A PLEASURE OF LIFE IN WORDS

A Festchrift for Angela Downing

edited by

Marta Carretero, Laura Hidalgo Downing,
Julia Lavid, Elena Martínez Caro, JoAnne Neff,
Soledad Pérez de Ayala, Esther Sánchez-Pardo

Departamentos de Filología Inglesa I y II
Facultad de Filología
Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Portada: LILLY KAQUAMEYE
IV 75
Tribu: Alyawarre, Utopia, N.T. (Australia)

Título: A PLEASURE OF LIFE IN WORDS

I.S.B.N. TOMO OBRA COMPLETA: 84-611-3485-0
I.S.B.N. TOMO OBRA COMPLETA: 978-84-611-3485-4

I.S.B.N. TOMO I: 84-611-3486-9
I.S.B.N. TOMO I: 978-84-611-3486-1

Depósito Legal: M-44407-2006

Imprime C.E.R.S.A.
C/Santa Leonor, 63 2° H
28037 Madrid
Tel. 91 327 22 14
www.publicarya.com
cersa@telefonica.net

Bridging the gap between coherence and cohesion: which cohesive devices are really textual?

Ana I. MORENO
Departamento de Filología Moderna,
Universidad de León
ana.moreno@unileon.es

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to show that only a small number of the cohesive ties normally accounted for in cohesion analyses do actually contribute to the reader's perception of relevance and coherence. To this aim, a comment article from *Guardian Unlimited* consisting of 60 coherence units and representing typical argumentative written text is analysed from a discourse-as-process viewpoint. First, the relation between each pair of consecutive sentences is discussed with 25 participants in order to arrive at a consensus about the type of connection that helps to perceive the relevance and coherence of the text at each juncture. Next, the cohesive ties contributing to the participants' perception of relevance and coherence are determined and analysed. Finally, all kinds of cohesive ties are identified from a text-as-product perspective and analysed. A comparison is made between the features of the cohesive items identified under the two approaches. The results show that only those cohesive resources dealing with whole sentences, larger fragments, or certain simple clauses linked paratactically, can be regarded as textual in nature, i.e. as contributing to the readers' perception of text relevance, and therefore, coherence. Thus Sinclair's (1993) hypothesis about written text structure is confirmed.

KEY WORDS: coherence, cohesion, relevance, written discourse analysis, text structure.

1. INTRODUCTION

According to most models of cohesion in English, cohesive items play an important role in perceiving texts as unified and meaningful. These models attempt to account for the explicit linguistic devices used in texts to signal relations between sentences (cf. Halliday & Hasan 1976). However, to date the exact role of the different kinds of cohesive devices in the perception of text relevance and coherence remains unclear. On the one hand, cohesive devices are not all that matters in order to account for coherence, since there are many coherence relations between text fragments that are implicit. And, as is commonly acknowledged, what is crucial for text comprehension is being able to interpret the coherence relations between text fragments, whether they are explicit or implicit.

On the other hand, in most of these models texts seem to have been approached as products rather than processes, while ordinary users of the language are more likely to approach texts as processes. That is, readers do not need to wait until they have finished reading the whole written product to try and make sense of the text. Motivated readers will attempt to make sense of the discourse from the very moment the reading process begins, and – if motivation and interest endures – may continue doing so at every stage in the reading process. In other words, accomplished readers will attempt to retrieve discourse meaning as they come across subsequent textual units in their search for relevance.

The present paper claims that, for a better understanding of the role of cohesive devices in the perception of text relevance, and coherence, in ordinary language processing, analyses should attempt to focus on all possible textual mechanisms, whether explicit or inferred, that play a crucial role in this perception when the discourse is approached as process rather than as product, that is, while readers are processing a text for a given purpose without having necessarily finished reading the whole written product.

To show how accounts of cohesion might change if considered in this way, the aims of the present study are:

a) To identify which textual mechanisms of a given text play a crucial role in helping readers to perceive text relevance and, therefore,

coherence in the process of reading a text for the purpose of summarizing it;
b) To compare these mechanisms with those cohesive devices identified on approaching the text-as-product in order to determine which features distinguish one group from the other.

2. ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT STRUCTURE, COHERENCE AND RELEVANCE

Structure is necessary in communicating meaning because we cannot say everything at once (cf. Winter 1986: 88). In the same way, when we interpret written discourse we cannot attend to the whole text at a time. We can only attend to one short stretch of the text at any time, or the *text of the moment*. One important question is, then, what can be considered as a minimal textual processing unit, from the point of view of coherence. According to Sinclair (1993: 6), if a text is seen as a sequence of sentences, the sentence being interpreted at a given moment is 'the likeliest unit to carry the status of *text of the moment*'. This view seems to assume that the sentence is the likeliest minimal textual processing unit. If we accept this view, then the *sentence* could, in principle, be taken the most appropriate minimal structural element in a study of the role of cohesive elements in the perception of coherence and relevance in discourse.

A text can be qualified as coherent when it is perceived as unified and meaningful to a particular reader. If coherence at a given point in a text is understood as a relation between linguistic units (Blakemore 1987: 111), then being able to perceive the relevance of a text segment –or minimal textual processing unit– at that point in the reading process may contribute to perceiving the text as coherent at that point. Let us assume that the minimal textual processing unit in written text is the sentence. Then a sentence will be said to be relevant if it conveys relevant information, and relevance will be defined in terms of a relationship between propositions (cf. Blakemore 1987: 111; Sperber & Wilson 1986), i.e. between meanings retrieved from the interpretation of sentences. Two sentences may be connected in coherent discourse in either of two ways:

1) Either in virtue of the fact that the interpretation of the first may include propositions used in establishing the relevance of the second. This type has been called relevance (dependent on the interpretation) of content (cf. Moreno 2003b), as shown in the following example taken from the text found in the Appendix:

(39) In my day, I was expected to annotate scripts to explain my marks to the chief examiner. (40) Remove *that requirement*, and the examining process will only appear to be more open, while in fact retaining an almost smug inscrutability.

In this example, it is clear that there is one segment in the second sentence, *that requirement*, whose interpretation is affected by the interpretation of another segment of previous discourse. In other words, we can say that in order to establish part of the content of the second proposition, which is an essential task to establish the relevance of the current processing unit, we need to use the propositional meaning created by the interpretation of the previous sentence: i.e. the requirement that in her day, the author was expected to annotate scripts to explain her marks to the chief examiner.
2) Or in virtue of the fact that a proposition conveyed by a sentence is affected by the interpretation of the other (Blakemore 1987: 122). This type has been called relevance (dependent on the interpretation) of relational function (cf. Moreno 2003b), as can be seen in the following example from the Appendix:

(19) Conscientious marking is a killer. (20) *And* examiners never did work in an irresponsible vacuum –

(21) the chief examiner always loomed over one's shoulder, checking, commenting, re-marking if necessary. (22) *At least*, I think that's what he did.

Let us focus our attention on coherence unit (22), which becomes the current unit of interpretation, or *text of the moment*. On trying to establish its relevance as a whole (not simply one element in it- as in relevance of content), the reader needs to do some extra inferential work to interpret the discourse function (i.e. an implicit import) of the whole of a previous discourse unit in relation to the discourse function of the whole of the current discourse unit. In this particular case, (22)

is interpreted functionally as a correction of a statement of fact previously made. What is then interpreted at this junction is a *relational proposition* (cf. Mann and Thompson 1986) of *statement-correction* that helps to perceive the relevance of coherence unit (22) in relation to previous discourse. In that sense, the interpretation of the proposition retrieved from the previous sentence has been affected by the interpretation of the proposition retrieved from the current sentence in relation to the previous proposition.

Other terms used in the literature to describe roughly the same kind of phenomena are the following: *conjunctive relations* (Halliday & Hasan 1976); *semantic relations* (Crombie 1985); *clause relations* (Winter 1986); *intersentential relations* (Hyde, 1990, 2002; Moreno 1996, 1997, 1998b); and *coherence relations* (Sanders et al. 1993).

In either case we might say that the relevance of the current coherent unit is somehow dependent on the interpretation of another one.

3. DESIGN OF THE EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

3.1. Research strategy

The present study attempted to establish a comparison between the cohesive mechanisms identified when approaching the same text in two different ways: 1) the discourse-as-process approach; and 2) the text-as-product approach.

The first approach attempted to identify and analyse only those textual mechanisms, whether explicit or implicit, identified by a group of readers as crucial in perceiving connections between successive coherence units of a given text that contribute to establishing the relevance of each new coherence unit in the process of reading the text for the purpose of summarising it (see section on the discourse-as-process approach below).

The second approach attempted to analyse all the explicit cohesive devices identified by the researcher as playing a role in establishing connections of all kinds between the different coherence

units of the same text analysed as product (see section on the text-as-product approach below).

3.2. Corpus

These two ways of approaching a text were applied to the same comment article from *Guardian Unlimited*. This article represents typical argumentative written text and was chosen for its length and the relevance of its topic to the participants' learning situation. A segmented version is shown in the appendix and the full reference to this text is in the references section below (cf. Moriarty 1999).

The text, made up of 56 sentences, was split into 60 constituent coherence units. As can be deduced, in most cases, the minimal unit of coherence corresponded with the orthographic sentence, or the clause complex (Downing and Locke 1992), enclosed by a full stop. However, based on Sinclair's (1993) conclusions about this issue, a few variations were introduced. In order not to make arbitrary or intuitive divisions of clauses within the different clause complexes in the text, it was decided to divide sentences at points where there was a colon (1, 17, 28, 41, 47, 58), a dash (20, 34), or a comma or dash followed by some cohesive device (3, 29, 31, 56 and 59), provided the following unit could stand as independent from a coherence point of view. No divisions between clauses in hypotactic, or dependent, relationship were made.

The same division of the text into its coherence units was used for both approaches of the text, as product and as process. This was the only place where the researcher had to impose her own interpretation of what could be considered as an autonomous unit from the point of view of coherence beforehand. However, this imposition was necessary to guarantee the validity of the results, i.e. to guarantee that both the researcher and all the participants were observing the phenomena that the study was focusing on. Arriving at a consensus on this aspect too would have constituted another study in its own right.

It should be noted that the items that appear in bold in the segmented text (cf. appendix) are the textual mechanisms identified as crucial in perceiving the relevance of the current processing unit by

the readers. The text elements presented in parentheses preceded by an asterisk in the segmented text were not part of the original text but are meant to represent the type of connection inferred by the readers between subsequent processing units so that the relevance of the current unit, or *text-of-the-moment*, was perceived. The underlined items highlight additional cohesive items that resulted from analysing the text-as-product. The symbol "<" represents a prospection and, the brackets following, [], embrace the coherence unit(s) that were perceived as satisfying the prospection.

3.3. The discourse-as-process approach

3.3.1. Participants

Two groups of readers were used in the study. The first group was made up of seven doctoral students taking a course in *Cohesion in English* at the University of León. This group of participants was used as the basis for a pilot study on which the final study was designed. The final study was carried out with a second group of 25 undergraduate students taking a course in *Contemporary Descriptive Models of English* (taught in the third year of *English Philology* at the same university, but also taken by students in the fourth year). In any case the Spanish participants were advanced learners of English, potentially non-intended readers of the targeted text. Both groups had been provided with a short introduction to the role and type of cohesive devices based on both Halliday and Hasan's (1976) account and Sinclair's (1993) view of cohesive devices, using examples from a variety of sources.

One problem with using a group of participants is that their perceived coherence patterns might be multiple because relevance and, therefore, coherence is ultimately subjective. To overcome this problem, the study sought to capture the coherence pattern of the text as perceived, or at least accepted, by the majority of the participants in their communicative role as readers of the same text, abstracting away from the particular idiosyncratic appreciation of any participant (including the researcher herself).

3.3.2. Procedure for obtaining data

In order to obtain the data object of analysis, i.e. the textual mechanisms, whether explicit or implicit, identified by this group of participants in reading the discourse-as-process that helped them to establish the relevance of each new coherence unit, the study used the following procedure:

The participants were asked to read the above-mentioned text carefully. To control for the factor *purpose of reading* since this could affect their effort in achieving coherence, they were told that they would have to produce a written summary later on. To monitor their processing the text individually, they were asked to do a number of interpretation tasks at each point in the reading process. These tasks were presented in the form of a written test (see Table 1 below). Next, a round of discussions was opened to contrast the different solutions given to the test, first in groups of five individuals, then to the entire class. Finally, a consensus on the most acceptable solution at each stage of the text was arrived at.

The consensus was achieved by first listening to the solution given by the different groups, then discussing in which way each solution helped them to perceive the relevance of the current unit in relation to the text, and then, in cases where there were differing solutions, by choosing the one that all the participants in the whole group considered as the most acceptable. This means that, after discussing the relevance of each new coherence unit, participants could change their minds as to how this was best achieved. In fact, in some cases, participants recognised that the agreed solution was far more powerful than the one they had obtained individually.

It could be said that this way of proceeding, i.e. explicitly asking readers to make judgements about coherence relations, does not really tap into the same processes that occur during ordinary reading, but as hinted above, reading processes may vary enormously as a function of the reading purpose. Considering that readers were asked to process this text in order to summarise it later on, it is quite likely that they had to make a somewhat similar explicit effort to understand the relationships between the different fragments in the text. In this way, the procedure was more likely to reflect some of the

processes that may occur during reading a text for the purpose of summarising it than the processes that may occur when the text is read for other purposes. In any case, most participants recognised that, although this was a very difficult task they had never done before, at least consciously, it had helped them enormously to improve their understanding of the text and be better prepared to undertake the task of summarising the text.

Another problem with this procedure is that in all cases the participants were non-native speakers of English and, although they were advanced learners of this language, their interpreting capacity may not be similar to comparable native-speakers of British English for at least two important reasons. First, their background knowledge about the topic of the text was limited. To overcome this problem, some information was provided about the assessment system at secondary schools in the U.K. before they approached the text. Second, their language resources were also limited, if compared with comparable native-speakers of English. To overcome some of these language problems, they were provided with a glossary with the most predictably difficult vocabulary items. In spite of this, other differences remain, which would not allow us to extrapolate the results from the present study to those obtained in comparable native-speaker reading situations. However, the results may precisely be helpful with comparable Spanish learners of English.

3.3.3. Test

The test consisted of a number of questions that students had to answer after processing each new coherence unit. Table 1 shows an extract of the test illustrating how it was presented.

The questions in the test were oriented to helping the students capture the following possible types of phenomena in each current sentence: either retrospective elements (questions B to E), or prospective elements (questions F to G). These two phenomena have been amply acknowledged in the literature (cf. Halliday and Hasan 1976; Tadros 1985, Hyde 1990, 2002; Sinclair 1993; Francis 1994).

(1) **Nineteen ninety-nine was the year we dipped a toe in the water:**

A) Can you perceive any connection between coherence unit (1) and its co-text? Yes No

F) Does coherence unit (1) lead you to expect something specific in the following text? Yes No

G) If this connection is explicit, circle and write down (the) prospective signal(s) that make(s) it explicit: _____

(2) **and you know what?**

A) Can you perceive any connection between coherence unit (2) and its co-text? Yes No

B) If you perceive an explicit connection with previous text, circle and write down the retrospective signal(s) that make(s) it explicit:_____

C) If you perceive an implicit connection, provide a signal/text fragment to make it explicit: _____

D) In relation to which part of previous text can you perceive this connection, whether implicit or explicit?

A (a word) B (a phrase) C (a clause)

D (a sentence) E (a larger unit)

E) In which sentence(s) is that part of previous text? Nº____

F) Does coherence unit (2) lead you to expect something specific in the following text? Yes No

G) If this connection is explicit, circle and write down (the) prospective signal(s) that make(s) it explicit:

_____

H) Does coherence unit (2) satisfy a prospection created in previous text? Yes No

I) If so, in which coherence unit was the prospection created? ___

Table 1. Sample test items (1 to 2)

The subjects were also asked to observe whether the current sentence a prospection created in a previous unit of the text (questions H to I) (cf. Sinclair, 1993). To avoid giving any specific clues, they were asked to answer the same nine questions (A to I) about each new coherence unit in the text, except for unit (1) at which point only questions A) F) and G), about prospecting mechanisms, were relevant.

3.4. The text-as-product approach

Looking at the text-as-product meant using a method whereby the researcher approached the whole text as a finished product in an attempt to identify all kinds of cohesive ties that play a role in establishing connections between a text fragment and another one beyond sentence boundaries. This meant going back and forward as much as necessary in the search for these ties (see underlined items in the segmented text).

4. METHOD OF ANALYSIS OF COHERENCE MECHANISMS

Once the data (i.e. the textual mechanisms, whether explicit or implicit, identified by the group of participants in reading the discourse-as-process that helped them to establish the relevance of each new coherence unit) had been gathered following the procedure for the discourse-as-process approach, they were arranged and classified according to the following criteria and categories:

1. Explicitness of connection:
   - -Explicit
   - -Implicit or inferred (I)
2. Phoric direction: (cf. Sinclair 1993; Moreno 2003b)
   - -Retrospection or encapsulation (E)
   - -Prospection (P)
   - -Fulfilment or satisfaction of prospection (S)
3. Coherence mechanisms and subtypes: (cf. Sinclair 1993; Moreno 2003b)
   - -Relevance of content: Deictic act / discourse act

-Relevance of relational function: Logical act
-Relevance of wording: Wording act

A combination of these three criteria has given rise to the following taxonomy of coherence mechanisms, illustrated with examples from the text analysed (cf. appendix) as follows:

4.1. Explicit encapsulating, or retrospective, mechanisms (E)

According to Sinclair (1993), encapsulating mechanisms are those text features identified in the new sentence that somehow refer back to the meaning created by the whole of the previous sentence. "By referring to the whole of the previous sentence a new sentence uses it as part of the subject matter. This removes its discourse function, leaving only the meaning which it has created" (Sinclair 1993:7). Various types of encapsulating mechanisms can be distinguished.

4.1.1. Relevance of content

4.1.1.1. Encapsulating deictic acts

Deictic acts include phenomena such as reference items and lexical cohesive items, sometimes used in combination, as in the example provided above about the connection between coherence units (39) and (40) in the text analysed.

That example shows quite clearly that the encapsulated text is the whole of the previous sentence. However, not all examples of relevance of content seem as clear as this. In fact, Sinclair (1993) opens an interesting debate that is especially relevant in the two areas of cohesion included in his framework under the category of deictic acts, namely, reference and lexical cohesion. The debate refers to a possible distinction between the process of encapsulation and what Sinclair identifies as *point-to-point cohesion.* According to Sinclair (1993), there are other kinds of cohesion that refer to less than a sentence, and these are not regarded as textual in nature. To clarify

this distinction terminologically speaking, I propose to call the process of *true* encapsulation *textual cohesion*, as opposed to *point-to-point cohesion.*

According to Sinclair, textual cohesion deals "only with sentences or, occasionally, clause complexes, or even longer stretches of text, and it does much more than effect a tenuous connection between isolated constituents of sentences. It is the process of encapsulation, and it reclassifies a previous sentence or text by *demoting* it into an element of the structure of the new sentence" (Sinclair, 1993: 9). A clear example of the process of encapsulation is found in (39-40), where it is easy to observe how the meaning of the first sentence, (39), has been demoted into the direct object of the first clause in sentence (40), *that requirement.*

As Sinclair (1993: 8) claims, "failure to appreciate the distinction between these two types of cohesion has hampered the development of models of text structure". The model of text that he puts forward "has no place for retention of the actual words and phrases of text so that such connections between text items could be established" (Sinclair, 1993: 8). The model I advocate also adopts the same perspective. However, it reconsiders some cases that might be considered as *point-to-point cohesion* by Sinclair (cf. Moreno 2003b).

4.1.1.2. Encapsulating discourse acts

Discourse acts occur when, rather than interpreting the semantic content of the whole of a preceding coherence unit, the reader needs to interpret the discourse act performed by it in order to establish the propositional content of a segment in the new sentence. In other words, they occur when the structure of the new sentence contains an element that reclassifies a previous discourse segment in terms of its discourse function. Examples of these signals of discourse acts may be: distinction, definition, difference, comparison, or any other encapsulating device that refers to an act performed by some segment of preceding discourse. Let us consider one example from the text:

(47) There will be logistical problems: returning all scripts will mean 13.5m papers

whizzing through the postal system, for instance. Photocopying scripts sounds horrendous even to a convinced "pro-returner" like me. Proper scrutiny of the papers in school will take time, possibly precious holiday time. (51) And if the big learners here are teachers, not pupils, should they be returned at all?

The answer is yes. I believe now, as I believed last year when I wrote one of the first articles calling for this move towards long-overdue transparency and accountability, and as the authorities hold in New Zealand, that it is simply the right thing to do. The right thing overrides logistical problems. (55) Pupil neglect of the papers is beside *the point.*

After reading these two paragraphs of the text, if we focus our attention on the noun phrase *the point* in the last sentence, it is clear that it has an encapsulating function. The reader will rapidly wonder which *point*, to remember that the point had been made in the preceding text in the form of a rhetorical question "should they (the scripts) be returned at all?" Thus in order for the reader to establish the content of the noun phrase *the point* in (55), s/he needs to interpret the discourse act performed by coherence unit (51) as *making a point.*

Encapsulating discourse acts can also co-occur with other deictic acts, such as in *this distinction.* This reinforcement makes the encapsulation process easier to perceive.

4.1.2. Relevance of relational function

This type of relevance takes place when relational propositions are inferred. Examples of relational propositions are: sequence, claim-support, argument-conclusion, claim-contrast, reason-action, effect-cause, etc. Since it does not seem possible to arrive at a consensus on a universal taxonomy, I will use the terms that the participants employed intuitively to describe their interpretations. What most authors seem to agree on is that relational propositions may be implicit or explicit. It is important to notice that it is when the relational propositions are made explicit that the encapsulation is patent, serving as a powerful textual constraint on relevance. Otherwise, the relevance of the new coherence unit can only count on the reader's inferential capacity.

4.1.2.1. Encapsulating logical acts

If we considered this phenomenon from Halliday and Hasan's (1976) view, then we would be considering the encapsulating mechanism effected by conjunctive items, which include expressions such as *And*, *Yet*, *So* and *Then*. However, as has been attested by Winter (1977), Crombie (1985), Hyde (1990, 2002) and Moreno (1996, 1997, 1998, 2003a), there are alternative means of signalling relational propositions to the well-recognized conjuncts. These alternative means stretch right across the spectrum of sentence structure, constituting central elements such as nominal, verbal, adjectival and others items.

It is precisely in most of these other alternative expressions where the mechanism of encapsulation is perceived more clearly. The main reason is that these integrated signals usually co-occur with other devices such as ellipsis, reference or lexical cohesion, which also encapsulate, making the encapsulation stronger. Consider for example the metatextual expression *this is not to say* identified in coherence unit (15) in the text analysed, where the previous relevant segment of text (12-14) is encapsulated by the reference item *this*, establishing relevance of content. What is interesting to point out is that the participants agreed that this expression was also signalling a relation, or relational proposition, of inferred consequence derived from the previous relevant discourse and that this relation was being cancelled by the negative word *not*.

If we now consider Sinclair's (1993) analytical framework, relational propositions would approximately correspond to what he terms *logical acts*. And this is the term I have adopted to refer to this phenomenon in order to avoid using more extraneous terminology.

4.2. Prospective mechanisms (P)

In addition to encapsulating the preceding text, a sentence can make a prospection about the next sentence, thus establishing a need for the next sentence to fulfil the prospection if coherence is to be

maintained. The sentence fulfilling the prospection does not encapsulate the prospecting sentence (Sinclair 1993: 28).

So, prospection occurs where the phrasing of a sentence leads the reader to expect something specific in the forthcoming text. Due to the precise nature of the type of relevance established in cases of prospection, I will distinguish the following two types on the basis of whether they are used to establish relevance of content or to establish relevance of relational function.

4.2.1. Relevance of content

In this variation of prospective coherence mechanism we can perceive a similar principle to the one we could perceive in the corresponding type of encapsulation but in the opposite direction. One type of prospection occurs where there are text elements in the current sentence whose propositional content is likely to be affected by the interpretation of an upcoming text fragment in the sense that its meaning will be fully determined.

Another way of looking at this is to say that prospection occurs when there is an element in the current sentence that gives the reader advanced warning as to how the assumptions derived from interpreting the following segment of discourse will be relevant. It is also important to notice that this phenomenon implies that the word or phrase to be elucidated in the upcoming text is presented as new to the context created in the course of interpretation. Within prospecting relevance of content it is possible to distinguish at least two types of prospecting act.

4.2.1.1. Prospecting deictic acts

The first type roughly corresponds to the phenomenon identified by Tadros (1985: 14) as *enumeration*. It rests on the reader interpreting the full meaning of a word or phrase (e.g. a sub-technical word such as *advantages*, *aspects*, *functions*, which Tadros terms *the enumerable*), as something to be elucidated in the following text. Tadros shows how the enumerable, or prospecting signal, is usually

preceded by some kind of numeral, whether exact, such as *two*, or inexact, such as *several* that commits the writer to enumerate. However, as the text shows, the enumerable does not need to be preceded by a numeral to create a prospection. It is sometimes simply expressed in the plural. A clear example from the text is found in coherence unit (47): *there will be logistical problems*, which by means of the lexical word *problems* (a superordinate), followed by a colon, makes a prospection over a group of sentences (48-50), which specify the logistical problems prospected.

The distinguishing feature of this type of prospection rests on the fact that interpreting the semantic content of a segment of upcoming discourse will help to fully determine the meaning of the prospecting signal. This also has the effect of establishing the relevance of the next fragment of discourse. Furthermore, for the prospection to be fulfilled satisfactorily, the semantic interpretation derived from the following unit(s) needs to be congruent with the general semantic meaning of the prospecting signal. For instance, relevance was easily perceived at each of text units (48-50) when after interpreting their semantic content it was possible for readers to abstract away and interpret each of the events described as problems.

I have termed this first type *prospecting deictic act* in a general sense to include not only this type of sub-technical lexical words, or superordinates, but also other prospecting signals such as cataphoric reference items and question words, where the meaning of the prospecting item is also elucidated by interpreting the semantic content of a relevant segment of upcoming discourse. The question word, *what*, in coherence unit (2) in the text is a clear case.

4.2.1.2. Prospecting discourse acts

Another common way in which this type of prospection may happen is when the current sentence contains a signal, similar to what Tadros (1985) terms *advance labelling*, such as *let us define*, whereby the "writer labels, and thereby commits himself to perform a discourse act" (Tadros 1985: 22) (cf. Sinclair 1993; Francis 1994). In this case, the writer is committed to performing an act of definition. In other

words, for the reader to fully determine the content of the element *define* in the current coherence unit, s/he will need to go on reading the following relevant fragment of text and interpret it as a definition. In fact, if the reader is to perceive the new coherent unit as relevant, s/he needs to be able to infer its discourse function as a definition. It is this inferred discourse function which needs to be congruent with the general meaning of the prospecting signal.

Other possible signals of prospected discourse acts may be the following: *consider, discuss, compare, describe, examine, mention* and *distinguish*, as in a sentence like "It is important to *distinguish* between real and nominal wages" (Tadros 1985: 22) followed by other sentences elucidating this distinction. It should be noted that the function of the following fragment of discourse is not part of a relational proposition but is just an autonomous discourse act.

The only example of a prospecting discourse act found in the text under analysis is in coherence unit (58):

(56) A few will be very interested indeed, (57) and that's enough. (58) * (*It is*) A bit *like* voting, really: < [(59) lots of people don't care about that either, (60) but for those who do, it's one of the markers of a civilized world.]

After reading (58), it seems as if the writer is committed to perform an act of comparison. It is true that a comparison is made in this clause by means of the comparative preposition, *like*, between the situation encapsulated by elliptical material such as *it is* and *voting*. In this sense, *like* is encapsulating, because the reference of the comparison is found in previous text. However, the comparison is not fully determined in the clause where *like* occurs, since the reader does not know in what way the two members of the comparison are similar. To satisfy this, the reader will need to go on reading. In this sense, the comparative preposition is, at the same time, prospecting a discourse act of comparison. Reinforcing this prospection is the colon, which indicates that the fulfilment of the prospection will follow immediately.

4.2.2. Relevance of relational function

4.2.2.1. Prospecting logical acts

Another variation of prospection that I would like to propose serves to help readers perceive the relevance of a new coherence unit by advancing the relational proposition that will be established between the next fragment of discourse and, either the current sentence, or a previous fragment of discourse. That is, in this type of prospection some proposition (or pragmatic import) derived from interpreting the current segment of discourse is used in establishing the relevance of the following segment of discourse by virtue of its discourse function in relation to the discourse function inferred from the current sentence or a previous one.

An interesting example from the text is in (28), *the reasons are obvious,* where the prospecting signal is the plural noun *reasons*. It is true that this case might also be analyzed as a case of enumeration (i.e. as a prospecting deictic act), in the sense that the content of the word *reasons* will be elucidated in the following text. That is, the reader will need to go on reading the following fragment of discourse to find the reasons enumerated. However, it also seems quite clear that interpreting the coherence unit in which the signal appears leads the reader to predict the relevance of the upcoming unit(s) in discourse functional terms. In the present case, the reader is led to interpret the following fragment of text as the *reasons* for the previous relevant discourse, which is then interpreted as the *fact* or *claim* that will be justified. Therefore the reader infers a relational proposition of *fact-explanation* or *claim-justification,* which helps him/her establish relevance of relational discourse function for the forthcoming piece of discourse.

4.3. Units fulfilling or satisfying a prospection (S)

As Sinclair (1993) puts it, the prospective acts relevant to a sentence are made in the previous sentence. The act of prospection means that the interactive force of a sentence extends to the end of the

sentence, or sentences, following. I would like to suggest that the relevance of that upcoming unit, which becomes the current sentence in the process of interpretation, is perceived if it satisfies the prospection made in the previous text. The prospection may be fulfilled in two ways: a) if the current sentence provides information from which to derive assumptions (in terms of semantic content or discourse act) that may be used to determine fully the content of a part of the propositional content of the coherence unit where the prospection was created, and/or b) if it provides information from which to derive a relational discourse function congruent with the relational proposition prospected in the preceding discourse. Failing this, the reader may find the discourse either unsatisfactory or incomplete, or illogical.

In the case under analysis, every sentence in the rest of the paragraph following *the reasons are obvious* is relevant in this sense. All these sentences together are then said to fulfil the prospection. And their status in the text structure will be that of fulfilling the prospection. This is why I would like to stress the role of the fulfilment of a prospection as a powerful, though less frequent, coherence mechanism.

In this section I have then introduced the main criteria used to analyze explicit coherence mechanisms and have discussed their role as textual constraints on relevance. It should be emphasized that this method of analysis was applied only to those text features provided by the participants, whose contribution to perceiving the relevance of each new sentence was discussed open-class. In summary, these text features were classified either as encapsulating (E) (deictic act, discourse act, logical act), prospecting (P) (deictic act, discourse act, logical act), combining both mechanisms, or fulfilling a prospection (S).

4.4. Inferred encapsulation, or qualified assignments (I)

In cases where there were no clear explicit signals of the coherence mechanism, that is, in cases of implicit connections, the

participants were asked to make them explicit. These were the cases that roughly correspond to what Sinclair (1993: 20) terms *qualified assignments*. He also suggests that, as a general rule in interpretation, in the absence of a clear indication we reverse the argument and ask what kind of relationship one would assume there is in that case, using all the powers of inference available. As a method for gathering data, that is exactly what the participants were asked to do. Then the group tried to arrive at a consensus about the most acceptable interpretation in relation to the groups' standard of coherence, which may not be the same in other discourse communities. The recovered material was also analyzed and classified following the same criteria as the ones applied to explicit mechanisms.

4.4.1. Inferred encapsulating logical acts

The recovered textual material typically signals encapsulating logical acts (as occurs between coherence units 37 and 38, where the relationship was made explicit by recovering a conjunct like *because*) and deictic acts of an elliptical type, as will be shown below.

It is important to stress that the category of *ellipsis* has been treated in the present study either as a case of inferred point-to-point cohesion or inferred encapsulation since one of the characteristics of this cohesive tie is precisely that there is no text signal indicating the tie but a structural slot that needs to be recovered for relevance to be established.

In some cases the structural slot is obligatory from a syntactic viewpoint as in (23).

(23) * (*Anyway*) Even if he didn't *(*loom over one's shoulder, checking, commenting, re-marking if necessary)*, the fear that he would *(*loom over one's shoulder, checking, commenting, re-marking if necessary)* was a great deterrent to misdemeanour.

In this case the elliptical text segment refers to a part of the wording used in the previous coherence unit (22): the predication in the clause. This would be a case of point-to-point cohesion. In other types of ellipsis, the structural slot is optional, as in (7).

(7) The Qualifications and Curriculum Authority has carried out an interim evaluation * (*of the pilot scheme*).

In (7), the elliptical encapsulating item did not simply refer to the part of the wording in the preceding coherence unit, (6) where the pilot scheme is first mentioned but to the whole semantic content of (6), where the pilot scheme is described in detail. Once recovered, the encapsulating devices were classified as any other explicit encapsulating acts. If one looks at these and other cases of ellipsis closely, two types of relevance seem to arise once the elliptical material is recovered.

4.4.2. Inferred encapsulating deictic acts

One of these types is relevance of content, as illustrated by (7), where the interpretation of one segment in the current sentence (excluding the linking word *of*), *the pilot scheme*, is affected by the interpretation of another segment of previous discourse, i.e. the whole of coherence unit (6) where the pilot scheme is described. It is this phenomenon which can be considered as really textual in nature because it involves encapsulation rather than point-to-point cohesion.

4.4.3. Inferred encapsulating wording acts

A second subtype of relevance that I would like to propose, drawing on Halliday and Hasan (1976), takes place when, rather than recovering the semantic content of the whole preceding coherence unit, the reader needs to recover (a part of) the wording used in it in order to establish the content of the elliptical segment in the new sentence, as in the two instances of ellipsis in (23) above. As we shall see, this type of point-to-point cohesion is usually accompanied by other types of cohesion, such as *he* in (23), which are able to encapsulate (cf. Moreno 2003b). It is worth noting that this type of relevance would also apply to cases of substitution, although in these cases the relation is made explicit by a word such as *one* and *do*. However, these cases tend to reflect point-to-point cohesion rather than true encapsulation.

5. METHOD OF ANALYSIS OF COHESIVE TIES

Once all the sentences in the text were classified according to the type of coherence mechanism that helped the readers to perceive their relevance, the study sought to determine which type(s) of cohesive tie were involved in each case in order to compare results with those obtained through the text-as-product approach. One problem at this stage was to decide which taxonomy of cohesive devices to use to classify the different coherence mechanisms found. It was eventually decided to use Halliday and Hasan's (1976) classification of cohesive devices for the simple reason that it is still the most comprehensive and widely known account of cohesive devices. Therefore, using their terminological framework would make it easier for researchers to establish comparisons between results obtained applying different but related models.

Thus, the textual features identified by the group as contributing to their perception of coherence were further classified, wherever possible, under the different categories identified by Halliday and Hasan (1976), and other works such as Salkie's (1995), which are within the same framework. The same taxonomy was used to classify items identified under the text-as-product approach. These were the major categories obtained for endophoric phenomena:

- Reference item: personal, demonstrative, comparative.
- Lexical item: repetition, synonym, hyponym, superordinate, general word, related word, opposite.
- Reference phrase: reference + lexical combinations.
- Reference clause: same meaning, similar meaning inferred meaning, opposite meaning.
- Ellipsis: nominal, post-modifier, subject + operator, predicator, comparative clause, other clause type.
- Substitution: nominal, verbal, clausal
- Conjunction: additive, causal, adversative, temporal
- Punctuation: question mark, colon.

As can be seen, in cases where the identified features did not fit any of the commonly accepted categories, further categories were added. For instance, categories like *reference phrase* and *reference clause*, have been added to reflect how cohesion can also be effected

by clusters of items rather than by individual words. Also, within conjunctive relations, further subcategories were specified but the terminology used to name each relational proposition in some cases had more to do with the participants' interpretation of the relational discourse functions inferred than with the subcategories used by any particular existing account in the literature to avoid losing the shades of relational discourse meaning perceived. Finally, as justified above, the category of *ellipsis* was treated in the present study as a case of either inferred encapsulation or inferred point-to-point cohesion.

The linguistic devices identified by adopting the above-mentioned approaches to the same text are shown in Table 2 below. Due to obvious space limitations, it is beyond the scope of this paper to show the complete analysis of all the different ties found. Therefore, only an extract from the complete table is provided showing, by way of illustration, the analysis from coherence units 14 to 19.

The left side of Table 2 (see the next two pages) shows a few examples of how the signals identified through the discourse-as-process approach were analysed. The first column indicates the number of the coherence unit where the cohesive signal(s) is/are found. The second column indicates the signals identified, where explicit or inferred [*()]. The third column indicates the type and subtype of coherence mechanism. The fourth column indicates they type and subtype of cohesive tie and the fifth column, the coherence unit(s) referred to (backward or forward) by the signals.

	Text-as-product view								
	Discourse-as-process view: textual cohesive signals				Point-to-point cohesive signals				
N°	***Explicit signal(s)*** **** = inferred signal(s)***	***Type and subtype of coherence mechanism***	***Type and subtype of cohesive tie***	***Relates to coherence unit number***	***Signal(s)***	***Type of cohesive tie***	***Subtype***	***Relates to unit number: text item***
14	1) * (In other words)	I: Logical	Causal: Inferred consequence	13	1) whatever was done to the papers would be seen in the outside world	Clausal	Paraphrase	13: there is an audience for what they produce
15	1) This is not to say that	E: Deictic E: Logical	Reference: Demonstrative Causal: (Cancellation of) inferred consequence	12-14	1) examiners	Lexical	Repetition	12: examiners
16	1) such a thing	E: Deictic	Phrasal: Comparative reference + Lexical general word	15				

17	1) * (because)	I: Logical	Causal: Claim-reason	16	1) examined	Lexical	Repetition w.w.c.c.	15: examiners
18	1) * (examining was)	I: Deictic	Elliptical: Subject . + operator	17	1) the … job	Phrasal: Reference +	Demonstrative	17: examined
						Lexical	Superordinate	
						Lexical	w.w.c.c.	
					2) standards	Lexical	Related word	17: examined
					3) scripts		Repetition	12: scripts
19	1) * (In other words)	I: logical	Additive: Expository: Paraphrase	18	1) conscientious marking	Lexical c.	Synonym w.w.c.c. +	18: requiring
						Lexical		painstaking effort and
							Synonym w.w.c.c	concentration
							Synonym w.w.c.c	17: examined
					2) killer			18: gruelling

Table 2. Extract from comparison between the discourse-as-process and the text-as-product views

The right side of table 2 shows how this analysis was carried out according to the text-as-product approach. The fourth column from the right lists the cohesive devices identified in each coherence unit. The third and second columns from the right indicate the type and subtype of cohesive tie respectively. The first column from the right indicates the text item referred to by the cohesive signal and the number of the coherence unit where it is located.

6. RESULTS

6.1. Results from the discourse-as-process approach

As shown in summary Table 3 below, in most current units there was at least one encapsulating mechanism (59.4%), whether explicit (33.9%), inferred (6.8%), or both (18.7%). Prospection always occurred in combination with some encapsulating device (8.5%), whether explicit (1.7%), inferred (3.4%) or both (3.4%). Twelve coherence units in the text fulfilled a prospection (20.4%), which occurred in combination with other mechanisms in 13.6% of cases.

A common feature to all of these mechanisms is that they refer to discourse meaning derived from entire sentences, larger fragments of text or, or certain simple clauses linked paratactically by a colon, a dash, or a comma or dash followed by some cohesive device (see column 5 in table 2 above).

Very few cases of point-to-point cohesion, that is, items referring to individual words, phrases or clauses, whether explicit (1.7 %), inferred (1.7%), or both (1.7 %) were identified when looking at the text-as-process. In any case, these did not seem to account for relevance by themselves. There was always a more powerful mechanism to account for coherence at that point.

The percentage of inferred encapsulations that account for coherence on their own was relatively high (32.2%). After the group discussion it was possible to arrive at a consensus on most cases without much difficulty. This suggests the existence of a standard of coherence shared by this discourse community that goes beyond the presence or absence of explicit signals.

Coherence mechanism	N	%	N° of coherence unit
Inferred encapsulation	19	32.2	12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 21, 25, 27, 35, 36, 38, 39, 42, 43, 44, 52, 53, 56
Encapsulation	14	23.7	5, 6, 8, 15, 16, 20, 22, 32, 34, 37, 40, 41, 51, 57
Encapsulation + Inferred E.	8	13.6	24, 26, 31, 33, 45, 46, 54, 55
Encapsulation + Inferred E. + Inferred point-to-point cohesion	1	1.7	23
Encapsulation + Prospection	1	1.7	2
Encapsulation + Inferred E. + Prospection	2	3.4	28, 58
Inferred E. + Prospection	2	3.4	7, 47
Fulfilment of prospection	4	6.8	3, 29, 49, 50
Fulfilment of prospection + Encapsulation	4	6.8	4, 11, 30, 48
Fulfilment of prospection + Inferred E.	2	3.4	9, 10
Fulfilment of prospection + Point-to-point cohesion	1	1.7	59
Fulfilment of prospection + Encapsulation + Inferred point-to-point cohesion + Point-to-point cohesion	1	1.7	60
Total	**59**	**100.0**	

Table 3. Major coherence mechanisms affecting each coherence unit: results from the discourse-as-process view

A smaller number of inferred encapsulations (25.5%) were perceived in combination with other types of coherence mechanism. This might be interpreted as the participants' need to reinforce relevance in order to make better sense of the text at that point in the interpretation of the discourse.

6.2. Results from the text-as-product approach

The results show that, as well as the previously mentioned coherence mechanisms -identified on reading the discourse-as-process-, there are many cases of point-to-point cohesion in the text that can be easily identified when approaching the text-as-product. The right columns in table 2 show a sample of these by comparison. Note that these right columns only include those additional devices identified from analysing the text-as-product. This does not mean that these are the only devices identified in this way. Indeed, most signals identified from the discourse-as-process perspective were also identified from the text-as-product perspective, but for the sake of brevity and clarity, they have been omitted on this side of the table. These additional cohesive devices have been underlined in the segmented text in the appendix.

As can be seen in the first column of Table 2 from the right, a common feature that characterises all of these additional ties is that they effect a tenuous connection between isolated constituents of sentences such as words and phrases or, occasionally, clauses.

7. CONCLUSIONS

In all cases, the textual mechanisms identified or inferred by the participants as actually contributing to their perceiving the relevance, and therefore coherence, of each subsequent coherence unit deal only with discourse meaning derived from entire sentences, larger fragments of text or, or certain simple clauses linked paratactically by a colon, a dash, or a comma or dash followed by some cohesive device. These types of textual cohesive mechanisms would be very

closely related to some of the material that is nowadays considered as interactive (or textual) *metadiscourse* (cf. Hyland, 2005:50).

If we agree to consider those elements as really textual, the point-to-point cohesive items underlined in the segmented text cannot be regarded as such (i.e. textual in nature) in this text because they were not essential, or at least enough, to account for the relevance of each successive coherence unit (also, at least, to this group of readers). They can only be said to contribute to creating superficial point-to-point cohesion in the text.

Another interesting feature is that the items referred to by point-to-point cohesive devices are not always in the immediately preceding coherence unit or relevant chunk, as was common with the fragments referred to by the encapsulating devices. There is also the possibility that different researchers find differing alternatives or solutions as to which items are referred to by the point-to-point cohesive devices. This is not a critical comment on the study but may simply be due to different analytical criteria used especially in relation to how to measure the scope of the relation. Whatever solution is found, this can be considered as excess of analysis that may detract from revealing what actually happens in the process of reading for summary purposes.

As Sinclair (1993) suggests, in the process of reading, the linguistic properties of the previous sentence are discarded and only what it expresses is retained. So his model has little place for the retention of particular words or phrases. Whatever meaning these have created, together with the other items in the rest of the previous sentence(s), is no longer a linguistic entity, but a part of shared knowledge which will be retrieved conveniently in the search for the relevance of new units (cf. Sinclair 1993: 9). Therefore, looking back in the text in the search of particular words or phrases that are referred to by every cohesive item in the new sentence does not seem to be an essential task to do in order to make sense of the text at a given point.

A more effective task would be to focus on those items of the new sentence, whether explicit or implicit, which truly are encapsulating, or prospecting, since they will give better clues as for the relevance and, therefore, the coherence of the current sentence. In

this sense, it can be said that the approach taken in the present study serves to bridge the gap between cohesion and coherence, although we must never forget that there is more to coherence than what cohesive devices can account for.

Several recommendations may arise from the present study. Teaching materials in reading comprehension should place a greater emphasis on raising students' awareness of and training students in identifying: a) textual cohesive mechanisms, i.e. encapsulating and prospecting mechanisms that establish connections across sentence boundaries and scope over fragments of text larger than the sentence or, occasionally, the clause; b) implicit connections between text fragments.

8. REFERENCES

Blakemore, Diane (1987). *Semantic Constraints on Relevance.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Crombie, Winifred. 1985. *Process and Relation in Discourse and Language Learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Downing, Angela and Phillip Locke. (1992). *A University Course in English Grammar.* Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall International, Ltd.

Francis, Gill. (1994). Labelling discourse: an aspect of nominal-group lexical cohesion. In M. Coulthard, ed., *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London: Routledge, 83-101.

Halliday, Michael A.K. and Ruquaiya Hasan. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman Group Limited.

Hyde, John R. (1990). *Aspects of Discourse Analysis: The Explicit Signalling of Intersentential Relations in English.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Salamanca, Spain.

Hyde, John R. (2002). Some basic issues in the study of language today: An introduction to the analysis of intersentential relations in English and Spanish newspaper editorials. In Alonso, P, Sánchez, M.J., Hyde J., and Moran, C., eds., *Aspects of Discourse Analysis*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 21-41.

Hyland, Ken (2005). *Metadiscourse. Exploring Interaction in Writing.* London: Continuum.

Mann, William C. and Sandra A. Thompson (1986). Relational propositions in discourse, *Discourse Processes* 9: 57-90.

Moreno, Ana I. (1996). Estudio Contrastivo Inglés-Español de la Expresión de las Relaciones de Coherencia Causal Interoracional: el Artículo Académico sobre Economía y Empresa, in *Tesis doctorales 1995* (vol 26: electronic format). Secretariado de Publicaciones. Universidad de León, Spain.

Moreno, Ana I. (1997). Genre constraints across languages: Causal metatext in Spanish and English, *ESP Journal* 16/3: 161-179.

Moreno, Ana I. (1998). The explicit signalling of premise-conclusion sequences in research articles: A contrastive framework. *Text* 18/4: 545-585.

Moreno, Ana I. (2003a). Matching theoretical descriptions of discourse and practical applications to teaching: the case of causal metatext. *English for Specific Purposes* 22/3: 265-295.(http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(02) 00021-2)

Moreno, Ana I. (2003b). The role of cohesive devices as textual constraints on relevance: A discourse-as-process view. *International Journal of English Studies*. (Monograph: *Discourse Analysis Today*) 3/1: 111-165.

Moriarty, H. (1999). Exam scripts pilot gets top marks for effort. *Guardian Unlimited.* EducationGuardian.co.uk © Guardian Newspapers Limited 2002.
http://education.guardian.co.uk/old/schools/story/0,10044,106551,00.html

Salkie, Raphael. (1995). *Text and Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Sanders, Ted J.M., Spoorem, Wilbert P.M. and Noordman, Leo G.M. (1993). Coherence relations in a cognitive theory of discourse representation. *Cognitive Linguistics* 4/2: 93-133.

Sinclair, John M. (1993). Written discourse structure' in John Sinclair, M. Hoey and G. Fox, eds., *Techniques of Description: Spoken and Written Discourse, a Festschrift for Malcolm Coulthard* .London: Routledge, , 6-31.

Sperber, Dan and Diedre Wilson. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Tadros, Angela (1985). *Prediction in Text (Discourse Analysis Monographs, 10)*. Birmingham: English Language Research. University of Birmingham.

Winter, Eugene O. (1977). A clause relational approach to English texts: a study of some predictive lexical items in written discourse. *Instructional Science* 6/1: 1-93.

Winter, Eugene O. (1986). Clause relations as information structure: two basic text structures in English. In Malcolm Coulthard, ed., *Talking about Text (Discourse Analysis Monographs, 13)*. Birmingham: English Language Research. University of Birmingham, 88-108.

APPENDIX: SEGMENTED TEXT

Exam scripts pilot gets top marks for effort

The verdict on returning examination papers to students? Fairly good, room for improvement.

Hilary Moriarty
Tuesday November 23, 1999
The Guardian

(1) Nineteen ninety-nine was the year we dipped a toe in the water:
(2) **and** you know **what?** <
(3) [The sharks didn't bite,
(4) **and the water** wasn't freezing.]
(5) **The water** was the great scary ocean of returning examination papers to candidates.
(6) This year saw the pilot scheme, with three different models for GCSE and at A level, for **the** copying and **return** of all **scripts** in 10 syllabuses, allowing centres to decide how to release the copied scripts **to candidates.**
(7) The Qualifications and Curriculum Authority has carried out **an** interim **evaluation** * (of **the pilot scheme**). <
(8) "How was **it** for you?"
(9) [The great news * (**about the pilot scheme**) is that there seems to be general approval for the principle of returning the scripts.
(10) * (**In other words**) The earth may not have moved, but the world didn't come to a standstill either.
(11) **It** was OK.]
(12) * (**In fact**) Not surprisingly, most of the people involved * (in **the pilot scheme**) felt that returning the scripts made the examination system more transparent and examiners more accountable.
(13) * (**because**) Sometimes you don't need to tell people to work better, you just tell them there's an audience for what they

produce.

(14) * (**In other words**) Knowing that whatever was done to the papers would be seen in the outside world must have been salutary.

(15) **This is not to say that** examiners were sloppy before.

(16) Would I say **such a thing**? (= I would not say such a thing)

(17) * (**because**) I examined for years:

(18) * (**examining** was) the most gruelling job in the world, requiring painstaking effort and concentration to sustain standards justly for 300 scripts in three weeks.

(19) * (**In other words**) Conscientious marking is a killer.

(20) * (**And = but**) **And** examiners never did work in an irresponsible vacuum –

(21) * (**because**) the chief examiner always loomed over one's shoulder, checking, commenting, re-marking if necessary.

(22) **At least**, I think **that**'s what **he did**.

(23) * (**Anyway**) Even if **he did**n't * (**loom over one's shoulder, ... if necessary**), the fear that **he would** * (**loom over one's shoulder, ... if necessary**) was a great deterrent to misdemeanour.

(24) **But** how much simpler and **more** thorough * (**than the chief examiner looming over one's shoulder...**) is the returning of marked scripts to the original writers.

(25) * (**Returning the marked scripts... is**) Real accountability.

(26) **The irony** * (**of the pilot scheme**) is, of course, that * (**in spite of**) **having been offered their scripts**, most of the candidates didn't want them.

(27) * (**As a matter of fact**) Staff in the centres reported the percentage of students "very interested" in viewing the scripts as about 12%, with a further 27% only "fairly interested".

(28) **The reasons** * (**why most of the students did not want to view the scripts**) are obvious: <

(29) [if you did well, you really don't care about the papers –

(30) **and that** goes for doing well unexpectedly, as well as having the satisfaction of achieving just what you expected.]

(31) * (**By contrast**) **Interest in the papers is generated** by doing

badly,

(32) * (**and** = **but; then** = **that**) **and then** only if **it** surprises you.

(33) * (**because**) **If you partied all year, or had a personal crisis,** then you will have done badly but you won't need to see the papers to see why.

(34) The interim report indicates **also** that pupils needed teachers to decode what they saw –

(35) * (**this** is) small wonder, if the rumours are right and examiners were virtually forbidden to write on the scripts for fear of litigation from insulted students.

(36) * (**because**) Without some sort of written explanatory commentary, candidates might well find the scripts "more meaningful when interpreted by their teacher".

(37) **Actually**, if the pilot scheme is judged successful and more scripts are returned in the future, **this** is an area where practice must be improved.

(38) * (**because**) Particularly in arts subjects, where marking is notoriously subjective, the examiner's commentary is vital evidence.

(39) * (**In fact**) In my day, I was expected to annotate scripts to explain my marks to the chief examiner.

(40) Remove **that requirement**, and the examining process will only appear to be more open, while in fact retaining an almost smug inscrutability.

(41) * (**If** = **While**) **If candidates didn't care about the scripts,** 71% of staff cared a great deal:

(42) * (**As a matter of fact**) 82% * (**of the staff**) agreed that access to the scripts would help with teaching the syllabus in the coming year.

(43) * (**Of course** = **this** is natural) Well of course.

(44) * (**because**) Knowing exactly where the last candidates got it wrong is the best learning tool a teacher can have to improve performance next year.

(45) * (**However**) **Better than knowing what they got** is knowing why they got it.

(46) * (**So**) If any government wants to conjure up massive whole

school improvement, **this** is the magic wand.

(47) There will be logistical **problems** * (**with the process of returning the scripts to candidates**): <

(48) [returning all scripts will mean 13.5m papers whizzing through the postal system, **for instance**.

(49) Photocopying scripts sounds horrendous even to a convinced "pro-returner" like me.

(50) Proper scrutiny of the papers in school will take time, possibly precious holiday time.]

(51) **And if the big learners here are teachers, not pupils**, should they be returned at all? * (= with all these problems, it looks as if they should not be returned at all)

(52) * (**However**) The answer (to **this question**) is yes (**they should be returned**).

(53) * (**because**) I believe now, as I believed last year when I wrote one of the first articles calling for this move towards long-overdue transparency and accountability, and as the authorities hold in New Zealand, that **it** is simply the right thing to do.

(54) * (**And**) **The right thing** overrides **logistical problems**.

(55) **Pupil neglect of the papers** is beside **the point**. * (= is not relevant to **the question**)

(56) * (**because**) A few * (**pupils**) will be very interested indeed,

(57) **and that**'s enough.

(58) * (**It** is) A bit **like** voting, really**:** <

(59) [lots of people don't care about **that either**,

(60) **but** for **those** * (**people**) who **do** * (**care**) , **it**'s one of the markers of a civilised world.]