uncertainty, stress and competence and is valued as a prestigious feature of spoken language in academic circles, a sign of syntactic maturity, and a trace of literate cognition. Thus, what linguists take as ignorance or mistakes may be deliberate behaviour as seen in corporate writers who tend towards
dysfluency. Such deliberate behaviour in a particular genre is observed in academic texts in the present study which tend to be repetitive, as discussed in chapter 3.

In a comparative analysis of cohesion and information strategies in three different academic texts, Lovejoy (1991) observes that different academic fields adopt different cohesive patterns. Psychology, for example, has the highest cohesive density, followed by biology. History with the least cohesive density, on the other hand, has more words in single lexical ties than psychology and biology. This is due to the fact that history being a non-technical subject uses more paraphrase unlike biology and psychology, which utilise the repetition of technical terminology more. Data from text samples in this study support this observation. The reportage text category, is found to use more lexical synonyms and superordinates. The academic category, on the other hand, employs a lot of direct repetitions (2.6 f.f.)

Jordan’s (1986) study on cohesion with "do so" is aimed at disproving Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) claim that "do so" is less frequent in all cases where the presupposing clause is structurally related to the presupposed one. Contrary to this, Jordan uses a large number of examples to show that "do so" occurs freely in many forms of close cohesion within a sentence. His corpus also reveals that "do so" functions differently from its counterparts, "do this, do that" and "do it", as it provides a nuance of meaning associated with close cohesion. Unlike
Jordan, the current study investigates all the cohesive categories as identified by Halliday and Hasan (1976) (chapter 2 f.f), and then adopts the framework of analysis developed by Hartnet (1986) to analyse further the occurrence of cohesion in two text categories.

Brandt (1986) shows that written texts bear indelible marks of the social and semantic conditions from which they arise, just like spoken ones. Observations from the study lead to the claim that through the recognition of such marks, readers are able to comprehend texts. Cohesion in the study is presented as a context sensitive strategy, for example through exophora, one can envisage a given world that a writer assumes to share with a reader. As a discourse unfolds, patterns of reference and reiteration indicate a writer’s attention to what is and can be on reader-writer focus. Analysis of cohesion in the text samples for the present study support Brandt’s observation of such patterns. This is dealt with in chapter 3 in this study.

Using data drawn from text excerpts obtained from newspapers, Freeborn et al (1986) observe that due to selective perception, the grammatical structures and vocabulary used in a text give evidence of the writer’s point of view, even if it is unintentional. Comparing the attitude and point of view in various British newspapers, they argue that reporters show sympathy to at least one side of the coin. They note, for example, that headlines in the articles are simple, informative and create impact. This is explained by Quirk et al (1985) who state
that this is made possible through use of block language rather than sentence language. Such nonsentence language which uses mainly noun phrases and clauses is necessitated by pressure on the space available in the newspaper. The headlines of the reportage text category in this study data utilise ellipsis as a style of achieving this. The headlines in this sample are brief but catchy, leaving the rest of the report for the main text.

Crystal and Davy (1969) in comparing the journalese of two different newspapers record that a newspaper adopts a particular style of its audience. Thus, one paper uses very technical formal language with long complex sentence structures and long paragraphs, while the other uses relaxed informal language, a wide variety of punctuation (colons, dashes, commas) apposition and parallelism instead of complex coordination. In the same analysis, the researchers show that generalisations about language use of a particular genre may be misleading since within it there are distinct styles. Like Crystal and Davy, the observations drawn from text samples in this study support those of Freeborn et al (1986) that there is always the danger of bias in any piece of writing. It has been noted that text samples in the academic text category impose their opinion on the reader, unlike those from the reportage category.

Ogutu (1996) analyses cohesion and coherence structure in texts written by secondary school English as a second language learners in Kenya. She attempts to quantify coherence and to show its levels in various texts through evidence of
cohesive markers present. Hasan's (1984) point to point cohesion fails to support her hypothesis since some texts are rated as incoherent despite the abundance of cohesive markers. Her data, however proves that cohesion upholds the hanging together of a text, especially through chain interaction of cohesive features.

Ogutu's study (ibid) adopts Sinclair's (1991) model of encapsulation and prospection which is later used to show that sentence to sentence cohesion is more relevant in textualisation of coherence in learner's texts, since each later sentence builds onto the preceding one. This could mean that cohesion of texts rests in the writer who signals clausal relations. Sinclair's (ibid) model proves adequate in highlighting problem areas and supporting coherent areas in learner's texts in Ogutu's (1996) text samples. For instance, it shows inappropriate use of encapsulation signals like vague usage of deictics. In addition, it proves adequate in analysing encapsulation and prospection signals in relatively formal discursive texts such as those in the academic text category in the present study. Such texts have to guide the direction of the argument in order to persuade the reader to adopt their point of view. Unlike relatively informal narrative texts such as those found in the reportage category in our study that have inbuilt schema for interpretation of continuity based on chronology of events, discursive texts have the obligation of providing the necessary signals (Ogutu 1996). This could account for the fact that discursive texts in the present study have more of such signals than descriptive texts which rely more on coreference.
Ogutu's (ibid) study is very instrumental to the present one since both studies analyse cohesion in written texts. Her methods, results and interpretations have provided crucial insights to this study.

Karanja (1991) investigates how clarity, cohesion and coherence are achieved in KBC, TV broadcast discussion programmes. She identifies the linguistic resources available to second language English users in maintaining the discussions. The discussions are found to be too rigid and therefore unnatural due to too much censorship involved during production.

A development emanating from the Halliday and Hasan (1976) model is that of Hasan (1984), which deals with coherence and cohesive harmony of texts. In this approach, Hasan maintains the subcategories of cohesion in the Halliday and Hasan (1976) model but revises the lexical cohesion category. The category of lexical collocation is done away with and, in its place, other categories like meronymy and hyponymy are introduced. In this model, Hasan posits that coherence is the property of how readers perceive texts. They can note when one text is more cohesive than the other. Coherence is therefore subjective while cohesion is objective. Hasan uses children's writing to show that cohesive ties contribute to the coherence of a text when they form cohesive chains that interact with each other. This interaction is termed as cohesive harmony. Using the cohesive harmony of texts, it is argued that it is possible to quantify coherence and rank texts on a scale from the least to the most coherent.
Furthermore, the model places significance on the function and combination of the ties, and not just their presence. It identifies two classes of chains: identity chains and similarity chains. An identity chain is made up of cohesive ties that share the same referent, since in a text, a number of chains may be built up of cohesive ties that refer to the same thing in the writer's world. Similarity chains on the other hand, are chains which have no identity but are described by the same lexeme, whether the referent is the same or not. Hasan notes that it is not the presence of chains that creates coherence but their interaction with one another.

Although Hasan's (1984) model is a development of Halliday and Hasan (1976) which is used in this study, it was not found useful because this study was not dealing directly with coherence.

Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) outline a model of textuality referred to as the procedural approach, in which mental activities involved in the interpretation of texts are emphasised. Within this perspective, the reader basing on his experience, the states and events in the world, actively builds the textual world. Such a reader goes further than just utilising the cohesive links and creates coherence. A text then is not just a ready made unit of analysis, but an end product of various dynamic cognitive processes whose phases are: planning, ideation, development expression and parsing. The end product of the procedure is a text which meets seven standards of communication namely: cohesion and
coherence, which are text centered notions, as well as situationality, informativity, intentionality, acceptability and intertextuality, all of which are user (reader) centered notions. If the standards are strongly violated, the text is non communicative and is considered a non text. For instance, highly informative texts are considered more interesting than repetitive texts which readily bore the reader.

In their analysis of cohesion, one of the standards of communication, Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) posit that syntactic rules of a language impose optional patterns upon the surface text, both intrasententially and intersententially. This ensures continuity, stability, and economy in texts. Intrasentential units, (words, phrases and clauses) can be utilised in a short span of time and processing resources. Long range stretches of text are "handled by reutilising previous elements or patterns, modifying and compacting where possible", Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981:17.

This brings us to the end of chapter one. The following chapters focus on the data used in the study.
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CHAPTER TWO

COHESIVE FEATURES IN THE TEXTS

2.0 Introduction

This chapter first discusses data presentation, then gives a general observation of the occurrence of cohesive devices in the text samples for the present study. The bulk of the chapter goes on to look closely at the patterns of cohesion in the data.

2.1 Data presentation

In the study, three samples from the academic text category (ATC) and three from the reportage text category (RTC) are used. Samples in the reportage text category are labelled text 1, 2 and 3 and form appendix 1, while those in the academic category are 4, 5 and 6 as found in appendix 2 (appendices 1 and 2 f.f.). Various examples from the data of the present study have been used in this and the next chapter to illustrate points here and there. When this is done, the specific sources of the particular example is given at the end of the example. For instance; (ATC: 4:1-2) reads that the example is taken from the academic text category, text 4, sentences 1 and 2.

(RTC:3;18) reads that the example is drawn from the reportage text category, text 3, sentence 18.

Each text category has a total of 56 sentences; each text sample an average of 18.7 sentences. Nevertheless, the academic text category has a sum of 1296
running words whereas the reportage one has only 1200 words. This is because unlike the academic category, sentences in the reportage text category tend to be shorter. Why? This uncertainty will be resolved after looking at the patterns of cohesive devices in the two text categories (2.2 f.f). On average, each text category has a sum of 1248 running words.

The texts have been analysed for cohesive devices, listed into four broad categories namely reference, conjunctions, ellipsis /substitution and lexical organisation (c.f 1.8). However, in some cases the categories overlap such that one lexical element e.g reduce, is analysed both as comparative reference and lexical repetition in cases where it recurs forming two different cohesive ties. The distribution of the cohesive devices evident in text samples for the study are given below in table 2.
Table 2: Distribution of cohesive devices in the texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohesive device</th>
<th>Total CD</th>
<th>% of CD</th>
<th>Total CD</th>
<th>% of CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in RTC</td>
<td>in RTC</td>
<td>in ATC</td>
<td>in ATC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite article</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conjunctions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lexical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonymy</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superordinates</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>231</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ellipsis/Substitution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Ellipsis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CD in the texts</strong></td>
<td>412</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Occurrence of cohesive devices.

As can be seen in table 2 above, all the four types of cohesive features identified by Halliday and Hasan (1976) occur in both text categories that provided the data for the present study. The most frequent cohesive device used in the text samples for the present study is lexical cohesion. It is followed by reference items. Surprisingly, the least used cohesive device is ellipsis/substitution. Conjunctions are used slightly more frequently than ellipsis.

It is evident from the table that lexical cohesion is used more by academic texts than reportage texts. For example, it represents 56.1% of all the occurrences of cohesive features in the reportage text category. This figure rises to 65.7% in the academic category. This is as expected since a writer defines a particular theme and discusses it in detail using the lexical items that relate to the theme. It is therefore imperative that reiteration of related lexemes will occur in the process of developing the argument (Lovejoy 1991:322).

Reference, the second most frequent cohesive category is used more by the reportage text samples than academic ones in this study. In the process of reporting events that happen to people, reportage texts often refer back to the people creating reference cohesion (2.3.1 example 8.1.1). Unlike reportage texts, academic ones discuss issues and will probably not use reference items as often. This possibly explains the big decrease in the distribution from 33.7% of the total occurrence of cohesive devices in the reportage text category to only 20.8% in
the academic category. Sections 2.3, 3.1.1, 3.1.2 and 3.2.1 below give more
descriptions on reference cohesion, as found in our study corpus..

Evidence from table 2 shows that on average, ellipsis/substitution are the least
used cohesive devices in the text samples for the study. This is in line with
results of other studies like Hoey (1991) and Beaugrande and Dressler (1981)
who have tried to rationalise this sparse occurrence. For example, Hoey argues
that ellipsis/substitution are features of spoken language where the speakers are
in immediate one to one interaction and will clarify issues in case of
misunderstanding. Written texts, on the other hand, are meant to be self-
clarifying. As such, writers minimise use of ellipsis which may create
incomprehension. Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) further contend that ellipsis,
if clustered in a text, will distort the reader’s understanding since the reader will
have to often refer back and forth to the text to retrieve the omitted information.
A further discussion on ellipsis can be found in sections 2.4 and 3.1.3 (f.f) of
this study.

Conjunctions as markers of cohesion occur more in the academic as opposed to
the reportage text category, as seen in table 2. Although the occurrence of
conjunctions in all the texts is generally low, there is a notable increase in
distribution from 4.4% of all the cohesive devices in the reportage text category
to 8.5% in the academic one. In a later section, (3.3 f.f) conjunctions are placed
under dynamic cohesive features. From this distribution it is plausible that
academic texts use more dynamic features as opposed to reportage texts. This possibly implies that such texts are more coherent and easier to read than the latter. This is dealt with in more detail in chapter 3. However, the relatively high occurrence of conjunctions in academic texts could be attributed to the fact that such texts interpret the issues under discussion and form a point of view. Conjunctions may reinforce an academic writer's opinion by slowly building up his line of argument and forcefully drawing the reader to it through well connectedness and sequencing of issues as the text is developed. The academic writer interprets his observations and gives reasons for taking a particular line of argument. This is unlike a news reporter who describes the scenes as they are without forming any opinions. Hence the academic writer ends up with long complex sentence structures unlike the news reporter. This explains our earlier observation (c.f 2.1) that academic texts used in this study have more words than those in the reportage category despite having an equal number of sentences. Various examples to illustrate this distinction can be found in section 2.3.5 (f.f).

2.2.1 Occurrence of sub-classes of cohesive devices.

As evident in table 2 there is a marked difference between lexical repetition which represents slightly above half (i.e 55.9%) of all cohesive devices in the academic text category and synonymy, which represents only 7.8%. This distinction in reportage texts is gradual with lexical repetition taking slightly more than one third (i.e 38.3%) of all the cohesive devices in the text category, followed by definite referencing with 19.7%. The highest percentage of lexical
repetition could be attributed to the fact that academic texts, being relatively formal in nature, often reiterate technical terms of the discipline under study. Unlike texts in the reportage category which, being targeted to the general public, have to use more generalised informal language that can be comprehended by all the people. This results in better balanced cohesion of the later texts than the former.

In the reportage text category, definite reference is the second most frequent subclass of cohesion used, after lexical repetition. This is understandable since the definite reference cohesive device identifies the referents as those already encountered. Thus every time the cohesive definite article the is encountered for example, it must be accompanied by the referent it points to (or by lexical repetition). The is used less in the academic text category than in the reportage one probably because demonstrative references, avoided in reportages, make up for it in academic texts.

Verbal ellipsis, adversative and causal conjunctions are the least frequent subclasses of cohesion in reportage text samples, every one of them taking only or below 0.5%. Apart from causal conjunctions, they are still the least frequent devices in the academic texts, although each represents at least 1% of all cohesive devices in this category.

Detailed descriptions of every cohesive device in the texts are given in the
remaining sections of this chapter.

2.3 Reference items.

Section (c.f) 1.8 notes that reference items have no semantic interpretation of their own since they make reference to something else in the textual environment for their interpretation. Such reference items comprise 33.7% of the total cohesive devices in the reportage text category decreasing to only 20.8% in the academic text category. All four types of reference are used in all the text samples, although to varying frequencies. Table 2.1 below shows the distribution of reference items in both text categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Item</th>
<th>Total Ref</th>
<th>% of Ref in RTC</th>
<th>Total Ref</th>
<th>% of Ref in ATC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite article</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparatives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total References</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from the table given above that the definite article and pronoun reference occur more frequently in the reportage text category than in the academic one. Comparative and demonstrative reference, on the other hand, occur most frequently in the academic category as opposed to the reportage one.
2.3.1: Pronoun reference.

Pronoun reference refers to something by specifying its function in the speech situation. The function may be that of the speaker or the addressee, hence they are used in the place of nouns. Their interpretation therefore depends on the identity of the referent. Consider the following examples illustrating pronoun reference:

8. Talking from her hospital bed, Mrs Amollo said that she could not recall how the accident occurred, saying that when she came to her senses, she found herself at the hospital bed. (RTC:3;8).

9. Among those at the scene of the accident was Kericho DC Nicholas Mberia and Kericho police boss Julius Soi.

9.1. They sent messages of condolences to families and relatives who lost their beloved ones in the accident (RTC:2;16-17).

10. The second or crash phase involves the interaction of the vehicle or vehicles, their occupants and/or pedestrians (ATC:5;3).

In illustration 8 above, the pronouns her, she and herself refer to Mrs. Amollo. They preserve the gender and number specification of the referent, as shown in her and she in this particular example, which allude to the fact that the referent is feminine. In example 9 above, they in 9.1 informs the reader that the people
In the academic text category, most pronouns e.g. *their* and *themselves* refer to non-living things as shown in example 10 above in which *their* refers to vehicle occupants. Such academic texts discuss issues unlike the reportage texts which report on incidents that happen to people hence their use of mainly personal pronouns.

Public vehicle transport system is the most common mode of transport for most Kenyan people. When such a vehicle is involved in a road traffic accident, large numbers of casualties result. A newspaper report on such accidents (like texts in the reportage category in the present study) will constantly refer to people involved in the accident. Such texts end up with many pronouns in a single report unlike academic texts, which do not report the accidents directly.

Pronoun references are more commonly used by the reportage text category than by the academic text category. Table 2.1 (c.f) shows that pronouns represent 34.5% of all reference cohesive devices in the reportage text category. The academic text category on the other hand has only 13.3% pronouns. Out of all cohesive devices in the reportage text category, pronouns account for 11.7%, while in the academic texts, this figure drops notably to just 2.8%.
3.3.2: The Definite Article.

As noted earlier, the definite article has no content of its own. Its main function in cohesion is to specify or identify the referent (Halliday and Hasan: 1976) as example 11 below shows.

11. Twelve people yesterday night perished while ten others are in critical condition when a Nissan matatu they were travelling in collided head-on with a bus at Kapkugerwet trading centre along the Kericho-Nakuru road, five kilometres from Kericho town.

11.1. The bodies of the twelve passengers were burnt beyond recognition when the two vehicles caught fire immediately after the accident.

11.2. The driver of the Coast bus which was travelling from Kisumu to Mombasa escaped unhurt (RTC:3:1-3).

12. Both accident and preventive counter measures may be defined within the framework of a three-phase sequence.

12.1. The first or precrash phase involves such factors as initial and continuing driver education, periodic driver examinations, existence of bad driving or walking habits and attitudes, and physical and mental deficiencies including those induced by alcohol and other drugs.

12.2. The second or crash phase involves the interaction of the vehicles, their occupants and pedestrians.

12.3. The third or post crash phase involves the physical damage to
humans vehicles and other objects which result from the crash

(ARTC:5;1,2,3,7).

The in example 11.1 above gives specification of the same twelve people and vehicles earlier introduced by the non-specifying article a. In 11.2, the reader will anaphorically interpret both the driver and the Coast bus as those introduced in 11, since the bus must have been being driven at the time of the accident anyway. Example 11.2 however, gives even more specification that the bus belonged to Coast bus company.

In example 12, each sequence is signalled by the definite article the as seen in 12.1-12.3, which defines what is involved in the non defining statement a three phase sequence that is first encountered by the reader.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) include the definite article the among demonstratives. In this study however, the definite article the is considered on its own as a subcategory of reference cohesion because of its unique properties. Unlike demonstratives, the always occurs with lexical repetition. Demonstratives are often found occurring without the referent they point to. Having considered examples 11 and 12 above let us now look at example 13 below that illustrates this distinction using the demonstrative reference this:

13. In Kenya, the percentage of casualties occurring
during darkness increased considerably between 1960 and 1972.

13.1. This is almost certainly due to an increase in night traffic (ATC:4;11-12).

In example 12 above for instance, cohesive the at the beginning of the sentence is accompanied by the word phase in all its occurrences. This is unlike in illustration 13.1 above in which the demonstrative this occurs without any referent.

Another unique property of the definite article the that alienates it from demonstratives is that it does not contain in itself referential proximity that can identify the referent in question. Demonstratives on the other hand, give not only the proximity from the referent, but also signal the number (singularity/plurality). as we shall see in the next section, (2.3.3 f.f).

Lastly, it was found necessary in this study to treat the definite article singly as a sub-category of reference cohesion because of the very high frequency of occurrence it exhibits in the reportage text category (c.f table 2.1). It would have inflated the demonstrative reference figures so much and obscured the differences between the two.

In the academic text category, the accounts for only 21.7% of all the references. This increases notably to 58.2% of the reference items in the reportage category.
making it the most commonly used type of reference. Out of all cohesive devices in the academic text category, this is equivalent to only 4.4%, rising to 19.7% in the reportage category (c.f. table 2).

2.3.3 Demonstratives

Unlike the, demonstratives "contain within themselves some referential element in terms of which the item in question is identified" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:71). Demonstratives give proximity of the referent from the person as well as the number signal. This/these indicate that the referent(s) is (are) near whereas that/those indicate that it (they) is (are) far. This /that indicate that the referent is singular, while these/ those indicate that they are many. In example 13.1 above for instance, this refers to the increase in percentage of casualties occurring in Kenya during darkness. Given below are more examples from text samples for the present study illustrating demonstrative reference.

14. Fundamental to a program of driver improvement is an effective method for identifying 'problem drivers'.

14.1. These are individuals who have a disproportionate involvement in traffic law violation or crashes (ATC:5;18-19).

15. Hence judging the models by slope and intercept criteria revealed that the prediction for pedestrians came nearest the ideal line followed by that for passengers and then the one for motorcyclists (ATC:6;)
These in example 14.1 above refers to problem drivers mentioned in the preceding sentence. That is also used in a few cases such as example 15. In this particular example, that refers to the prediction for passengers as given in the model.

Texts in the reportage category in this corpus use the cohesive demonstrative reference those and not any other. This is exemplified below:

16. Among those at the scene of the accident was Kericho district commissioner Nicholas Mberia and Kericho police boss, Julius Soi (RTC:2;16).

17. The DC also sent a message of condolences to the family relatives and friends of those who perished following the accident (RTC:3;14).

The use of those in the two examples above is suitable here since it refers to people already defined. In section 3.3.3 (f.f), we will return to the interpretation of those as evident in the reportage text category.

Academic texts in this study corpus show greater evidence of the use of demonstratives which represent 32.5% of the reference items, while texts in the reportage category have only 4.3% demonstratives. Out of all cohesive devices in the academic text category demonstrative reference accounts for 6.8%. In the
reportage one, it represents only 1.5%.
2.3.4: Comparative Reference.

Comparative reference indicates that something is like or unlike another. The comparison may be made in reference to a particular property or quality. Comparison is therefore a referential property; something is either like or unlike another. Examples given below exemplify comparative reference.

18. An analysis of road accidents and casualties in Kenya showed that the average number of casualties per injury-accident taking place has increased by 60% over the last ten years.

18.1. This could be due to increasing vehicle occupancy over the time or to the fact that a specific type of accident is much more common now than was the case ten years ago (ATC:4:7-8).

19. For example, commercial vehicles are now commonly used to transport workers to and from their places of work.

19.1. When such a vehicle is involved in an accident, large numbers of casualties often result (ATC:4:9-10).

Increased/increasing in example 11 exemplifies comparative reference. In this case, the number of people injured in road traffic accidents in Kenya has continued to soar over the years. The academic text category has many such examples. In some cases, a text focuses on comparison, like text 4 (appendix 2 f.f) which compares the trend of accident rates in various countries.
Halliday and Hasan (1976:79) note that in comparative reference, "the comparison may be internal - the likeness expressed as mutual likeness, without a referent appearing as a distinct entity". Thus, in example 18 above, we do not need to get the point of departure of increase. It will suffice to note comparative reference mutually inherent in the used comparative lexeme. The same example has the comparative reference much more in 18.1. Such in example 19 above looks back to commercial vehicles.

Comparative reference as a category appears more frequently in the academic text category than in the reportage one. In the latter category, it accounts for only 2.9% as compared to 32.5% in the former. This is owing to the fact that texts in the reportage text category mainly describe the accident scene as it is without comparing scenes to any other, since their purpose is to inform the public of the latest occurrences. Academic texts, on the other hand, need to form opinions from the studies they analyse and persuade readers to follow their line of argument. Comparing different studies may be used if it will enhance this argument. It may be the case therefore that this introduces many comparative references into the academic text.
2.4 Substitution / ellipsis

This analysis treats the two subcategories of cohesion, substitution and ellipsis as the same grammatical relation since ‘the boundary line between the two is indistinct’ (Hoey, 1991:6). As said earlier (c.f 1.8), an item is either replaced by another (substitution) or by nothing (ellipsis). We found no evidence of clausal substitution/ellipsis. Both text categories are however fairly similar in their use of substitution/ellipsis.

It is evident (c.f table 2) that the reportage text category has 5.8% instances of substitution/ellipsis, while the academic one has 5%. Both text categories in this study sample show that substitution is hardly used. Hoey (1991) also notes this saying that substitution is rare outside conversation so most examples used in published material are fabricated.

2.4.1 Nominal Substitution/ellipsis

Nominal substitution is used when a writer replaces the earlier used noun/nominal group by a different word to stand in for it. The following two examples in which the substitute one is used illustrate nominal substitution.

20. They sent messages of condolences to families and relatives who lost their beloved ones in the accident (RTC:2;17).

Example 15 is repeated here as example 21
21. Hence judging the models by slope and intercept criteria revealed that the prediction for pedestrians came nearest the ideal line followed by that for passengers and then the one for motorcyclists (ATC:6:5).

In example 20 above, the nominal substitute ones stands for friends and relatives. Example 21 has the substitute one used in the place of prediction. This substitute (one) is accompanied by the, so as to make it clear to the reader that the omitted lexeme is the same prediction in the preceding text.

In both text categories, substitution comprises less than 1% of the total cohesive devices. These findings concur with observations made in other studies like Bazerman (1981). It may be postulated here therefore that substitution is more of a feature of spoken language and is therefore not expected frequently in written texts such as the ones used in this study data.

2.4.2 Nominal ellipsis

Nominal ellipsis is used in texts when a writer omits a noun that has been encountered in the preceding text. The gap left however, does not create comprehension problems since the omitted noun is retrievable. In this study, the sign ĺ is inserted where there is a gap indicating ellipsis. Below are some examples which exemplify nominal ellipsis.

22. Scores of passengers were injured.
22.1. The charred remains of the dead were taken to Kericho district hospital yesterday morning (RTC:1:4-5).

23. The bus was said to have been carrying 87 passengers but the number of those in the matatu was not immediately known (RTC:1:7).

24. An analysis of road accidents and casualties in Kenya showed that the average number of casualties taking place has increased by 60% over the last ten years.

24.1. This could be due to increasing vehicle occupancy over the time or to the fact that a particular type of accident is much more common now than was the case ten years ago (ATC:4:17-18).

In example 22.1 above, the word passengers retrievable from 22 has been omitted making the sentence cohesive with the earlier text. This would have formed the noun head in the noun phrase the dead passengers. Its omission leaves only the article and the determiner so the head has to be retrieved from the earlier text for coherent interpretation.

In example 23 above, the omitted lexeme passengers is retrieved from the same sentence, unlike in example 24 in which the cohesive effect is intersentential. The expected noun between the demonstrative this and the modal verb could is omitted in example 24 leaving a gap which is filled once the noun increase is
retrieved from the previous text. In example 21 above, the word prediction has been omitted leaving a gap between that for, which must be retrieved from the text.

Nominal ellipsis occurs most frequently in the reportage text category than the academic text one. In the academic category, it represents 75% of all occurrences of ellipsis, while in the reportage one, it increases to 91.3%.

2.4.3 Verbal ellipsis

Verbal ellipsis, though present, in the text samples for this study is seldom used. There are a few examples of this particular type of ellipsis, some of which are given below.

25. Meanwhile, five people were killed on the spot and 13 others rushed to the Coast General hospital when two passenger buses were involved in a head-on collision (ATC:3; 16).

26. Many countermeasures or remedial actions have been and are being proposed for each of these phases (ATC:5; 9).

There is the omission of a helping verb were in example 25 which is retrievable form the earlier part of the sentence.
In example 26 above, the cataphoric main verb **proposed** has been left out. It must be filled in through further reading of the text.

The above examples of verbal ellipsis could imply that verbal ellipsis is very seldom applied in written texts. If used, then the omitted verb is retrievable from the same sentence and not across sentences. Text samples for the present study did not have any instance where the omitted verb is to be retrieved from the previous sentence.

When verbal ellipsis is used in text samples for this study, modal verbs are the ones that are mainly omitted in the reportage text category. It may be the case that since some newspaper readers skim through the paper rather than read it closely, content verbs cannot be omitted in the reportage text category as they supply the needed information. Modal verbs mainly help to indicate, for instance, tense and aspect. Such verbs can therefore be left out if the reader has limited space within which to produce content as in press reportage. The academic text category, on the other hand, is not faced with pressures of making the most out of its space financially. For this case, ellipsis is generally less of an option. It may also be the case that readers of academic texts tend to be more serious readers. They may not scan through the text for information, if they are carrying out an academic research, for instance. Such texts are hardly read for pleasure, but for formal academic purposes. Traffic accident reports occurring in the published press, on the other hand, may be browsed through for information.
hence quick scanning.

All in all, substitution/ellipsis are sparingly used in text samples for this study. As already mentioned (c.f 2.2), if they are concentrated in a text they tamper with its easy flow since the reader will waste so much time trying to refill the ellipted information. Such a text will not achieve the intended and expected cohesive effect.

2.5: Conjunctions.

Conjunctions constitute 4.4% of all the cohesive devices in the reportage text category. This doubles to 8.5% in the academic text category (c.f table 2). As compared to other categories of cohesive devices evident in the corpus for the present study, (c.f section 2.3) conjunctions are relatively infrequent in this data.
Table 2.2: Distribution of Conjunctions (conj) in Reportage and Academic Text Categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conjunction / Text category</th>
<th>conj in RTC</th>
<th>% in RTC</th>
<th>conj in ATC</th>
<th>% in ATC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversatives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident from table 2.2 that of the four subcategories of conjunctions as markers of cohesion in texts, temporal and additive conjunctions occur more frequently than the other two subcategories in the reportage text category. In the academic text category on the other hand, it is firstly additives, then causal conjunctions that are frequent.

2.5.1: Additive conjunctions

Additive conjunctions occur in both text categories in this study corpus. These conjunctive relations are used when there is something more to be said in the discourse. They serve the purpose of highlighting the relations between the present text and the previous one. Examples from the texts for the study are
27. The Kericho District Commissioner, Mr. Nicholas Mberia was among the first people to visit the scene of the accident yesterday morning.

27.1. Mr. Mberia called on the Ministry of Public Works to immediately seal and fill all the potholes along the route which he said was one of the major causes of accidents.

27.2. The DC at the same time cautioned drivers against overspeeding and overloading to minimise the rate of road accidents in the country.

27.3. The DC also sent a message of condolences to the families, friends and relatives of those who perished following the accident (RTC:3; 11-14).

28. This result indicates that concerted efforts in road safety improvements should be directed towards the drivers and pedestrians.

28.1. Again passenger transportation is another area of potential improvement if RTAs are to be reduced (ATC:6; 10-11)

Also in example 27.3 above serves to conjoin this particular sentence to the previous text. The same in 27.2 also serves to conjoin the sentence in which it is found to the earlier text. It would be problematic to understand these sentences in isolation since the emboldened additive conjunctions inform the reader that there is more information prior to this.
Example 28.1 illustrates a similar type of conjunction: **again**. The writer in this example adds that passenger transportation should be looked into in addition to drivers and passengers in order to reduce road traffic accidents. This is made possible by use of the additive conjunction **again**.

The next illustration gives a different type of additive conjunction: an exemplification. Exemplificatory additives are in the sense that they clarify what has been said, by giving examples.

29. *This could be due to increasing vehicle occupancy or to the fact that a specific type of accident is much more common now than was the case ten years ago.*

29.1. *For example commercial vehicles are now commonly used to transport workers to and from work (ATC:4;9).*

In example 29 above, **for example** found in 29.1 is the additive conjunction used to explicate the information in the previous text as shown.

In the reportage text category, additive conjunctions represents 38.9% of all conjunctions present. They increase to 41.2% of all conjunctions in the academic one. Out of all cohesive features in the reportage text category, additives account for only 1.7%, which rises slightly to 3.5% in the academic text category.
2.5.2: Adversative conjunctions.

Adversative conjunctions are cohesive conjunctive relations that express a contradiction to what is expected. However, but and instead of in the illustrations below exemplify adversative conjunctive use.

30. Another victim Beatrice Ajode a teacher at Haria Primary School in Mombasa who was travelling from Kisumu to Mombasa is admitted at the hospital with her twelve year old daughter Frida Atieno.

30.1. The doctors at the hospital however, described the conditions of the two women as stable and out of danger (ATC:3;10).

31. This report shows that there was a continuing downward trend in fatality and injury rates per licensed vehicle over the period 1961 to 1971.

but that Kenya, Jamaica, Zambia and Malawi were notably exceptional to this (ATC:4;1).

In example 30.1 above it is unexpected when the doctor says that the two women are out of danger. This is because earlier in the text the reader is given a horrifying description of twelve people having been charred in the accident.

In example 31, contrast is registered when the four countries named are said not to have recorded improvement unlike the rest.
32. Instead of merely testing a driver by means of simple memory tests on basic driving rules and checking his depth perception and static visual acuity, much more comprehensive testing techniques should be developed (ATC:5:14).

Instead of, a corrective adversative conjunction in example 32 above, introduces the writer’s opinion on how to test drivers in order to evaluate their capability to continue driving.

Data for the present study had 11.1% of all conjunctions in the reportage text category being adversatives, with 11.8% in the academic text category (c.f table 2). Adversative conjunctions in the text samples for the present study occur to a fairly similar extent in both the reportage and the academic text categories.

2.5.3: Causal conjunctions

Causal conjunctions indicate cohesive relations where a proposition is connected to its purpose, reason or result. Examples evident in our data are given below where since in example 33 expresses reason and so as to in 34 expresses purpose.

33. He urged the Ministry of Public Works and Housing to seal potholes on highways since they were contributing to accidents (RTC:118)
34. They appealed to members of the public and passengers who might have continued with the journey after the accident to report to any police station wherever they might be so as to assist the police with investigation (RTC:2;18)

Therefore and hence in examples 35.1 and 36.1 below express result.

35. However, it was observed that 80% of those killed are pedestrians and passengers followed by 14% as drivers.

35.1. Therefore, in order to reduce RTAs, efforts should be directed towards drivers as they have responsibility for themselves as well as for passengers (ATC:6;7-8)

36. For indicative purposes, the levels of significance found were reasonable.

36.1 Hence judging the models by slope and intercept criteria revealed that the prediction for pedestrians came nearest the ideal line, followed by that for passengers and then the one for motor-cyclists (ATC:6:4-5).

There is a marked difference in the distribution of causal conjunctions in the two text categories. Out of all its conjunctions, the reportage text category has only 11.1% causal conjunctions. The academic one, on the other hand, has 32.4%. Out of all cohesive devices in the reportage text category causal conjunctions
represent only 0.5%. This increases to 2.8% in the academic category.

2.5.4: Temporal Conjunctions

Temporal conjunctions connect sentences which express propositions related in terms of sequence in time or simultaneity in occurrence, (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). Reportage texts in this study use more of simultaneous temporal conjunctions. This simultaneous use can be seen in example 37 in which **while** links the two clauses in the text.

37. Twelve people yesterday night **perished** **while** ten others are in critical condition when a Nissan matatu they were travelling in collided with a bus at Kapkugerwet trading center, along the Kericho-Nakuru road, five kilometres from Kericho town (RTC:3:1)

Temporal conjunctions used in the academic text category are mainly sequential, unlike those in the reportage text category which are simultaneous. Example 38 below illustrates sequential use.

38. Finally, for the national RTA trends in Kenya, the percentages of those persons injured was found to be described by the logarithmic trend curve over time (ATC:6;15).

In example 38 above, the writer has been discussing persons killed, and he now
embarks onto his final item which is persons injured. This item is introduced by the sequential temporal conjunction finally. Thus finally in this particular example links not only the sentence in which it is found to the preceding one, but also links the entire discourse on persons dead before it to the text on those persons injured that is forthcoming.

Like causal conjunctions there is a marked difference in the use of temporal conjunctions between the two text types. The reportage text category uses this type of conjunction as much as it uses additive conjunctions, both having the greater 38.9%. This is against 14.7% used in the academic text category. Considering all cohesive devices in the reportage text category, temporal conjunctions account for 1.7% yet in the academic text category, they represent only 1.3%, (c.f table 2).

2.6.0: Lexical cohesion

As noted earlier (c.f 2.2), lexical cohesion is the most frequent cohesive device in both text categories in this study corpus. It accounts for 56.1% of all cohesive devices in the reportage text category, increasing to 65.7% of those in the academic category. Reiteration, either of the same word or a word similar in meaning occurs because the writer defines a certain theme for his discourse and discusses it in detail using terms related to the theme. He constantly has to repeat terminologies. This explains why over half of the cohesive devices observed in this study are lexical repetitions, synonyms or superordinates.
Table 2.3: Distribution of Lexical Cohesion in Reportage and Academic Text Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical (Lex) item</th>
<th>Lex CD in</th>
<th>% in</th>
<th>Lex CD in</th>
<th>% in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>ATC</td>
<td>ATC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonymy</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superordinate</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Form table 2.3, we note that lexical repetition is used more by the academic text category than by the reportage one. The reportage text category, on the other hand, uses lexical synonymy and lexical superordinates more than the academic one. In the next subsections, we deal with observations from table 2.3 at length.

2.6.1 Repetition

Repetition is the reiteration of the same word or its derivation e.g. driver - drove - driven-drivers. There is repetition of several words in the same order (phrases) throughout the text in all the text samples that form the academic text category in the present study. For instance, text 4 has constant repetition of fatality and injury rates (sentences 2,3,4,5 etc); text 5 has regular repetition of physical and mental ability; and in text 6 (appendix 2 f.f), efforts in road safety
improvement is found in sentences 10, 11 and 8. This type of repetition does not occur in the reportage text category which is a less formal genre. Lexical repetition in the reportage text category is mainly of single lexemes. However, instead of repeating words, this text category occasionally paraphrases or even deletes what would have been repeated. This can be illustrated by this excerpt in example 39.

39. 12 Perish as Bus Goes Up in Flames

12 people died when a bus collided head-on with a matatu and burst into flames on the Kericho Nakuru highway on Friday night.

39.1. Eleven of the victims were burnt beyond recognition.

39.2. Police said the accident occurred at around 2pm at Kapkugerwet market, almost five km from Kericho town (RTC:1:1-3).

There is no repetition in these three sentences of example 39, yet it would have been possible to mention 12 people in 39.1, and bus and matatu. in 39.2. Instead, the writer leaves out 12 people and uses the word victim. He also paraphrases a bus collided head on with a matatu by accident. Repetition is only encountered when reference is made to the title. In the words of Hoey (1991:12) "deletion is another style of disguised repetition". Let us consider some more examples of lexical repetition which highlight the differences in the use of this subcategory of cohesion in the two text categories in this study.
40. Instead of merely testing a driver by means of simple memory tests on basic driving rules and checking his depth perception and static visual acuity, much more comprehensive testing should be developed (ATC:5;14).

41. The regression line calculated for developing countries is clearly different from that developed by Smeed, the regression line having a lower slope.

41.1. The regression line calculated for developing countries for the year 1971 was above that calculated for 1968, the slope of the two lines being almost exactly the same (ATC:4;6-7).

The academic text category has several repetitions of the same words in a particular sentence, unlike the reportage text category. In example 40 above, for example, there are three occurrences of testing and two of driver.

Furthermore, lexical repetition in academic texts is common at the beginning of sentences where a word or phrase in the preceding sentence forms the beginning of the proceeding sentence. They act as a framework on which new information is included in the text, as demonstrated by example 41. However, whenever such a lexeme has a cohesive effect, it is accompanied by a demonstrative referent or the definite article as illustrated by example 41.1 above. In this example, regression line is repeated at the beginning of the sentence, making it cohesive.
with the previous text. In the same example, we also have repetition of **calculated for developing countries** in 41.1.

Lexical repetition is the single subcategory of cohesion that is most frequent, representing more than half of the devices present in each text category. Of all the lexical cohesive devices, (c.f table 2.3) 68.4% are repetitions in the reportage text category. In the academic category the figure is even higher, representing 85.1% of all lexical cohesive devices. Lexical repetition still represents the major 55.9% of all cohesive devices in the academic text category falling to only 38.3% of the total cohesive devices in the reportage one. The academic text category therefore uses more repetitions.

2.6.2. Synonymy

Synonymy is used when there is need for the writer to reiterate an item in a discourse by using another word similar in meaning. In order to make their argument complete, writers constantly refer to already mentioned words which define the discourse. Consider:

42. Survivors told of terrified screams and scenes of utter horror as those injured in the crash perished in the flames trapped in the wreckage unable to escape.

42.1. I smashed the window of the bus and pushed my daughter through. Both of us managed to flee from the bus (RTC:2;3).
43. Mr. Mberia called on the Ministry of public works and housing to immediately seal and fill all the potholes on highways which he said was one of the major causes of accidents (RTC:3;11).

44. The first or precrash phase involves such factors as initial and continuing driver education, periodic driver examination, existence of bad driving or walking habits and attitudes and physical and mental deficiencies including those induced by alcohol and other drugs.

44.1. It is essential that beginning drivers undergo extensive testing of both their mental and physical ability to successfully operate a motor vehicle. Experienced drivers must be periodically reexamined in order to evaluate their physical and intellectual capability to continue driving. (ATC:5:2,12-13).

Escape and flee in example 42 above have the same meaning. Perished in the same example is used to mean died which is a term used throughout the text to refer to those passengers that got killed in the accident.

In some cases, the synonyms are juxtapositioned in the reportage text category, as in example 43 in which seal and fill are an example of double marking. Either of them could still have conveyed the meaning. However, they are both used perhaps to achieve a certain effect? Section 3.2.2 (f.f) returns to this question.
Such usage is uncommon in academic texts where synonyms mainly occur intersententially, as seen in example 44.1 above. In this illustration, beginning drivers is synonymous with initial driver, whereas experienced drivers is synonymous with continuing drivers found in 44.

The reportage text category uses more synonyms than the academic one. They comprise 17.3% of cohesive ties in the reportage category and 11.8% in the academic text category (c.f. table 2.3).

2.6.3 Lexical superordinates.

Lexical superordinates and general word are treated as one sub-category in this analysis. As Hoey (1991:6) that "the boundary between the two is extremely fuzzy; there is a cline between the two types of lexical relations and it is of less significance for text analysis than for lexical analysis to distinguish them".

Examples of superordinates include people in both text categories which is used to mean various persons e.g. accident victims, individuals named, drivers, motorists and passengers. Examples 45 and 46 below demonstrate lexical superordinates.

45. 12 people died in a fiery horror when a bus and matatu collided head-on at Kapkugerwet trading centre, some 7km from Kericho town.

45.1 The impact set off a fire which gutted the two vehicles leaving only
twisted metal frames (RTC:2;6)

46. Detailed research in these countries is needed to obtain a full understanding of the accident patterns that exist.

46.1. Fatalities per licensed vehicle for developed and developing countries were found to be significantly correlated with vehicle ownership: the higher the level of vehicle ownership, the lower the fatality rate (ATC:4;14)

In example 45, vehicle is a superordinate or general term for bus and matatu. Patterns in example 46 above is a superordinate for the higher the level of vehicle ownership, the lower the fatality rate which is a pattern found in 46.1. Superordinates represent 14.3% of all lexical cohesive features in the reportage text category and only 3.1% of those in the academic one.

2.7 Summary

In this chapter, we have described the various cohesive devices observed in our data. Reportage and academic texts use references, substitution/ellipsis, conjunctions and lexical cohesive features to bring about connections in their texts. The reportage text category for example, uses more references than the academic one which uses more lexical cohesion instead. Both text categories use substitution/ellipsis to a fairly similar extent, although this category has very few occurrences which are nominal in almost every case. There is neither clausal
substitution/ellipsis nor verbal substitution in the data. The academic text category uses sequential temporal conjunctions as opposed to simultaneous ones which are favoured by the reportage category. Lexical cohesion is the most commonly used type of cohesive device, claiming about two-thirds of all cohesive features present. The academic text category uses more repetitions than the reportage one which uses more of synonyms and superordinates.

In the next chapter, we will compare how the academic and reportage text categories use these cohesive devices after recategorising them into those that achieve staticness and those that achieve dynamism in texts as stated in our theoretical framework (c.f 1.8). The interpretations of the findings for the study are included in the chapter. Chapter 3 will address the question:

Does Hartnet's (1986) categories explain the difference in coherence in the two text categories in our study corpus?
CHAPTER THREE

STATICNESS AND DYNAMISM

3.0 Introduction

Halliday and Hasan's (1976) categories of cohesion have been useful in identifying and describing the cohesive devices present in text samples used in this study. In the preceding chapter, the cohesive devices evident in the data were discussed. It has been observed for example, that both the reportage and the academic text categories use these features frequently to connect and continue the discourse. The use of the devices however, has some points of similarity and of difference. In this chapter, a comparison is made on the use of these features after recategorising them into those that achieve staticness and those that achieve dynamism in texts (c.f 1.2). According to Hartnet (1986), cohesive features that play the role of achieving staticness in texts include:

- The definite article, pronoun and demonstrative reference
- Substitution/ellipsis
- Lexical repetition and synonymy.
- Additive conjunctions.

Cohesive features that achieve dynamism include:

- Comparative reference
- Comparative, causal and adversative conjunctions.
- Lexical superordinates/general word.
This chapter will address the question whether or not Hartner’s (1986) categories of static and dynamic cohesion account for the differences in cohesion in the two text categories in this study.

3.1 Static and dynamic cohesive devices

Static cohesive devices are those that hold attention on a topic without necessarily manipulating it in any way. Examples of such cohesive devices include lexical repetition, reference by pronouns and ellipsis. Dynamic cohesive devices on the other hand, specify how a writer manipulates an internal representation of environment. Instead of repeating an idea, such devices indicate how it develops. Examples of cohesive devices that achieve dynamism in texts include conjunctions and lexical superordinates.

Hartner (1986) argues that dynamic cohesive ties perform a developmental role in the logic of the discourse, since they introduce new relationships in the text, while static ones simply refer us back to what has already been stated without any manipulation of the topic. Unlike static cohesion, dynamic cohesive ties are optional and are rarely used. If properly manipulated however, they make it easier to read a text (by enhancing its coherence) since they signal how one clause or sentence flows into the other. Consider the following two examples that illustrate staticness and dynamism in texts.

47. Among the survivors was a KNA writer Ms. Margaret Amollo who
boarded the bus in Kericho town.

47.1 She said she had gone to see her father at Bomet Mr. Jacob Amollo who is a teacher in the district (RTC:2;8-9).

48 It was observed that nearly 80% of those killed are pedestrians and passengers followed by 14% as drivers

48.1 Therefore drivers were found to be potentially responsible for nearly 49% of those killed whereas pedestrians have a share of 43% (ATC:6;8-9)

Example 47 above, illustrates pronoun reference as an achiever of staticness in texts. The writer uses the pronouns she and her in 47.1 to point back to the referent Ms. Amollo. The English language offers only this choice of reference item.

In example 48.1, the conjunction therefore points the text ahead as it introduces the writer's opinion. In this case, the writer however has the choice to use the causal conjunction that will best suit him among several choices offered by the language (e.g since and so), unlike in the case of pronouns above. In fact the position of dynamic cohesive devices, unlike static ones, can be switched about in the sentence. Example 49 below shows how therefore can occupy a different position but still achieve dynamism in the text.

49. Therefore in order to reduce RTAs, efforts should be directed towards
drivers since they have responsibility for themselves as well as for passengers (ATC:6; )

49.1. In order to reduce RTAs therefore, efforts should be directed towards drivers since they have responsibility for themselves as well as for passengers.

According to the brief descriptions above, cohesive devices have further been recategorised in the present study as follows.

Markers of staticness are:

The definite article, and pronominal reference,

Substitution/ ellipsis

Lexical repetition and synonymy.

Markers of dynamism, on the other hand, include:

Comparatives and demonstrative reference

Conjunctions

Lexical superordinate/ general word.

It is important to note that using the Hartnet (1986) model of analysis, markers of cohesion identified as achievers of staticness represent 81% of all cohesive devices in this study sample. Achievers of dynamism on the other hand, account for only 19% of all cohesive devices. These findings show that static cohesive
ties are used more often than dynamic ties, which are seldom applied. This is in agreement with Hartnet's study which shows that dynamic cohesive ties are "both optional and sparse unlike static ties" (Hartnet 1986:146). The high frequency of markers of staticness in both text categories in this study is attributable to the fact that once a writer introduces a topic, he has to keep referring to the same referents and may repeat words in the course of building the text. And yet not every writer will need to use achievers of dynamism in his text. A text describing road traffic accidents, for instance will rarely introduce the writer's opinion since his/her purpose is not to argue out a point. Nevertheless, even an academic writer whose purpose may be to argue out a point will need to state the facts as they are before introducing his point of view. Both text categories therefore end up with more static cohesion and less dynamic cohesion. However, as will be seen later, (3.2 and 3.3 f.f), this chapter aims at showing which of the two text categories under investigation here is more coherent than the other, using these distinctions of staticness and dynamism.

3.2 Occurrence of static cohesive devices.

In the reportage text category, the cohesive devices considered as achievers of staticness account for 85% of all cohesive devices present. In the academic text category on the other hand, static cohesion represents only 76% (table 2.4a f.f). Thus, in the reportage text category, static ties constitute 43% of all cohesive devices in the data for the present study. In the academic text category, on the other hand, static cohesive devices represent 37% of all cohesive devices in the
study data. It can be drawn from these figures that the reportage category has more static cohesive ties than the academic one. Could this imply that texts in the reportage text category in the present study are less coherent than those in the academic text category? This is addressed in the subsequent sections of this chapter. However, there are even more differences between the text categories lying in the particular patterns of static ties a particular text category employs. The rest of section 4.2 provides a discussion of the patterns of achievers of staticness in this study corpus.

Table 2.4a below shows the distribution of static cohesive devices in text samples for the present study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>252</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4a: Distribution of static cohesive devices
Table 2.4a: Distribution of Static Cohesive Devices in Reportage and Academic Text Categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text category</th>
<th>CD in RTC</th>
<th>% of CD in RTC</th>
<th>CD in ATC</th>
<th>% of CD in ATC</th>
<th>% out</th>
<th>CD in RTC</th>
<th>% of CD in RTC</th>
<th>CD in ATC</th>
<th>% of CD in ATC</th>
<th>% out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellipsis/subs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: subs - substitution

As can be noted in table 2.4a above, all the three categories of cohesion identified as achievers of staticness are represented in the samples for both text categories in the corpus for the present study. The most frequent marker of static cohesion is lexical cohesion, followed by reference. Ellipsis/substitution is notably the least frequent.

In section (c.f) 2.2, it was noted that lexical cohesion is expected to appear frequently in texts. The reason for this being that a writer having selected a theme to dwell on, generates detail from it using related lexemes which are reiterated throughout the discussion. The academic text category accounts for the
highest percentage of lexical cohesion identified as achievers of static cohesion in text samples for the present study. It represents 83.8% of all static cohesive devices in this text category and is still the most frequent in the reportage text category, where it accounts for 56.4% of all its static cohesive devices. We wonder why the figure drops so drastically in the reportage text category. This will be explained after looking closely at other markers of staticness (3.2.2 f.1).

Reference as an achiever of static cohesion is the second most frequent category of cohesion. However, the reportage text category has more reference items than the academic one. In the reportage category, reference accounts for 36.8% of all static cohesive devices. In the academic, one on the other hand, reference represents a mere 9.6% of all its static cohesion. This difference raises eyebrows and we hope to resolve the mystery after looking more closely at the subcategories of cohesion that are achievers of staticness in section 3.2.1 (f.1).

3.2.1 Distribution of subcategories of static cohesion in the study corpus.

Table 2.4b below shows the distribution of subcategories of cohesive devices that mark staticness in the study sample.
Table 2.4b: Distribution of subcategories of Static Cohesive Devices in Reportage and Academic Text Categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Static CD / text category</th>
<th>CD in RTC</th>
<th>% of CD in RTC</th>
<th>CD in ATC</th>
<th>% of CD in ATC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite article</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonymy</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ellipsis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be noted from table 2.4b above that lexical repetition in the academic text category accounts for the highest frequency of static cohesive devices. It represents 73.6% of all static cohesive devices in this text category. In the reportage one, it accounts for only 45% of all static cohesive devices.

Both the pronoun reference and the definite article are employed more by the reportage text category to achieve staticness than by the academic one. Whereas the definite article accounts for 23.1% of all static cohesive devices in the reportage text category, in the academic one it accounts for only 5.9%. Pronoun
reference also drops from 13.7% in the reportage text category to just 3.6% of all static cohesion in the academic one. Section 3.2.2 below discusses the observations made above in detail.

3.2.2 Staticness.

This section discusses the markers of staticness which have already been identified (c.f table 2.4b)

Both the definite article and pronoun reference do not develop the logic of the text. They rather maintain the readers’ attention onto the referents given in the previous text. Hence they achieve staticness in texts. They enable writers to organise texts by pointing to the referents already identified.

The definite article the gives the identity of people or vehicles introduced earlier on in the text. This may be illustrated by the following example.

50. Twelve people yesterday night perished while ten others are in critical condition when a Nissan matatu they were travelling in collided head-on with a bus at Kapkugerwt trading centre along the Kericho-Nakuru road.

50.1. The bodies of the twelve passengers were burnt beyond recognition when the two vehicles caught fire immediately after the accident (RTC:3;1-2).
The definite reference article the in example 50.1 above achieves staticness in this text excerpt by defining that the same twelve people said to have perished in the crash are the very ones who were burnt beyond recognition. The also qualifies a nissan matatu and a bus as the very ones introduced to us by the non defining reference article a, in example 50.

Pronoun reference is one of the achievers of staticness as it leads the reader back to the preceding text for the referent. In the reportage text category, for instance, the people involved in the accident and those at the accident scene are talked about throughout the description of the accident, as has been illustrated by examples 8-10 (c.f 2.3). The academic text category does not have frequent reference to individuals because such texts discuss issues. They do not narrate a specific incident like those in the reportage text category. Example 51 below illustrates pronoun reference from text 5.

51. The second or crash phase involves the interaction of the vehicle, their occupants and /or pedestrians (ATC:5;3).

In example 51 above, the reference pronoun their refers to vehicle occupants, a static pronoun reference (whose analogy may be their spare parts).

When substitution/ellipsis are used as markers of staticness in texts, the writer is only repeating what has been said without adding any new information. The
lexemes that are recovered are exactly those that are omitted/substituted, hence Halliday and Hasan (1976) call them grammatical and not semantic categories. It has been noted that in spoken texts, (c.f 2.2) it is not uncommon to find such features, but when they occur, they are accompanied by prosodic features of speech like a rise in tone so as to put stress on the intended meaning for easy comprehension of message (Quirk 1985). Since there is no immediacy between writer and reader, (Cook 1989) written texts need to be self clarifying. Too much ellipsis may check their comprehension.

Nominal ellipsis ties, as noted by Lovejoy (1991) may be used as a kind of stylistic feature that allows the writer to avoid having to repeat the same key terms continually. In the three text samples that make up the reportage text category in the corpus for this study, there is the use of those $\_\_$, where the elliptical item is always **people** or **passengers**. Consider examples 52-54 below drawn from the reportage text category.

52. The bus was said to have been carrying 87 passengers but the number of those $\_\_$ in the matatu was not immediately known (RTC:1:7)

53. Among those $\_\_$ at the scene of the accident was Kericho DC Nicholas Mberia and Kericho Police boss, Julius Soi (RTC:2;16)

54. Among those $\_\_$ admitted at the hospital is a Kenya News Agency
Due to this recurrence of similar use in a particular text category, one may make three observations about ellipsis as a marker of staticness:

Firstly, that ellipsis in reportage text samples is used as a stylistic feature to achieve economy of space. Often texts in this category are faced with pressures of maximising benefits from the space available. Thus, some of the items that have already been referred to are omitted.

Secondly, ellipsis may be preferred in texts in order to avoid monotonous repetitions of lexemes, making the text compact, and hence achieving staticness.

Lastly, greater use of ellipsis in reportage texts in this study sample could be attributed to the fact that newspaper texts serve the purpose of informing the public of the goings-on around the world. It may be crucial for a news daily to contain as much information as it can. Ellipsis may make this possible if a word is omitted to create room for another in order for the text to bear more information. In the process, ellipsis makes the text static and not dynamic.

Lexical repetition is the most frequent static cohesive device in the data for the present study. It is hard to imagine any text without occasional repetition of lexemes because after a writer has defined a topic, much detail is generated from it allowing for constant reiteration of lexemes. This static tie does not change or develop the topic under discussion, as the same lexeme is reiterated. This is illustrated by the following examples.
55. The third or postcrash phase involves the physical damage to humans, vehicles and other objects which may result from the crash.

55.1. This damage may be temporary or permanent, superficial or extensive (ATC:5;7-8)

56. Many countermeasures have been and are being proposed for each of these phases.

56.1. Countermeasures in the crash phase cover a wide range of activities (ATC:5;9-10)

In the two examples above the emboldened terms damage and countermeasures, direct repetitions from the previous sentences, serve as the means by which to introduce related information. In some cases as in example 56.1, the repeated terms are preceded by demonstrative reference which serve to point back to the same lexemes. As has been illustrated in the examples, repetition therefore is a way of opening out a sentence so that its lexical uniqueness may be used as a basis for providing further related information. Hoey (1983) also notes this, observing that repetition is both a common method of connecting sentences as well as a significant contributor to their interpretation. This is because, he argues, that the repeated material acts as a framework for the interpretation of the new material.

Perhaps the academic text category in our study sample uses more lexical
repetition to achieve staticness because it occasionally has to reiterate technical terminologies, unlike the less formal reportage text category which may use superordinates and synonyms in some cases. As Lovejoy (1991) observes, texts in his study sample have very high numbers of repetitions probably because texts drawn from scientific studies define very narrow topics about which they generate much detail. Texts in this category are formal and technical in nature. Texts in the reportage text category on the other hand, have to colour their language by use of synonyms or other expressions instead of repeating chunks of text. This serves to avoid making the reader bored as monotony will disinterest the reading of news. A reader who reads a text for academic purposes might tolerate repetition of phrases and clauses more than one who reads newspapers for information and pleasure. Texts in the reportage text category have therefore to use attractive language.

Synonymy also achieves staticness in texts. In using it, a writer instead of reiterating what has gone before by use of the same word, uses another word similar in meaning. Such a writer is simply drawing the reader’s attention back to what has gone before in another way. Synonyms therefore do not carry the discussion on.

In this study sample, synonyms occur more frequently in the reportage text category than in the academic one. In the reportage category, synonyms occur alongside each other. When this is done, they are probably used as a style for
emphasis. This may be illustrated by the following two examples. Example 43 is repeated here as example 57.

57. Mr. Mberia called on the Ministry of Public Works to immediately seal and fill all the potholes along the route which he said was one of the major causes of accidents (RTC:3;11).

58. There were wails and screams from passengers as some struggled to escape through the windows (RTC:1;10).

Seal and fill in example 57 above carry the same meaning. However, perhaps they are both used statively as a stylistic device that emphasises the fact that if the roads didn’t have potholes, less people would be being lost on them.

In example 58 above, if either wails or screams had been used, the message would still have been conveyed. Nevertheless, the two terms may have been used so as to achieve an emphatic effect showing the terror and despair that was at the scene.

Examples of the use of synonyms drawn from the academic text category in this study corpus hardly reveal such juxtapositioning. They rarely occur but when they do, they are used mainly intersententially as exemplified in example 13, repeated as example 59 below.
In Kenya, the percentage of casualties occurring during darkness increased considerably between 1960 and 1972.

59.1. This is almost certainly due to an increase in night traffic (ATC:4:11)

In the above example, darkness is synonymous with the night.

Lovejoy (1991) notes that the writers of biology and psychology passages make repeated use of technical terminology whereas the history passage writer has considerably more referential freedom because the topics are more general and the writer has more choice of words. A similar observation is made in this study corpus. For example, in the academic text category, there is a higher frequency of repetitions but fewer synonyms. In the reportage text category on the other hand, the frequency of occurrence of synonyms is higher, but that of repetition is low; this category having more freedom of terminology. This ensures that the report is pleasurable to read. Since most newspaper readers skim through and do not concentrate on detail, it would be unattractive to the reader if every word is a repetition of the previous.

3.3 Dynamic cohesion.

It has been observed that dynamic cohesive ties also occur in the data for the present study. These are crucial for text development in that they do not just maintain our attention on relationships already drawn in the text. They develop
new relationships. Instead of repeating an idea, they show how it develops, changes or relates to something else. They are a manipulation of the writer, who decides the best among several items that will foster his logic so as to have the reader with him through the text. Thus, they enhance easy reading of the text, making it more coherent to the reader.

### 3.3.1 Occurrence of Dynamic Cohesive Devices.

The reportage text category has only 14.8% of all its cohesive devices comprising dynamic ties. The academic text category on the other hand, has more markers of dynamic cohesion, representing 24.1% of all cohesive devices present in this text category. Are academic texts used in this study data therefore more coherent and easier to read than reportage texts? The implications of these findings will be revisited in the next chapter. However, initial findings are in agreement with other research. For instance, Hartnet's (1986) study corpus had more static cohesive ties than dynamic ones. She notes that "unlike static ties dynamic cohesive ties are both optional and sparse" (1986:146). Dynamic cohesive ties perform different functions. The remainder of this section shall discuss in depth achievers of dynamism in texts for this study as evidenced in our findings.

Table 2.5a below shows the distribution of dynamic cohesive features in our data. Like table 2.4a, this table has percentages of frequencies of cohesive features that mark dynamism in each text category. The percentages of every type of dynamic
cohesive marker has been calculated from the total sum of all dynamic cohesive
devices in each text category in this study corpus.

Table 2.5a: Distribution of Dynamic Cohesive Devices in
Reportage and Academic Text Categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynamic CD/ Text Category</th>
<th>CD of RTC</th>
<th>% of CD RTC</th>
<th>% out of CD RTC</th>
<th>CD of ATC</th>
<th>% of CD ATC</th>
<th>% out of CD ATC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunctions</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the categories of cohesion categorised as achievers of dynamism in texts for
this study occur in both text categories (c.f table 2.5a). The most frequent marker
of dynamism in the text samples for this study is reference, followed by
conjunction. Lexical cohesion is notably the least frequent type of dynamic
cohesion. It is expected to be the least employed achiever of dynamism because
the greatly repetitive subcategories of lexical cohesion do not develop the logic
of the writer.

The academic text category accounts for the highest frequency of reference, a
marker of dynamic cohesion in texts for this study. Reference represents 56.2%
of all cohesive devices in this particular text category. Why does the figure drop so drastically to only 16.4% of those in the reportage text category? This will be solved after a closer analysis of subcategories of reference that mark dynamism (3.3.3 f.f)

The academic text category also has the highest occurrence of conjunctions. They account for 34.4% of all its dynamic cohesive devices. It is also a wonder that conjunctions drop to 29.5% of the total dynamic cohesive devices in the reportage text category. This could be because writers of texts in the academic text category impose their opinion on the reader and therefore link their arguments by conjunctive expressions. If this be so, it suggests that such academic texts present their arguments in a more coherent way than those found in the reportage text category in this study sample.

It is notable that unlike reference and conjunctions, lexical cohesion is more frequent in the reportage text category than the academic category (c.f table 2.5a). This particular marker of dynamic cohesion represents 54% of all dynamic cohesive devices in this text category. In the academic text category, lexical cohesion that marks dynamism represents only 8%. Why? This is probed more in the following sections of this chapter.

3.3.2 Occurrence of subcategories of dynamic cohesive device.

Table 2.5b below shows the frequencies of occurrence of subcategories of cohesion that achieve dynamism in text samples for the present study.
Table 2.5b: Distribution of Subcategories of Dynamic Cohesive Devices in Academic and Reportage Text Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynamic CD/</th>
<th>RTC</th>
<th>ATC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>CD in</td>
<td>% of CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superordinate</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lexical superordinate which accounts for 54.1% of all achievers of dynamism in the reportage text category is the most frequent subcategory. It is followed by comparative and demonstrative reference in the academic text category. They each represent 28.1% of all dynamic cohesive devices in this particular category. In the reportage text category, they represent only 6.4% and 9.8% of all dynamic cohesive devices respectively. Adversative and causal conjunctions in the reportage text category are the least occurring cohesive devices that mark dynamism. They represent only 3.3% of all dynamic cohesive devices in the text category. The following section (3.3.3 f.f) discusses observations from table 2.5b critically.
3.3.3 Dynamism

Comparative reference as an achiever of dynamic cohesion develops a discourse by focusing on comparison and contrast. The example below will elucidate this:

60. Accident and casualty rates per licensed vehicle are higher during the hours of darkness so a change in the proportion of traffic at night will have an effect on the overall accident or casualty rates.
60.1. Fatalities per licensed vehicle for developed and developing countries were found to be significantly correlated with vehicle ownership, the higher the level of vehicle ownership, the lower the fatality rate.

\[ATC:4;13-14\]

The emboldened terms in example 60.1 above do not hold our attention on the discourse but they develop it. They give the reader information not yet encountered. Comparative dynamic cohesive features are seldom used by the reportage text category. In this text category in particular, no differentiation is made between two things. Instead, scenes are described as they are. In cases where the reportage text describes two incidents, it places them one after the other like text 3 (appendix I 1 f) which describes two accidents.

In this study, demonstrative reference is categorised among cohesive devices that mark dynamism in texts., unlike in Hartnet (1986) who groups it among static cohesion. In this study sample, demonstratives particularly this/these and that play the important role of highlighting the development of the text. Consider the
following example.

61. Instead of merely testing a driver by means of simple memory tests on basic driving rules and checking his depth perception, much more comprehensive driving techniques should be developed.

61.1. These tests many of which can be administered by means of simulation devices should also evaluate such complex and varied characteristics as mental attitude, aggressiveness, judgemental ability in varied situations, neuromuscular conditions and dynamic visual acuity (ATC:5:14-15)

Demonstratives in the academic text category are used when the writer wants to say something more about what has already been written about. They form the basis or theme on which new information is introduced, and so they do develop the topic as in these in example 61.1 above which gives the basis on which to explain what driving tests should encompass.

We noted in the preceding section (c.f 3.3.2) that the academic text category in this study corpus employs more demonstrative references than the reportage text category. This could be because demonstratives enable the academic writer to capture the already given information and develop it as he forms his opinion about it, and argues it out. Demonstrative references therefore enable the writer to develop his logic as already demonstrated.
In this study, all conjunctions form dynamic cohesive ties. They perform various functions with the sole aim of developing new relationships as they forge the discussion ahead. In the text samples for the present study, additive conjunctions have been included among dynamic cohesive devices unlike in Hartnet (1986). In her study, she groups them together with static cohesive devices. The argument for this recategorisation is that additive conjunctions develop the discussion by adding new information onto what we already know. In this study corpus, it appears that they introduce crucial content that would adversely affect the text if missed out. Usually they do not refer us back to the previous text, but forge the text ahead when they signal crucial information the reader has not encountered before. The examples below will illustrate this:

62. Mr. Mberia (the Kericho DC) called on the Ministry of Public Works to immediately fill and seal all the potholes along the route which he said was one of the major causes of accidents.

62.1. The DC at the same time cautioned drivers against overspeeding and overloading to minimise the rate of road accidents.

62.2. The DC also sent a message of condolence to the families, relatives and friends of those who perished following the accident (RTC:3:12-14)

63. Apart from the reasons put forward above, such as changes in vehicle composition, or increase in night time driving, the many factors needed to reduce accident rates such as improved junction design, vehicle
maintenance and inspection, education and enforcement are not keeping abreast with the larger increases in vehicle ownership (ATC:5;11-12)

In example 62, at the same time in 62.1 states what additional information the DC said. Also in 62.2 signals the introduction of new additional information from the DC which is not a reiteration of the previous. It is fresh news that is very significant especially to the bereaved. In example 63, apart from not only signals additional information to that which has already been stated, but also serves as a sign post for the writer to state his opinion on the matter.

Additive conjunctions in this study sample occur more frequently in the academic text category than in the reportage category. This may be because academic writers discuss a certain phenomenon in detail. As they dwell on the idea and try to make the reader understand the argument, they employ additive conjunctions which highlight the ideas logically. This is illustrated by the additive conjunction apart from in example 63 above. Writers in the reportage text category may not employ such conjunctions since their objective is to describe road traffic accidents.

Temporal conjunctions as markers of dynamism in texts support the chronology of events. They also indicate that events are carried out simultaneously or chronologically. Temporal conjunctions occur more frequently in the reportage text category than in the academic category (c.f table 2.5b). However, this
simultaneous vis-a-vis chronological usage is what makes the difference in patterns of temporal conjunctions between the text categories under investigation here. The reportage text category uses more simultaneous temporal conjunctions than the academic one. We could attribute this to the fact that using temporals is a style of narrating various events concurrently in the reportage text category which has to use its space very economically and yet profitably. The following examples illustrate the use of temporal conjunctions in this study corpus.

64. Horror crash leaves 12 dead: as five others perish on Mombasa-Nairobi highway.

64.1. Twelve people yesterday night perished while ten others are in critical condition when a Nissan matatu they were travelling in collided with a bus at Kapkugerwet trading centre along the Kericho-Nakuru road, five kilometres from Kericho town (RTC:3.tittle-1).

65. Both accident and preventive countermeasures may be seen within a three-phase sequence.

65.1. The first or precrash phase involves such factors as initial and continuing driver education, periodic driver examinations, existence of bad driving or walking habits and attitudes, and physical and mental deficiencies including those induced by alcohol and other drugs.

65.2. The second or crash phase involves the interaction of the vehicle or vehicles, with their occupants and pedestrians
65.3. The third phase or postcrash phase involves the physical damage to humans, vehicles and other objects which result from the crash. (ATC: 5.1-3 and 7).

Both as in example 64 and while in 64.1 above are temporal conjunctions used to simultaneously describe two different things. In the case of as we have two separate accidents. While is used to connect the statement talking about the 12 dead, and that describing the people who are critically injured.

In chapter 2, we found out that temporal conjunctions used in the academic text category are mainly sequential as seen in example 65 above. In this example, the first sentence talks about a three phase sequence. The subsequent sentences detail out what each of the three sequences entail during an accident. This sequencing is signalled by the first 65.1, the second in 65.2 and the third in 65.3. This kind of temporal conjunction signal chronology of occurrence of events. It is useful in academic texts probably because after analysing their research findings, academicians need to present their arguments not only in an organised manner, but also convincingly. Chronology of events is one of the ways of building up the arguments so that they come out forcefully. Chronology is not always important in newspaper narration of an accident since it happens too fast, sometimes no-one notices the events leading to one. In fact the consequences of the accident are much more important to the anxious readers and so they are foregrounded in print mass media.
Causal conjunctions as achievers of dynamism in texts are a kind of dynamic tie that show a proposition’s purpose, reason or result. They are important in connecting reasoning from its cause to effect. And so, they develop the text without necessarily referring the reader back to past elements. There is a difference between the text categories in the pattern of this kind of dynamic tie. Perhaps press reports in this study corpus use them less frequently because they do not justify or explain the causes of accidents, but they just narrate them to the public as they are. Since their performance on the market lies in the immediacy and accuracy with which they report the events taking place, news reporters mainly highlight consequences of the accidents. In addition, news reporters may not have much time on their hands to analyse causes of occurrences. Besides, their purpose is to pass information to the public and not to analyse the occurrences. Academic writers on the other hand, have to analyse the facts and find causes of the effects given. Their main aim is not to highlight consequences, like reportages, but to find causes and give logical arguments that can justify those consequences. These arguments are often expressed persuasively so as to convince the reader to follow the point of view of the academic writer. Such texts will naturally employ more causal conjunctions possibly to develop the discussion and to impose the writer’s opinion on the reader. Examples are necessary here:

66. An analysis of road accidents and casualties in Kenya showed that the average number of casualties per injury accident taking place has increased by 60% over the last ten years.
66.1. This could be due to increasing vehicle occupancy over the time or due to the fact that a specific type of accident is much more common now than was the case ten years ago (ATC:4;7-8)

67. It was observed that nearly 80% of those killed are pedestrians and passengers followed by 14% as drivers.

67.1. Therefore drivers were potentially responsible for nearly 49% of those killed whereas pedestrians have a share of 43% (ATC:6;8-9)

The causal conjunction due to is used in example 66.1 as the signal that what follows is the writer's opinion, hence developing his logic. Another illustration of the same is illustration 67.1 above, in which therefore creates cohesion by not only linking it to the preceding text, but also by pointing to the reader to read on in order to follow the argument.

In the reportage text category, all causal conjunctions are direct speeches of people at the scene of the accident, as seen in examples 68 and 69 below.

68. The DC "urged the ministry of Public Works and Housing to seal potholes on highways since they were contributing to accidents." (RTC;1,18).

69. They "appealed to members of the public and passengers who might have continued with the journey after the accident to report to any police
Since in example 68 expresses reason, while so as to in 69 expresses purpose. Both causal conjunctions appearing in reportage texts are not a feature of the reporter, but are taken from the speeches of the people at the scene. They therefore do not signal the reporter's opinion nor do they develop his logic unlike those illustrations in academic texts.

Adversative conjunctions are another type of dynamic cohesive feature. They achieve dynamism in texts by signalling contrast to what is expected. Both text categories use them to a fairly similar extent. The following examples illustrate this type of conjunction. Example 30 is repeated here as example 70.

70. Another victim Beatrice Ajode is admitted at the hospital with her 12-year old daughter Frida Atieno.

70.1. The doctors at the hospital however described the conditions of the two women as stable and out of danger (RTC:3,9-10)

71. Detailed research in these countries is needed to develop a full understanding of the accident patterns that exist, but desegregated data have been used to illustrate some of the factors leading to increasing as opposed to decreasing fatality and injury rates (ATC:4;2)
In example 70 above, contrary expectations are signalled by the adversative conjunction **however** found in 70.1. In the preceding text we are given a ghastly account of 12 people being burnt beyond recognition in a road traffic accident (text 3 f.f). So it comes as a surprise that some of the survivors are not in the expected critical condition. This contrary expectation is achieved by **however**.

The above examples show that adversative conjunctions signal crucial information that develops the text. The academic text category in this study sample employs more adversative conjunctions than the reportage text category. We have noted (this section) that adversatives found in the reportage category in this study do not develop the news writer's logic. This is because they are not features of his thought. The academic writer, on the other hand, employs contrast; signalled by adversative conjunctions in order to state his opinion which is often contrary to the situation as it is. This is illustrated by example 71 above, in which the adversative link is signalled by the adversative conjunction **but**.

Lexical superordinates are another type of cohesive device that perform a developmental role to the discourse. Hartnet (1986) says that lexical superordinates perform the function of identifying high level logical relationships. They therefore develop the logical thrust of the discourse as exemplified in the cases below.

72. The **first** or **crash phase** involves the interaction of the **vehicle**, their **occupants and/or pedestrians**.
72.1. This phase begins when mechanical forces in excess of those the vehicle occupants and pedestrians can tolerate start to exert themselves on vehicles and people (ATC:5,3-4).

73. The percentage distribution of those persons killed in road traffic accidents in Kenya was found to be described by the logarithmic trend curve over time.

73.1. However, it was observed that nearly 80% of those killed are pedestrians and passengers followed by 14% as drivers (ATC:6,1 and 7).

People in example 72.1 above encompasses not only pedestrian, but passengers and drivers as well. Vehicles is also used to mean not only the particular one causing the accident, but all the other that may find themselves affected or involved.

Lexical superordinates may be used to tear down a discourse from the general to the specific as in example 73 above. In this particular example, we first encounter a general reference to persons which is later torn down into specifics, given as pedestrian, passengers and drivers. There is such use in the reportage text category where people is used to mean individuals like accident victims named, drivers, and other people at the scene. Lexical superordinates occur less frequently in academic text samples probably because such texts have to use the formal vocabulary of the discipline and therefore have less freedom of reference.
Thus they utilise repetition of technical terminology more. The reportage text category being relatively informal has more freedom to use various terms. Besides, the news report is consumed by people from all cadres of the public so the language used has to be as general as possible in order for these people from different backgrounds to understand. Using very difficult technical language may put off beginning readers who may also use the newspaper as their source of information. In addition, the use of lexical superordinate in this genre may achieve the effect of giving variety to the text for attractive reading instead of outright repetitions. It might also ensure that less space is used as shown in example 74.

74. 12 people yesterday night perished while 10 others are in critical conditions when a nissan matatu they were travelling in collided head-on with a bus at Kapkugerwet trading center.

74.1. The bodies of the 12 passengers were burnt beyond recognition when the two vehicles caught fire immediately after the accident (ATC:3;1-2).

Instead of repeating nissan matatu and bus, the lexical superordinate vehicles has been used in 74.1. This saves some space. However, in section 3.3.1 (c.f) we wondered why lexical cohesion that achieves dynamism in texts occurs so very frequently in the reportage text category as opposed to the academic one. It is observed that lexical superordinate subcategory is the one that inflates the
figure for lexical cohesion (c.f table 2.5a). This subcategory has the highest frequency of all achievers of dynamism in the reportage text samples. Why?

Looking at the sample of data that forms the reportage text category, (appendix 1 f.f), this high frequency of lexical superordinate may be attributed to the fact that in narrating the happenings at the accident scene, there is reference to people. Thereafter various individuals involved in the accident directly or indirectly are named e.g the victims like Margaret Amollo, Atieno and Ajode; government officials like the DC, Mr. Mberia, and the police boss Mr. Julius Soi; and even people who condole the bereaved as seen in example 75 below.

75. Others who sent messages of condolence were Kericho mayor, Cllr John Chege, Antony Kimeto a prominent businessman, Mr. Keboolr and chairman Supreme council of Kenya muslims, rift valley province Alhaj Abdulahi Kiptanui (RTC:2; 19)

All these individuals named fall under the superordinate term people. However, do they really promote dynamism in texts? Could it be that some of the markers of dynamic cohesion promote dynamism more than others? This is outside the objective of the present research, but we shall return to it as a suggestion for further related research in chapter 4.

3.4 Summary

Markers of staticness occur in a majority of cases in both text categories in this
study as expected. Every writer organises the text using such static cohesive devices. In the reportage text category however, static cohesive devices occur more frequently than in the academic one. The use of each static cohesive device still varies from text to text. For example, the definite article and pronoun reference, are employed more by the reportage text samples which have to constantly refer back to the people in the process of reporting on them. The serves to specify that they are the same entities referred to earlier.

Whereas the academic text category uses more repetitions to achieve staticness, the reportage one uses more synonyms and employs deletion in some cases. The academic text category is a formal technical area of study which may define a narrow topic and generate much detail from it, reiterating technical terminologies often. In the reportage category on the other hand, the writer has more referential freedom and has to attract the reader by colouring his language instead of making it monotonous by use of repetitions.

In summary, dynamic cohesive devices are generally used less, although they occur more frequently in the academic text category than the reportage category. There is varying use of each type of dynamic cohesive feature by the texts; for instance, conjunctions; comparative and demonstrative references occur more frequently in the academic text category. In the reportage one on the other hand, it is lexical superordinates that are frequent. It was noted that the use of comparatives however, depends on the topic of the writer. A topic on comparison
employs more comparatives. Conjunctions as markers of dynamism are used more by academic texts because such a writer has to justify his arguments and the findings in his corpus, in addition to imposing his opinions on the reader. The news reporter may use conjunctions less as his aim is to inform the public of the consequences of the accidents; he has no time to find and analyse justifications for their causes if he has to inform them in a flash.

The chapter further attributes the use of more lexical superordinate by reportage texts than academic texts to the fact that the reportage text category has more freedom of reference to use general language so that different members of the society can understand the news. However, the various individuals involved in the accident also inflate this subcategory of cohesion.

Using the distinctions of staticness and dynamism, it may be the case that since academic text samples used in this study employ more dynamic cohesive devices as opposed to reportage texts, then academic texts are rated as more coherent than reportage text samples in this study corpus. These reportage texts employ more static cohesive devices instead, which do not enhance coherence of texts as they do not develop the writer’s connection of ideas.

The above conclusions bring the analysis of this study data to a close. The next and last chapter summarises the findings of the study, highlighting its implications and making some recommendations for more related research.
CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

4.0 Introduction

This concluding chapter summarises the findings of the study and the implications that accrue from them. It then gives recommendations for further related research.

4.1 Summary of the findings

Using the descriptive framework as propagated by Halliday and Hasan (1976), the present study reveals that both academic and reportage text categories use cohesive features to connect and continue their discussion. These features are however, used in varying frequencies. Ellipsis/substitution, for instance, are rarely used while lexical cohesion is frequently used.

Hartner's (1986) model which is used to recategorise these cohesive features reveals that dynamic cohesive features, the features that introduce new relationships in the text, developing it and rendering its easy reading, are sparsely employed. On the other hand, static cohesive ties, which play the important role of relating the reader to what has already been said for easy flow of the text, are often employed.

The study shows that the reportage text category uses more ellipsis/substitution
and lexical superordinates as a style of avoiding to reiterate the same key terms and hence saving some of its space. The academic text category, on the other hand, has more lexical repetitions since it defines a narrow area of study and generates much detail from it often reiterating technical terminology. The reportage text category avoids such plain repetition and uses lexical synonymy and superordinates, to colour its language for attractive reading. It also has more referential freedom, being an informal genre. If readers have to read newspapers for pleasure, monotonous repetitiveness of every other word will create disinterest.

The academic text category in this study sample tends to omit main verbs, unlike the reportage text category in which, as observed, main verbs have to stay put since these are the verbs that contain the news needed by readers who may simply scan the newspaper for information. The reportage text category prefers to omit modal verbs instead. Such verbs mainly help content verbs to carry the information. Omitting them will not interfere with the comprehension of a skimming/scanning reader since main verbs are present to bear the message.

Also, text samples in the academic text category in this study have more conjunctions because the writer in this category has to justify the argument being put forward and impose his point of view on the reader. This is unlike the reportage category in which there is a tendency for the writer to just narrate the incidents as they are. The argument in academic texts has to be logically.
convincingly and forcefully presented, making the academic text category use chronological temporal conjunctions, unlike the reportage text category which uses simultaneous ones, so as to narrate two incidents at the same time and economise its space as it creates room for more news.

It is also observed that the use of comparative conjunctions depends on the topic of the writer. A writer focusing on comparison will use more comparative conjunctions. This could explain why the reportage text category seldom has comparatives; it hardly ever compares incidents.

It is apparent from the study that the academic text category uses more of repetitions, demonstratives and conjunctions because:

1. It is a relatively formal discursive genre which has to persuade the reader to follow its opinions by clearly stating its views with supportive evidence.
2. It has to convince the reader by presenting its views logically and forcefully.
3. It defines a narrow topic of study and often reiterates technical terminology of the discipline.
4. It may need to compare two or more things if the comparison will reinforce its point of view.
5. It targets a specific audience of members of the discipline who will easily understand the technical language employed in the text.
6. It does not narrate things that happen to people but discusses issues hence uses demonstrative reference as opposed to pronoun reference.
The reportage text category on the other hand, uses more lexical synonyms and superordinates, pronoun and definite references and nominal ellipsis since:

1. Its purpose is to convey current news to the public so it has to ensure that as much information is contained in a news edition as possible.
2. It has to ensure that no profitable space is wasted.
3. It has to be attractive and thus avoids monotonous repetitions.
4. It narrates things that happen to people and so constantly makes reference to them to create some organisation in the text.
5. It has to cater for people of different backgrounds and must therefore use generalised language.

Lastly and most importantly, the academic text category in this study appears to have better textual development than the reportage category which use comparatively fewer dynamic cohesive ties. Ranking coherence of the two text categories on a cline using static and dynamic cohesion, coherence of academic texts is ranked above that of reportage texts, although this difference does not render reportage texts incoherent. It simply implies that academic texts are fairly more coherent than reportage texts.

4.2 Recommendations and implications.

The findings of the present study imply that details about cohesion (and writing in general) in diverse disciplines may be useful to teachers since different text categories create their texts in different ways. Teachers of various subjects may
use them to guide their students on how to develop their texts, make them flow well, and easily readable.

Language policy makers may employ the results of this study by encouraging the use of dynamic cohesive devices which enhance coherence of texts as demonstrated here.

The results imply that mere counts of cohesion may not be very useful in judging writing quality. Halliday and Hasan (1976) is a useful model for identifying and describing cohesive devices in texts, but fails in judging writing quality. The categories need to be redefined to suit a researcher's purpose for deeper interpretations of coherence, as has been done by Hartnet (1986).

Finally, the results of the present study have some theoretical implications for road traffic accident newspaper reports. Since coherence of texts in the reportage text category is ranked below that of texts in the academic text category, then writers of newspaper reports on traffic accidents may need to go beyond just describing the accident and inject an argument that could strongly bring out the need for safe road usage by all.

4.3 Suggestions for Further Related Research.

The present study used a small sample of only three texts from each text category. Each text category had an average of 1245 words. A longer, larger
sample may yield different results and interesting interpretations from these given here.

The present study was limited to only a small section of academic and reportage text categories. It would be useful if research was carried out to determine whether different sections of the same article use cohesion similarly. For instance, it would be interesting to compare the news editorial with sports features; or to compare different sections of academic texts e.g introductions, conclusions; results and methods. And, even more revealing results may come out of a study which compares cohesion in various texts in the same category especially the reportage text category which compete for the same market.

A study which compares how the print media reports spoken discourse might reveal crucial differences in cohesion as used in spoken against cohesion in written texts.

More studies should be carried out to test whether Hartnets’s (1986) categories of static and dynamic cohesion will determine coherence of texts in other disciplines.

It was observed earlier (c.f 3.3.3) that some cohesive features classified under dynamic cohesion appear to promote dynamism in texts more than others. It might be useful if a study was carried out to provide more insight on this observation.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


_______, (5-5-97), "30 Feared Dead in Horror Smash", Nairobi, Nation Group.

East African Standard, (5-5 97), "40 Feared Dead in Pile up", the Standard Limited, Nairobi.


Jacobs, G.D. and P.R. Fouracre (1977) "Further Research on Road Traffic Accidents in Developing Countries", in Transport and Road Research Laboratory, Crowthorn, Birkshire.


Kenya Times. (1-1-96), "Last Years Death Toll", Nairobi, Kenya Times Media Trust.

---------- (5-5-97), "45 Feared Dead in Horror Pile up", Nairobi, Kenya Times Media Trust.


APPENDICES

Below are the texts used in the study. All texts have been reported here with sentence numbers inserted.

APPENDIX I:
Appendix I comprises the three text sample from the reportage text category.

12 Perish as bus goes up in Flames
1. 12 people died when a bus collided head-on with a matatu and burst into flames on the Kericho-Nakuru highway on Friday night.
2. Eleven of the victims were burnt beyond recognition.
3. Police said the accident occurred at around 2pm at Kapkugerwet market, almost five kilometres from Kericho town.
4. Scores of passengers were injured.
5. The charred remains of the dead were taken to Kericho District Hospital Mortuary yesterday morning.
6. The burnt shells of both vehicles were still smouldering.
7. The bus was said to have been carrying 87 passengers but the number or those in the matatu was not immediately known.
8. Many of the survivors were taken to the district hospital.
9. One of the survivors, Mr. Edward Ndege, said at the hospital: "all that I heard was a loud bang followed by two explosions before fire engulfed the bus.
10. There were wails and screams from passengers as some struggled to escape through the windows".
11. Mr. Ndege, an employee of the Kenya Wildlife service said he boarded the bus in Kisumu on its way to Mombasa.
12. Another survivor, Miss Margaret Amollo, who works for the Kenya News Agency in Nairobi, said she escaped from the burning bus by breaking a window and jumping through. 13. She could not remember how she got to the hospital.
14. The local police boss, senior supt Julius Soi, appealed to the accident victims transferred to hospitals outside the district to report to the nearest police station.
15. He said one of the drivers was hiding.
16. In Nakuru, the Rift Valley Provincial Deputy Traffic Enforcement Officer, Mr. John Makori, said the accident occurred when one of the vehicles tried to avoid a pothole.
17. The Kericho District Commissioner, Mr. Nicholas Mberia, who visited the scene told drivers to avoid overspeeding. 18. He urged the Ministry of Public Works and Housing to seal potholes on highways since they were contributing to accidents.
19. He sent a message of condolences to the bereaved families.
12 die in horror crash
1. Twelve people died in a fiery horror when a bus and a matatu collided head on at Kapkugerwet trading center some 7 km from Kericho town.
2. Seven others are recovering at Kericho district hospital.
3. Survivors told of terrified screams and scenes of "utter horror" as those injured in the crash perished in the flames "trapped in the wreckage and unable to escape".
4. The accident occurred at 11 pm on Friday night.
5. It involved a Coast bus vehicle heading from Kisumu to Mombasa and a Nissan mini bus.

Twisted
6. The impact set off a fire which gutted the two vehicles leaving only twisted metal frames.
7. All passengers' property in the vehicles was destroyed in the fire.
8. Among the survivors was a KNA writer Ms Amolo who boarded the bus in Kericho town.
9. She said she had gone to see her father at Bomet Mr. Jacob Amolo who is a teacher at St Michael's primary school in the district.
10. Another survivor, Ms Beatrice Ajode is among those recovering at the hospital.
11. She said she got on the bus in Kisumu with her 12-year old daughter, Frida Atieno.
12. She said she heard "a loud bang" and saw "a huge fire and smoke" erupt from the driver's cabin.
13. "I smashed the window of the bus and pushed my daughter through.
14. "Both of us managed to flee from the bus. A good samaritan took us and other survivors to the hospital in his vehicle
15. Among those at the scene of the accident was Kericho district commissioner Nicholas Mberia and Kericho police boss Julius Soi.
16. They sent messages of condolences to families and relatives who lost their beloved ones in the accident.
17. They appealed to members of the public and passengers who might have continued with the journey after the accident to report to any police station wherever they might be so as to assist with investigations.
18. Others who sent messages of condolences were Kericho mayor Cllr John Kaura, Antony Kimeto, a prominent businessman, Mr. Keboor and chairman, Supreme Council of Kenya Muslims Rift Valley Province Alhaj Abdulahi Kiptanui.
Horror crash leaves 12 dead as five others perish on Mbs-Nbi highway.

1. Twelve people yesterday night perished while ten others are in critical condition when a Nissan matatu they were travelling in collided head-on with a bus at Kapkugerwet trading center along the Kericho-Nakuru road, five kilometers from Kericho town.

2. The bodies of the 12 passengers were burnt beyond recognition when the two vehicles caught fire immediately after the accident.

3. The driver of the Coast Bus which was travelling from Kisumu to Mombasa escaped unhurt.

4. When Sunday Times visited the scene of the accident yesterday morning, the two vehicles were still smouldering.

5. Police from Kericho lead by the Kericho OCPD, SSP Julius Soi arrived at the scene immediately and helped in clearing the road.

6. Police with the help of good samaritans rushed the injured to the Kericho District Hospital where they were admitted while the bodies were removed to Kericho hospital mortuary.

7. Among those admitted at the hospital is a Kenya news agency staffer, Mrs Margaret Amollo. Talking from her hospital bed Mrs Amollo said that she could not recall how the accident occurred, saying that when she came to her senses, she found herself at the hospital bed.

8. Another victim Beatrice Ajode, a teacher at Haria primary school in Mombasa who was travelling from Kisumu to Mombasa is admitted at the hospital with her 12-year old daughter Frida Atieno.

9. The doctors at the hospital however, described the conditions of the two women as stable and out of danger.

10. The Kericho District Commissioner, Mr. Julius Mberia was among the first people to visit the scene of the accident yesterday morning.

11. Mr Mberia called on the Ministry of Public Works to immediately seal and fill all potholes along the route which he said was one of the major causes of accidents.

12. The DC at the same time cautioned drivers against overspeeding and overloading to minimise the rate of road accident in the country.

13. The OCPD appealed to members of the public whose relatives were travelling in the two vehicles identify the bodies at the Kericho District Hospital; Mortuary or to check on the survivors at the hospital.

14. Meanwhile five people were killed on the spot and 13 others rushed to the Coast General Hospital when two passenger buses were involved in a head-on collision at Jomvu along the Mombasa-Nairobi road on Friday morning, reports Charles Kerich.

15. The accident occurred opposite Moi Airport when a bus being driven by Anwar Ahmed collided with another bus belonging to Akamba Bus Company in the wee hours of Friday. The driver of the second bus Isaac Kimemia died on the spot together with four passengers bringing this years death toll to 545.
APPENDIX 2
Appendix 2 comprises all the three text samples from the academic text category.

TEXT 4: JACOBS G.D AND P.R. FOURACRE (1977): FURTHER RESEARCH ON ROAD ACCIDENT RATES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. CROWTHORN BIRKSHIRE: transport and Road Research Laboratory (Pages 10-11).

Conclusions and discussions.
1. This report shows that there was a continuing downward trend in fatality and injury rates per licensed vehicle over the period 1961 to 1971, in the majority of the countries studied, but that Kenya, Jamaica, Zambia, Malawi and Nigeria, were notable exceptions to this.
2. Detailed research in these countries is needed to obtain a full understanding of the accident patterns that exist, but desegregated data have been used to illustrate some of the factors leading to increasing as opposed to decreasing fatality and injury rates.
3. In the countries studied, there was found to be a close correlation between changes in the proportion of two-wheeled motor vehicles on the road, and the changes in fatality and injury rates per licensed motor vehicle. Thus, countries showing the greatest increases in fatality rates per vehicle also had the largest increases in the ownership of two-wheeled motor vehicles.
4. In most countries, over recent years, there has been a tendency for the fatality and injury rates per licensed vehicle to pedestrians to show a considerable decrease. Zambia, Jamaica and Malawi did not show this decrease, and pedestrian rates often increased faster than those of other road users.
5. An analysis of road accidents and casualties in Kenya showed that the average number of casualties per injury accident taking place has increased by sixty per cent, over the last ten years. This could be due to increasing vehicle occupancy over the time or to the fact that a specific type of accident is much more common now than was the case ten years ago. For example commercial vehicles are now commonly used to transport workers to and from their places of work.
6. When such a vehicle is involved in an accident, large numbers of casualties often result.
7. In Kenya, the percentage of casualties occurring during darkness increased considerably between 1960 and 1972. This is almost certainly due to an increase in night traffic. Accident and casualty rates per licensed vehicle are higher during the hours of darkness so a change in the proportion of traffic at night will have an effect on the overall accident or casualty rates.
8. Fatalities per licensed vehicle for developed and developing countries were found to be significantly correlated with vehicle ownership, the higher the level of vehicle ownership, the lower the fatality rate. The equation derived by professor Smeed using data from different developed countries, for the year 1938 was found to be a very good predictor of fatality rates for the years 1950, 1960 and 1970. The equation for developing countries is clearly different from that
derived by Smeed, the regression line having a lower slope.

17. The regression line calculated for the year 1971 was above that calculated for 1968, the slopes of the two lines being almost exactly the same. In other words, the fatality rates per licensed vehicle were greater in 1971 than in 1968, for the same levels of vehicle ownership. This implies that over the short period 1968 to 1971, the situation has worsened in developing countries.

20. Apart from the reasons put forward above, such as changes in vehicle composition, or increase in night-time driving, the many factors needed to reduce accident rates, such as improved junction design, vehicle maintenance and inspection, education and enforcement are not keeping abreast with the larger increases in vehicle ownership.
Human Safety Problems and Solutions

1. Both accident occurrence and preventive countermeasures may be considered within the framework of a three-phase sequence.

2. The first or \textit{precrash phase} involves such factors as initial and continuing driver education, periodic driver examinations, existence of bad driving or walking habits and attitudes, and physical and mental deficiencies including those induced by alcohol and other drugs.

3. The second or \textit{crash phase} involves the interaction of the vehicle or vehicles, their occupants and/or pedestrians.

4. This phase begins when mechanical forces in excess of those the vehicle occupants and pedestrians can tolerate start to exert themselves on vehicles and people.

5. During this phase, vehicles strike other vehicles, pedestrians or fixed objects.

6. Vehicle occupants may collide with objects within the vehicle or be ejected from the vehicle.

7. The third or \textit{postcrash phase} involves the physical damage to humans, vehicles and other objects which result from the crash.

8. This damage may be temporary or permanent, superficial or extensive.

9. Many countermeasures or remedial actions have been and are being proposed for each of these phases.

10. Countermeasures in the precrash phase cover a wide range of activities and interests.

11. They include the development of comprehensive driver preparation and reeducation programs.

12. It is also essential that beginning drivers undergo extensive testing of both their mental and physical ability to successfully operate a motor vehicle under most normal and emergency situations.

13. Experienced drivers must be periodically reexamined in order to evaluate their physical and intellectual capability to continue driving.

14. Instead of merely testing a driver by means of simple memory tests on basic driving rules and checking his depth perception and static visual acuity, much more comprehensive testing techniques should be developed.

15. These tests, many of which can be administered by means of simulation devices, should also evaluate such complex and varied characteristics as mental attitude and aggressiveness, judgemental ability in emergency situations, neuromuscular coordination, and dynamic visual acuity.

16. Driving simulators are now being developed which enable a single instructor to work simultaneously with several students and give them a more comprehensive learning experience in a shorter period of time than is now possible.

17. Specialised instruction can now be offered to physically handicapped and mentally retarded individuals.

18. Fundamental to a program of driver improvement is an effective method of identifying "problem drivers". These are individuals who have a disproportionate involvement in traffic law violation.

19. This involvement may be the result of mental or physical disabilities and can only be identified through a complete and functional system.

The percentage distribution of those persons killed in RTAs in Kenya was found to be described by the logarithmic trend curve over time. Since these predictions were about the ideal line all the results could be accepted as indicative of the distribution characteristics of those killed. Because data was of short duration, it was found that it had very considerable scatter even after smoothing. For indicative purposes, the levels of significance were reasonable. Hence, judging the models by slope and intercept criteria revealed that the prediction for pedestrians came nearest the ideal line, followed by that for passengers, and then the one for motorcyclists. In terms of trends, it was found that they were all stable. However, it was observed that nearly 80% of those persons killed are pedestrians and passengers followed by 14% as drivers. Therefore in order to reduce RTAs, efforts should be directed towards drivers as they have responsibility for themselves as well as for passengers. Drivers were found to be potentially responsible for nearly 49% of those killed whereas pedestrians have a share of 45%. This result indicates that concerted efforts in road safety improvement should be directed towards the drivers and pedestrians. Again, passenger transportation is another area of potential improvement if RTA deaths are to be reduced. This confirms earlier predictions by responsibility distribution. For long term predictions, these data need to be extended by further observations and subsequent recalibration. This may be said to be true of all predictive models obtained in this study. Finally, for national RTA trends in Kenya, the percentage distribution of those persons injured in RTAs was found to be described by the logarithmic trend curve over time. It was found that the prediction for motorcyclists and pedal cyclists were not statistically significant.