EXPOSITORY WRITING IN TURKISH:
A RHETORICAL APPROACH TO COHERENCE AND COHESION

by

B. Dilara Koçbaş

Submitted to
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Linguistics

Boğaziçi University

2006

The thesis of B. Dilara Koçba is approved by

Assist. Prof. Dr. Didar Akar (Committee Chairperson) _____

Prof. Dr. Eser Erguvanlı-Taylan _____

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Aksu-Koç _____

June 2006

ABSTRACT

Expository Writing in Turkish:

A Rhetorical Approach to Coherence and Cohesion

B. Dilara Koçbaş

Coherence, i.e. the overall structure of the content of a text and *cohesion,* i.e. the text-internal relations across clauses are considered two important standards that indicate the development of text construction abilities of children. This study analyzes the development of coherence and cohesion in expository writing in Turkish. The participants in this study from four grade groups (5^{th}, 7^{th}, 9^{th} grade and university students) were asked to produce written expository text after having seen a video which depicts "the problems between people".

With respect to the macrostructural organization of the texts, the demarcation of opening, developing, and concluding parts is achieved via their rhetorical function in the overall text. To serve this purpose, MOVE analysis is recruited from genre analysis. It has also been noted that the existence or absence of structural parts such as opening, development, and conclusion can only be determined in relation to each other in the texts.

The cohesive properties of the data are analyzed in terms of reference, ellipsis, conjunction, lexical cohesion, temporality, aspectuality, and modality. It is noted that children's use of cohesive resources shows sensitivity to the rhetorical function of global parts of the discourse from early grades on.

To conclude, the development of coherence and cohesion is proposed to be intricately related through literacy development. Especially the use of coordinative conjunctions, referential chains, and temporal-aspectual-modal marking seem to be related to the rhetorical organization of the texts.

KISA ÖZET

Bu çalışmada çocukların kompozisyon yazma becerilerindeki gelişim, metin düzleminde *bağdaşıklılık* ve *bağlılık* açısından incelenmektedir. Örneklem grubu, 5., 7., ve 9. sınıf ve üniversite öğrencilerinden oluşturulmuştur. Çalışmada her yaş grubundan 20 deneğe "kişiler arası problemler"in işlendiği bir film izletilmiş ve bu deneklerden işlenen konu hakkındaki düşüncelerini açıklayıcı kompozisyon türünde yazmaları istenmiştir.

Metinlerdeki bağdaşıklılık; giriş, gelişme ve sonuç gibi yapısal bölümlerin metnin bütünü içindeki sözbilimsel işlevleri açısından incelenmiştir. Özellikle küçük yaşlardaki deneklerin ürettikleri metinlerde yapısal bölümlerin değerlendirilmesinin ancak bütün bölümlerin birbiri ile ilişkilerinin incelenmesi ile yapılabileceği açıklanmaktadır.

Metinlerdeki bağlılık; metin içi göndergeler ve eksiltiler, bağlaçlar, sözcükler, zaman, görünüş, ve kip belirten ekler açısından çalışılmıştır. Çocukların küçük yaşlardan başlayarak bu öğelerin kullanımları ile metindeki yapısal bölümlerin sözbilimsel işlevleri arasında ilişki olduğu belirtilmektedir.

Sonuç olarak, okur-yazarlık edinimi sürecinde metin içi bağdaşıklılık ve bağlılık oluşturma becerilerinin birbiriyle ilişkili olarak geliştiği saptanmıştır. Özellikle bağlaçların, göndergelerin ve zaman, görünüş ve kip belirten eklerin kullanımı metnin yapısal bölümlerine göre belirlenirken, bir yandan da o bölümlerin belirlenmesinde rol oynadığı açıklanmaktadır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my thesis advisor Assist. Prof Dr. Didar Akar without whose guidance and encouragement this work would have never been completed. I am grateful to her for many hours of discussion and her invaluable criticisms at every stage of this thesis.

I am indebted to my committee members Prof. Dr. Eser Erguvanlı-Taylan and Prof. Dr. Ayhan Aksu-Koç for the valuable suggestions, and comments on both earlier version and later version of this thesis. I will never forget their support during all phases of this study. Special thanks go to Prof. Dr. Ayhan Aksu-Koç who has opened my eyes near to linguistics. Her enthusiastic interest in language development has been a source of inspiration for me.

I would like to express my thanks to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aylin Küntay and Dr. Mehmet-Ali Akıncı for providing me the data and all sorts of materials and instruments necessary for the development of this work.

Many thanks are due to my friends Tamer, Evrim, Bilgen, Ilgın, Özgür, Ayça, Emre, Çağatay, Ayşenur, and especially to Emrah for their unfailing interest and support in my hard times.

And last but not least, I would like to thank my mother, sister, and my “Blue Bead” for their love, tolerance, and belief in me during the whole phase of my research. This thesis is dedicated to them.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Kısa Özet	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	x
CHAPTER I: Introduction	1
1.1 The Aim	1
1.2 Genre Analysis	5
1.3 Expository Texts in Turkish School Practices	12
1.4 Organization of the Thesis	14
CHAPTER II: Coherence and Cohesion	15
2.1 Introduction	15
2.2 Discourse Coherence	17
2.2.1 Coherence in Expository Texts	23
2.3 Discourse Cohesion	25
2.3.1 Reference	26
2.3.2 Ellipsis	28
2.3.3 Conjunction	29
2.3.4 Lexical Cohesion	30
2.3.5 Temporality	32
2.3.6 Aspectuality	33
2.3.7 Modality	34

2.4 Development of Coherence 36

2.5 Development of Cohesion 38

2.6 Relation between Coherence and Cohesion 42

CHAPTER III: Data and Methodology 46

3.1 Description of the Study 46

3.2 Research Population 47

3.3 Data Collection 48

3.4 Text Types 50

3.5 Data Transcription and Coding 51

3.6 Data Description 51

CHAPTER IV: Development of Global Structure in Expository Texts 53

4.1 Introduction 53

4.2 Global Textual Structure 54

4.2.1 Britton's Grammar of Exposition 54

4.3 An Alternative Analysis:

Analysis of Rhetorical MOVEs in the Framework of Genre 59

4.4 5th Graders' Expository Texts 68

4.4.1 List-type Texts at 5th Grade 69

4.4.2 Texts with MOVE Structure at 5th Grade 73

4.5 7th Graders' Expository Texts 79

4.6 9th Graders' Expository Texts 86

4.7 Adults' Expository Texts 90

4.8 Conclusion 95

CHAPTER V: Development of Cohesion 100

5.1 Introduction 100

5.2 Development of Cohesion: An Overview 101

5.3 Cohesion in 5th Graders' Texts 111

5.3.1 Referential Cohesion 111

5.3.2 Conjunction 113

5.3.3 Temporal, Aspectual, Modal Cohesion 115

5.3.4 Lexical Cohesion 117

5.4 Cohesion in 7th Graders' Texts 120

5.4.1 Referential Cohesion 120

5.4.2 Conjunction 121

5.4.3 Temporal, Aspectual, Modal Cohesion 123

5.4.4 Lexical Cohesion 124

5.5 Cohesion in 9th Graders' Texts 126

5.5.1 Referential Cohesion 126

5.5.2 Conjunction 132

5.5.3 Temporal, Aspectual, Modal Cohesion 133

5.5.4 Lexical Cohesion 134

5.6 Cohesion in Adults' Texts 136

5.7 Conclusion 142

CHAPTER VI: Conclusion:

The Relation between Coherence and Cohesion Development 149

APPENDIX 157

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. Age, Number, Mean Age, Age Ranges of Our Subjects…….47

TABLE 2. Order of Presentation across the Tasks and Groups……....49

TABLE 3. Text Lengths in terms of Total and Mean Number of Clauses per Group for Turkish Monolinguals in Written Expository Texts……..52

TABLE 4. Number of Texts in each Grade Group according to the Present MOVEs…….....62

TABLE 5. Types and Number of STEPs in MOVE 1 by Grade Levels.....64

TABLE 6. Types and Number of STEPs in MOVE 2 by Grade Levels……...65

TABLE 7. Types and Number of STEPs in MOVE 3 by Grade Levels….....66

TABLE 8. First-Mention Strategies of Agent Subject NPs (Tokens)…….101

TABLE 9. Number of Matrix Clauses and Frequencies of Referential Ellipsis across Grades……103

TABLE 10. Number of Free Coordinative Conjunctions in each MOVE across Grade Groups……104

TABLE 11. Temporal Marking in each MOVE across Grade Groups……..105

TABLE 12. Distribution of Aorist –Ir/-Ar, Progressive/Imperfective –Iyor, Factive –DIr, and Obligation/Necessity -mAlI in each MOVE……106

TABLE 13. Distribution of Aorist, Progressive/Imperfective –Iyor, and Factive -DIR in each MOVE across Grades……108

TABLE 14. Distribution of Obligation/Necessity Modality in Different MOVEs through the Grade Groups……110

TABLE 15. Number of Texts with Repeated Evaluative Statements across Grades……...…110

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE AIM

The aim of this thesis is to investigate the development of coherence and cohesion in the expository texts of monolingual Turkish children coming from 5th, 7th, 9th grades from a rhetorical genre perspective. We also include an adult group to compare the textual organization abilities at the university level and before it.

Since 1960's, linguists have been interested in units larger than a sentence and the organization of language at the discourse level. The common assumption is that people communicate in coherent sequences of utterances rather than isolated sentences. In such a perspective, larger units, i.e. "texts" are considered the basic unit of communication in a social context and are thus, analyzed as specific instances of language use.

In the realm of text analysis, the concepts of "coherence" and "cohesion" are formulated in order to conceptualize the aspects of textual organization flourishing especially in the works of Halliday & Hasan (1976) and Widdowson (1979). Coherence is typically related to the overall structure of the content of a text, whereas cohesion is related to the text-internal relations across clauses. These are the two distinct but interrelated standards that a text should meet.

The contributions of text linguistics in extending language studies beyond sentence boundaries have influenced language development studies, too. Since narrative is the earliest type emerging in children's discourse[1], children's narrative productions have been investigated from a developmental point of view. A number of researchers have aimed at analyzing the structure of children's narrative productions (Applebee, 1978; Berman & Slobin, 1994; Bronckart & Schneuwly, 1991; Eisenberg, 1985; Espéret, 1991; Fivush, Gray & Fromhoff, 1987; Gopnik, 1989; McCabe & Peterson, 1991; Menig-Peterson, 1975; Menig-Peterson & McCabe, 1978; Miller & Sperry, 1988; Peterson, 1990; Peterson & McCabe, 1983), as well as the acquisition of the linguistic expressions in the organization of discourse-internal relations such as information flow (e.g. Hickmann et al., 1996; Hickmann, 2003; Kail & Hickmann, 1992; Kail & Sanchez-Lopez, 1998).

Expository discourse[2], on the other hand, has been neglected in developmentally oriented studies. Although there have been various works that focus on comprehension of expository texts (e.g. Keçik, 1991, Meyer & Poon, 2001; Papas & Pettigrew, 1998), considerably less research has been done so far specifically concentrating on the production of expository texts[3].

Expository discourse differs from narratives in significant ways. First, narrative is one of the most shared forms of discourse in all cultures (Karmiloff-

---

[1] Some linguists use the notion "text" as referring always to written forms of discourse. Furthermore, Connor (1996) makes a differentiation between text "as discourse without context" and discourse as "text plus context". However, we use these terms interchangeably throughout this thesis.

[2] Broadly speaking, expository discourse can be defined as text types that provide information or discussion of ideas (Grabe, 2002; Berman & Katzenberger, 2004).

[3] One exceptional field dealing with the expository prose production is contrastive rhetoric because the research on expository text types in different languages other than English is expected to provide more sound assessments for English L2 instruction (Grabe, 1987; Hinds, 1990; Kaplan, 1983).

Smith, 1986), whereas expository discourse is usually limited to school activities. Most of the time moreover, thematic content of narratives consist of concrete objects and events which are presented in temporal sequence. In contrast, there is not "a clear overarching principle of organization" in expository discourse (Berman & Katzenberger, 2004; p. 89), because its organization is based on presenting ideas and abstract topics in the form of generalizations (Grabe, 2002; Jisa & Vigué, 2005). In these respects, expository text production imposes dense cognitive demands on its producer regarding the content and organization of the presented information. Therefore, the development of expository text production needs to be enforced via schooling. With literacy-related activities such as reading and writing in school, children get exposed to expository discourse and gain experience in it. As a result, literacy development and schooling are considered crucial for the mastery in expository discourse more than narratives. On the other hand, the mastery in expository text writing is considered crucial for academic achievement (Jisa, 2004; Berman & Katzenberger, 2004; Martin, 1989).

Recently, a crosslinguistic project called "The Spencer Project on Developing Literacy" has been conducted to investigate how school children in comparison to adults construct narrative versus expository texts in two modalities –spoken versus written. In this project, Berman and Verhoeven (2002) defined a group of "diagnostic domains" to investigate the development in text production abilities. These domains include both the local level of lexical and morpho-syntactic expressions and the global level of over-all discourse structure and content. Accordingly, the analyses have been carried out in terms of lexical density (Strömqvist, 2002), subject noun phrases (Ravid et al., 2002), verbal structure and content (Ragnarsdóttir et al., 2002), passive voice (Jisa et al., 2002), clause packaging (Verhoeven et al., 2002), use of

modals (Reilly et al., 2002), text openings and closings (Tolchinsky et al., 2002) and discourse stance (Berman et al., 2002) in both narrative and expository text elicitations. They compare the frequencies of lexical and morphosyntactic expressions across genres, i.e. narrative versus expository texts, and across modalities, i.e. speech versus writing. In addition, they showed how the uses of these expressions differ regarding the genre and modality distinctions. One of the key findings of this project is that although children as young as 9 years of age differentiate narratives from expositions in terms of the linguistic features across languages, expository text construction develops later than narratives (Berman & Nir-Sagiv, 2004).

Berman et al.'s findings lead to the claim that children's use of linguistic devices in different situations is likely to be related to the structural properties of discourse types. In other words, there is a connection between principles of text construction and the choice of specific linguistic devices. Berman & Katzenberger (2004; p. 87) state this relation directly:

> (…) In (discourse-embedded contexts –such as monologic narrative and expository text production-) it is not enough for speaker-writers to make use of their repertoire of grammatical and lexical devices to produce well-constructed simple clauses and isolated sentences. Preschool children are well able to perform such tasks. What takes a long time to acquire is the ability to concurrently recruit wide range of combined linguistic, cognitive, and communicative resources and to deploy them appropriately in the online production of monologic text construction.

Hickmann (2003) specifies such a relation between structural and procedural aspects of text production as the relation between coherence and cohesion. According to Hickmann (2003), many studies on children's narrative development have examined either coherence or cohesion exclusively; however the relation

between the two needs to be looked at in order to reach a full-fledged account of narrative development as the studies in Berman & Slobin (1994) relate form and function in narratives.

The present study will try to cover two neglected issues. One is the development of children's expository text productions and the other is to track the relation between coherence and cohesion along this development. A major difficulty to realize our aim has been to find the proper method for the study of coherence in expository texts. Studies that investigate the global structural parts of a discourse type have suggested a myriad of analyses based mainly on narratives. However, narratives and expository texts rely on distinct principles and have a different developmental pace; hence we argue that the proposed analyses for narratives can not be adapted to expository texts. An alternative analysis that serves our purposes better comes from the area of genre analysis.

1.2 GENRE ANALYSIS

Genre theory is introduced to rhetorical studies by Swales to propose a way of classification of discourse types based on communicative purpose. According to Swales (1990; p. 58), genre refers to "a recognizable communicative event characterized by a set of communicative purpose(s) identified and mutually understood by members of the professional or academic community in which it regularly occurs".

According to this definition, the nature and production of a genre is mainly determined by its communicative purpose(s) that assign(s) the internal structure of a genre. Changing the communicative purpose(s), then, differentiate the type of the

genre because the communicative purpose determines the cognitive structuring of the genre that corresponds to the organizational regularities in it. These regularities provide construction and understanding strategies for the members of a particular discourse community to achieve their communicative purpose(s). Swales (1990) defines these organizational regularities as MOVEs. In other words, the discourse as genre is organized in the form of MOVE structures which are characterized as cognitively oriented.

With this definition based on communicative purpose(s), genre analysis studies writing in institutional contexts such as academic writings and legal discourse (Bhatia, 1993). The aim of such studies is to look at the reasons why professionals write in the way they do. Bhatia's work on research abstracts (1993) is one example of genre analysis. The communicative purpose of abstracts is "to give the reader an exact and concise knowledge of the full article" (Bhatia, 1993; p. 78). Bhatia (1993) studied some research abstracts from different disciplines and concluded that irrespective of the discipline all abstracts carry information on (1) what the author did, (2) how he/she did it, (3) the findings, and (4) the conclusions. In an abstract, these four aspects are presented concisely through four MOVEs given below:

- MOVE 1 "Introducing purpose": It gives the author's intentions and thesis or hypothesis. The goals or objectives may be given in this MOVE 1, as well.

- MOVE 2 "Describing methodology": The author talks about the experimental design by mentioning the data, procedures, and methods in the research.

- MOVE 3 “Summarizing results”: In this third MOVE, the author states his/her observations and findings. If a problem was presented in MOVE 1, the author gives the solution in this MOVE.

- MOVE 4 “Presenting conclusions”: The author interprets results and applications of the findings in MOVE 4. He/she also mentions the implications of the research.

The MOVE analysis above outlines the overall rhetorical structure of the article abstracts on the basis of the communicative intention of each MOVE. The special communicative intention indicated at the MOVE level may be realized by different rhetorical strategies called STEP. Swales’ famous Create a Research Space (CARS) model (1990) about article introductions is an important example of MOVE analysis. The following illustration of CARS model is adapted from Bhatia (1993):

Introduction		
MOVE 1	Establishing a Territory by	
	Step 1	Claiming centrality
	and/or	
	Step 2	Making topic generalization(s)
	and/or	
	Step 3	Reviewing items of previous research
MOVE 2	Establishing a Niche by	
	Step 1A	Counter-Claiming
	or	
	Step 1B	Indicating a Gap
	or	
	Step 1C	Question Raising
	or	
	Step 1D	Continuing a Tradition
MOVE 3	Occupying the Niche by	
	Step 1A	Outlining purposes
	or	
	Step 1B	Announcing present research
	Step 2	Announcing principal findings
	Step 3	Indicating article structure

According to CARS model there is a three-MOVE structure that the members of a discourse community use to produce and interpret the article instructions in academic settings. The list of the STEPs may be extended by adding new rhetorical strategies to realize the intended MOVE.

The methodology and application of genre analysis have been used broadly for the teaching and learning of language in context. As genre analysis gets involved in different types of texts, finding a clear communicative purpose for each type becomes difficult (e.g. Akar, 1998 for memos; Miller & Shepherd, 2004 for weblogs). For example, Akar (1998) analyzes business faxes that lack a clear communicative purpose yet have a clear structure of production and interpretation shared by the members in a business setting. As a result, different orientations other than Swales' (1990) and Bhatia's (1993) "consistency of communicative purposes" emerge in genre theory to define discourse types in various discourse settings (Bhatia, 2004). Miller's conceptualization of "Recurrent Rhetorical Situations" is one of them.

According to Miller (1994), the term "genre" is the product of "Recurrent Rhetorical Situations" that defines a way of classifying a discourse type based on rhetorical practice. Its main objective is "to understand the structure and function of language use to communicate meaning" (Bhatia, 1993; p. 3). There are two important terms to be defined in Miller's definition (1984); one is genre as "recurrent", and the other is genre as "situation". Miller (1994) uses the term "recurrent" to indicate "comparable", "similar" or "analogous" situations that we refer to in order to make sense out of new situations. The "situations", on the other hand, denote social constructs that lead people to define and interpret their

environment and to act accordingly. In sum, "Recurrent Rhetorical Situations" roughly indicate typified situations -with typified participants- that lead to typification in the rhetoric; hence genre knowledge.

Despite differences in orientation, which are not really in contradiction with one another, the conceptualizations of genre knowledge have some common emphasis (Bhatia, 2004; Johns, 1997). For example, in a communicative act, shared genre knowledge rises out of repeated, contextualized experiences with texts. It is both abstract, schematic and gets more reliable as people encounter a certain genre category several times. Johns (1997) mentions the common characteristics of a genre knowledge that can be stored in memory to produce a particular genre. According to her, some or all of them can be detected among writers who share particular genre knowledge. For the sample of our expository texts, we find that almost all of these characteristics are present in texts even produced by our young subjects, i.e. 5th graders that lead us to assume that our expository texts are produced with common genre knowledge. Let us analyze them one by one for our data:

1. A shared name: The texts and their situations are distinguished through a common name. It makes the readers and writers to expect certain conventions of the text, specific reader and writer roles, and particular contexts in which texts occur. Some pedagogical genres may be loosely named in some languages such as Turkish. Compared to the name of "expository text" in English, in Turkish such texts are loosely referred as "*kompozisyon*".

2. Shared communicative purposes: Writers produce texts because there is something that he/she intends to communicate others. In our instructions, the purposes given to the subjects inform them to state their thoughts about the interpersonal problems.

3. Shared knowledge of roles: People produce their texts with a concern of their social roles. The subjects in our study are well aware of their role as students while writing their texts. They write under the control of their teacher, which is the usual practice in school.

4. Shared knowledge of context: Context indicates both physical sphere and nonlinguistic and non-textual elements that provide the situation. In a familiar context, writers can retrieve their previous textual experiences to cope with the current requirements. Our study is carried out in the classroom of our subjects on a regular school day. It is a regular writing task that they are familiar with in school context. In addition, the shared name and roles enable the subjects to set up a familiar context helping them to transfer their prior experiences.

5. Shared knowledge of formal text features (conventions): Text form contributes to the genre knowledge in such a degree that certain formal characteristics are expected by community members to read and write confidently. It may be realized in its macrostructure, or in its sentence-level elements. We will show in Chapter 4 and 5 that both the macrostructure and the grammatical elements throughout our subject groups share certain conventions such as text headings or global MOVEs.

6. Shared knowledge of text content: The topics in a text have a significant role in the structuring of genre knowledge. Furthermore, the vocabulary selection is influenced by the content. In our study, we restricted the content selection of our subjects by making them watch a video as a prompt. All the subjects select their contents from the same video, and construct their vocabulary accordingly.

7. Shared register: The choice of specific lexical and grammatical features in a text indicates register or style. We observed that some preferences related to the

register are constant across our expository texts, such as use of factive modality marking. Furthermore, our subjects at different ages prefer certain predicates while the others do not, such as *gerek-mekte-dir* "necessitate-PRESENT PROGRESSIVE-MODAL" in adult texts.

8. Shared cultural values: The ways that writers interpret their environment are related to their cultural practices about sharing life experiences and values. So, the "ways of being in the world" (Geertz, 1983) shapes the generic knowledge of the writer. The writers in our study come from the same culture and as a result they state similar moral judgments in their texts.

9. Shared awareness of intertextuality: All texts have been influenced by other text types encountered so far. Although children in our study write their texts on a paper, they had all seen the video film beforehand. Such an interaction established between video and paper work affect the intertextuality of our texts. Moreover, there exists also the effect of textbook discourse that the children have experienced in school.

Writers may share these nine characteristics mentioned above while producing a text from a genre. Eventually, the presence of nearly all the common characteristics in genre knowledge among our subjects leads us to argue that all our subject groups construct their expository texts with a shared knowledge of a certain genre[4]. Therefore, we orient the generic classification of our expository texts according to the presence of shared genre knowledge in our research population.

[4] It is a well-established fact that expository discourse is conceptually different than the other types of discourse such as narratives (see above). Yet, there is an ongoing debate on whether expository discourse is also generically distinct (e.g. Bhatia, 2002; Berkenkotter, 2002; Grabe, 2002; Martin, 2002). However, this discussion goes beyond the scope of our study.

According to Fairclough (1992), a genre is not just a special type of text, yet it entails also a special process of producing. So, the acquisition of genre requires both the acquisition of procedural knowledge and social knowledge. The procedural knowledge indicates the familiarity with the tools and with the field's methods and framework, whereas social knowledge indicates the knowledge of rhetorical and conceptual context.

For studying the acquisition of procedural knowledge in terms of global structure of a discourse, Swales (1990) and Bhatia (1993) introduced MOVEs as the organizational tools. In addition, even though genre analysis appears to be specifically concentrated on the global construction of written discourse, it does not disregard textual features as indicated in Bhatia (1993, 2004). First, the grammatical features can be examined quantitatively to find out which specific features are mainly employed in the context of certain genres. More interestingly, one can find out what aspects of the genre are textualized by using what grammatical features.

1.3 EXPOSITORY TEXTS IN TURKISH SCHOOL PRACTICES

Expository text production is one of the frequent practices in Turkish classes beginning in primary school years under the name of *kompozisyon çalışmaları* "practices of expository writing". The topics that are given to students to expose on are chosen from several classes taught. However, the topics are too broad such as "*Orman ve Ağaç*" ("The Forest and Tree") that hinder them to restrict their expositions to clear and neatly organized units (Ruhi, 1993). Besides, there are no written practices beforehand about how to clearly frame the given topic in their exposition (Aksan & Çakır, 1997; Ruhi, 1993; Savaş, 2005).

In her examination of 5th grade Turkish textbooks, Ruhi (1993) finds only one instruction about writing "*kompozisyon"*. In these textbooks, it is roughly stated that all the texts are planned units as having one introduction, one development, and one conclusion. Yet, there is not a closed set of text types that are given to students; in other words students can write any text types such as personal narratives, letters, or discussion of their ideas about one topic as their "*kompozisyon*". Therefore, the requirement they are taught that every text should have an introduction, development, and conclusion covers indefinitely broad set of rhetorical choices to organize their texts. As a result, studies about Turkish students' text productions reveal that there are severe problems in coherence and cohesion properties of the writings. For example, Turkish 5th graders' texts were qualified as underdeveloped regarding the principles of grounding and focusing (Ruhi, 1993). The underdevelopment in Turkish children's writing is argued to be related to the language instruction programs and the inadequate emphasis given in explicit writing instructions.

To conclude, the MOVE analysis that we adopt from genre analysis will enable us to study the rhetorical content of introduction, development, and conclusion parts of Turkish children's texts more thoroughly. Furthermore, we hypothesize that the relation between the acquisitions of overall structure of a discourse, i.e. "coherence" and of grammatical relations across clauses, i.e. "cohesion" can also be analyzed by this kind of analysis. The MOVEs enable us to define the structural parts in our expository texts, and thereby their relation to the grammatical cohesive features.

1.4 ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

In this Chapter, we provided the basic definitions of coherence and cohesion. Furthermore, we introduced genre analysis as the methodology we will use for the analysis of my data. Chapter II gives an overview of the literature concerning coherence and cohesion. This chapter also includes the discussions about the development of coherence and cohesion and the arguments that these two textual dimensions might be related in the course of literacy development. Chapter III consists of the description of the study and the research population in detail. In Chapter IV and Chapter V, we analyze the coherence and cohesion properties of our data, respectively. Chapter VI is the conclusion where we consider the relation between coherence and cohesion development as our subjects get experienced in school literacy.

CHAPTER II

COHERENCE AND COHESION

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Both coherence and cohesion are considered among fundamental principles in the production of texts[5] (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981). As a result, scholars have long been occupied with understanding the role of coherence and cohesion in shaping a text as an autonomous semantic unit. Among the earlier ones, Halliday & Hasan (1976) formulate cohesion as one of the components of texture that ensures non-structural relations between surface features in a text. According to them, "the concept of cohesion is a semantic one" (p. 4). Generally speaking, it refers to the linguistic structures that regulate the interpretation of one element in relation to another in discourse.

Although the primary focus of Halliday & Hasan (1976) is on the analysis of cohesion, they also mention structural relations that unify the parts of a text on the global level, hence creating coherence. They add up theme patterns and information structure as well as the macro-structural properties of a text in relation to its context under the title of coherence.

---

[5] Beside coherence and cohesion, Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) propose five more standards of textuality: intentionality, acceptability, situationality, informativity, and intertextuality.

Since Halliday & Hasan (1976), there have been many others who assert that coherence and cohesion are the two distinct but interrelated standards that a text should meet (e.g. Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981; Enkvist, 1990; Hickmann, 2003a)[6]. The reason they maintain the discrimination between coherence and cohesion more strongly than Halliday & Hasan (1976) is the fact that a text can be coherent without being cohesive on the surface level. Furthermore, there are examples, suggesting that cohesion is not enough in itself to create coherence. The following texts taken from Enkvist (1990; p. 12) will provide two examples to support the point:

1. "Susie left the howling ice cube in a bitter bicycle and it melted. It soon tinkled merrily in her martini. Into her drink she then also poured the grand piano she had boiled in a textbook of mathematics the night before. She chewed the martini, read the olive and went to bed. But she took her clothes off. She then took her clothes off."
2. "The net bulged with the lightning shot. The referee blew his whistle and signaled. Smith had been offside. The two captains both muttered something. The goalkeeper sighed for relief."

The passage in (1) seems to have well established sentential links such as sharing similar referents, yet the expressions such as 'howling ice cube', and 'bitter bicycle' are strange enough to hinder the reader to produce a sensible world image. Since the passage is produced out of images of an impossible world, it is regarded as nonsensical.

[6] Although Halliday & Hasan (1976), Hickmann (2003a) and Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) maintain that these concepts are different, albeit related, some scholars in this field do not differentiate coherence and cohesion as two aspects of textual organization (cf. Givón, 2001)

In passage (2), on the other hand, sentences seem to lack any relations on the surface as opposed to example (1). Yet, in terms of the relation that propositions have to the real world, example (2) is argued to be in a better condition (Enkvist, 1990). If the passage is read by a soccer-wise reader, it makes logical connections to the world-picture (or a scenario) that the reader has in mind. Therefore, the passage in (2) is considered as a coherent passage. As a result, Enkvist (1990) suggests that (1) has cohesion but not coherence, and (2) has coherence despite the lack of overt, grammatically describable cohesion markers such as repetition or anaphora. Since the propositions in passage (2) refer to a plausible world, they form a coherent and unified discourse.

Following the current literature mentioned above, our standpoint throughout this work assumes a differentiation between coherence and cohesion. First, we will analyze coherence as the property underlying the surface text, and second, cohesion as the ways that the surface components in a text are mutually related.

This chapter is organized as follows. We will begin with the definitions of coherence and cohesion discussed in the literature in Section 2.2 and in Section 2.3. The developmental studies on coherence and cohesion will be presented in 2.4 and in 2.5. Lastly, relations between the mechanisms of coherence and cohesion will be discussed in Section 2.6.

2.2 DISCOURSE COHERENCE

Generally speaking, coherence has been defined as the semantic, logical, or cognitive links that hold a text as a unified whole (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981;

Bednarek, 2005; Enkvist, 1990). Regarding the literature, textual coherence has been studied mainly at two levels of discourse.

The first group of studies characterizes coherence as the particular configuration of meanings and concepts subsumed in successive clauses. The underlying assumption in this line of research is that the meanings of the parts of a discourse construct the meaning of the whole discourse that is larger than the sum of its parts. Consider the following sentences:

3. a. Bill was about to be impeached. He called his lawyer. (Result)

   b.? Bill was about to be impeached. He bought six pounds of zucchini.

(Kehler, 2000; p. 539)

In (3a), the two statements are dependent on each other via a causal RESULT relationship. The reason that Bill called his lawyer is that he is about to be impeached. This relation is not directly stated with a lexical item in the surface such as with a conjunction like ‘because’ or ‘therefore’. Instead, it is inferred through the configuration of the two statements. On the other hand, (3b) is marked with a question mark because it is highly impossible to infer a relationship between those statements in (3b). Therefore, it is suggested that there is no coherence in the second sentence above.

Coherence relations between succeeding utterances are subsumed under a detailed model proposed by Kehler (2000). Based on Hume’s classification of “connection among ideas” (1955), Kehler’s model of discourse coherence subsumes coherence inducing relations across clauses under three basic sets: CAUSE-EFFECT relations, RESEMBLANCE relations, and CONTIGUITY relations. The following examples are taken from Kehler (2000):

4. (CAUSE-EFFECT) Bill called his lawyer. He was about to be impeached.

5. (RESEMBLANCE) Bill likes to play golf. Al enjoys surfing the net.

6. (CONTIGUITY) Ken Starr convened his grand jury this morning. Vernon Jordan was subsequently called to testify.

Although the particular configuration of concepts and meanings can convey information, Kehler (2000) notes that to get the right relation between statements we can apply tests using conjunctions or other relation indicating items.

Similarly, according to Givón (2001) the coherence relations in a piece of discourse are tighter when syntactic clues accompany them. Consider the examples from Kehler (2000; p. 543):

7. Margaret Thatcher adored Ronald Reagan and Tony Blair admires Bill Clinton.

8. Margaret Thatcher adored Ronald Reagan and Bill Clinton is admired by Tony Blair.

The PARALLEL relation is evident in (7) in the syntactic structure. However, in (8) the degree of syntactic parallelism is reduced and diminishes coherence, as well. The only difference between (7) and (8) is that the second clause has passive structure. Although passivization does not disturb the PARALLEL relation between the two clauses in (8), the coherence is not as tight as it is in (7) because it becomes more difficult to identify parallel arguments in (8). As a result, processing the text demands more effort from the text receiver.

Another line of coherence analysis deals with global patterns in a text on the macro level. The focus in these analyses is beyond isolated sentence groups, because as it is stated by van Dijk (1980) the local relationships between subsequent propositions are determined by the organization at macro level, as well. That is to

say, in coherent discourse, there is no clause totally independent of its local and its global context.

In accordance with van Dijk's view, Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) studied coherence in different types of texts such as nursery rhymes, poems, and scientific texts. They analyzed "mutually accessible concepts and relations that underlie the surface of a text" (p. 4) as coherence.

In order to handle the coherence in global patterns, Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) introduced the "chunks of knowledge". For example, a text producer may describe the conditions of 'clothes' and 'furniture' to depict "poverty" without any common grammatical items continuing in successive clauses. According to Beaugrande & Dressler (1981), in this example, 'poverty' is built up by using "the knowledge that *actually* is conveyed by expressions occurring in a text". Rather than grammatical items, such a configuration of concepts and meanings produces a kind of continuity that makes a text coherent.

Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) call FRAME, SCHEMA, PLAN and SCRIPT as four complete chunks of the macrostructure of a text. FRAMEs include concepts that belong together semantically. For instance, "bride", "groom", and "wedding ring" belong to the frame of "wedding". On the other hand, SCHEMAs contain events related by temporal and causal ties to the global level. So, SCHEMAs arrange the events sequentially in a textual world. PLANs outline the ways through which the text producer advances toward the goal. Lastly, SCRIPTs consist of pre-established routines of the events. A script has specified actions and participants of these actions have pre-established roles in a script. For example, in the SCRIPT of a wedding the groom and bride enter the wedding hall, and sit in front of the officer to perform their wedding vows.

Consequently, Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) argue that using global patterns enables a text producer to lessen the complexity on the local patterns since global patterns make it possible to retain more items active in the textual world during text production and text reception processes.

In addition, coherence also includes the concept of "global theme" introduced by van Dijk (1980). In accordance with the Enkvist's world-picture model of coherence (cf. examples 1 & 2), "global theme" indicates the macro propositions that the overall discourse is about. A text is considered as incoherent in the lack of a global theme as illustrated in the following passage taken from Tomlin et. al. (1997; p. 90):

9. "This morning I had a toothache. I went to the dentist. The dentist has a big car. The car was bought in New York. New York has had serious financial problems."

Note that each sentence is connected with the following one via a common referent in each of them above. Yet, due to the lack of a global theme the text is considered as incoherent. The failure in the example (9) is related with the macrostructure of discourse formulated by van Dijk (1980) as the global semantic structure of a discourse. According to van Dijk (1980) macrostructures indicate higher level conceptual units that establish global organization such as the title, headline or summarizing sentences in a text.

In this respect, structure is considered as the organization of content or information at a higher level. The extension of the concept of coherence with the notion of structure, leads to study the role of structure in coherent narrative discourse. Among others, Shapiro & Hudson (1997) state that children can produce coherent narratives by using the story schema to organize the content into defined

fragments of narratives in the form of beginning, setting, and background orientation. Such an overall organization of the discourse into larger segments is suggested as one of the elements that ensure coherence (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Tolchinsky et al., 2002; van Dijk, 1980).

Children as early as 18 months seem to acquire the basic structure of the narratives from their care-givers who present them short narratives during their interactions (Bruner, 1990). Therefore, for early-acquired text types, such as narratives, it is relatively easy to study the acquisition of the text structure and observe the structural parts in it. On the other hand, when we want to study the development of text types other than narratives, such as expository texts, we run into problems at earlier ages such as 5th grade. That is why; the studies on the acquisition of the narrative structure have a well-developed tradition compared to the expository discourse (Berman & Katzenberger, 2004).

There is indeed less research done on expository text construction compared to development of narrative. Most of the studies deal with the development of expository text comprehension and thereby try to study the expository text structures from comprehension data (e.g. van Dijk, 1980; Guindon & Kintsch, 1984; Keçik, 1991; Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978).

However, Britton (1994) has analyzed the expository texts of professionals and suggests a structure for it. According to Britton (1994), there is a grammar of exposition consisting of some structure building operations such as EXPAND, ENLARGE-ON, MOVE-ON, UNITIZE, and STOP. Since the text type in our study is expository writings, we will focus on Britton's model in some detail below.

2.2.1 COHERENCE IN EXPOSITORY TEXTS

Britton (1994) argues for a grammar of expository texts in order to define a set of rules that govern the structure of expository discourse similar to "the story grammar" that was introduced for defining the macrostructure of narratives. He characterizes these rules in terms of certain structure building instructions that render the expository discourse coherent units.

In order to convey the intended message to the text receiver correctly, the producer should construct the structure of the text accessible to the receiver. They can achieve this via the moves they make (Britton, 1994). A move in a piece of discourse leads the text receiver to consider one section of a discourse differently than the section before the move. For example, if the author moves to Subtopic 2 from Subtopic 1 without indicating his/her shift in some way, the reader fails to follow the producer. As a result, the text receiver builds an incomplete or incorrect representation for the subtopics in the text. Therefore, a mature writer is the one who provides appropriate textual cues to infer the relations between subtopics in a text completely and correctly (Britton, 1994).

Britton (1994) specifies five expository moves in the grammar of exposition. The basic expository move is EXPAND. It is the topmost move to expand the overall topic of the text. Titles in a text are examples of expanding the topic at the uppermost level. Until the text producer puts a stop to the EXPAND, the topic in the text is enlarged, uncovered, illustrated, and so on. The other four expository moves – namely ENLARGE-ON, MOVE-ON, UNITIZE, and STOP- are nested within this basic EXPAND operator.

ENLARGE-ON is the move that elaborates the topic at lower levels such as the newly introduced part of the previous sentence[7]. ENLARGE-ON includes some elements that lead the reader to construct the intended mental structure. Among these elements, new information and old information are the most common ones. New information is essential in the occurrence of ENLARGE-ON operation to be added to the mental structure of the reader. Otherwise, there will be no enlargement of the topic but only the repetition of the previous part. On the other hand, old information is important in locating new information to the current knowledge structure. In doing that, the text producer has to build some links between the nodes of information. The first link is built while connecting old information to a node from previous structure. Thereby, the author specifies the old information that is relevant at a particular point in a text to create the other link between the specified old information and the introduced new one. Existing with the new information, old information signals the location where the new information is placed in the text.

When the author indicates a move to the next topics and subtopics, his/her shift is called MOVE-ON. This often comes after ENLARGE-ON as finishing the enlarging on one subtopic and starting with another one. MOVE-ON has some schematic phrases such as “our next topic is” or “turning to”. After using these phrases, text producer can move on to another subtopic to be enlarged. In addition, periods, paragraphs, and a new heading also signals MOVE-ON in written discourse.

The other expository move is UNITIZE. Similar to MOVE-ON, UNITIZE may also come after ENLARGE-ON part. When the author enlarges on the topic as much as necessary, he/she unitizes the contents in the text at the end of each

[7] Britton (1994) states that the two terms EXPAND and ENLARGE are interchangeable. Following him, we use EXPAND for the topmost operation and ENLARGE for the lower ones.

discourse unit, because contents of the active memory need to be reduced due to the limitations on active memory. So, the first function of UNITIZE move is to manage the limitations of active memory. Moreover, since the author intends to construct a specific mental representation in the reader, he/she usually guides the reader in unitizing the current topic by a statement like "in summary". This summarizing function of UNITIZE move constructs a macrostructural statement from the text.

Britton (1994) also adds STOP as the final expository move. This STOP move puts an end to the discourse. It is considered the limit point of expanding a topic because usually the limit of expanding is where the text producer decides that he/she has said or written enough.

In short, the rules formulating the grammar of expository text indicate the structure of relations of larger discourse units in expository text types. In that way, it is similar to the "story grammar" because it enables the text producer as well as the text receiver to construct a coherent macrostructural schema of the exposition. We will try to pursue Britton's analysis in the following chapter while analyzing coherence properties of the texts in our data.

2.3 DISCOURSE COHESION

Besides on the global level, the items in a text are suggested to be related to each other on the local level as well. According to Halliday & Hasan (1976), it is this property that defines a text as a system. They use the term "COHESION" to focus on the organizational function of syntax in textual communication.

Cohesion simply means "sticking together" (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981; Halliday & Hasan, 1976). In a text, it ensures the continuity between the textual units

such as sentences, clauses, and referents. In other words, the non-adjacent items in successive clauses are dependent on each other through an intermixture of lexical and grammatical clues. Especially, for lengthy texts the grammatical devices at the surface level are needed to make the connection between already introduced items as they are re-introduced, or modified (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981; Givón, 2001; Halliday & Hasan, 1976). For example, pronouns mark the continuity of the referents in non-adjacent clauses. Since textuality is considered as based on continuity of items, grammatical devices to fill in the potential gaps such as pronouns are of special importance to make textual world evolve which is the main function of cohesion.

Halliday & Hasan (1976) calls the occurrence of a pair of cohesively related items as TIE. For example, a pronoun and its antecedent form a tie of referential kind. The analysis of ties provides a systematic way to analyze the cohesive pattern in a text. In their recent work, Halliday & Matthiessen (2004) specify four major groups of cohesive ties based on the linguistic form. These are reference, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion[8].

2.3.1 Reference

Reference points to certain participants or events whose identity is not interpretable by its own existence in the discourse yet depends on another element (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). That is to say, the information about references is to be

[8] Cohesive ties are categorized in five groups in Halliday & Hasan (1976) with an extra category of substitution. Yet, Halliday & Matthiessen (2004) subsumed substitution in the category of ellipsis as a systemic variant.

retrieved from other sources, hence creating the continuity of referents between referentially dependent items. This type of cohesion is called referential cohesion.

There is a range of linguistic devices to link the referring expression and the entity it refers to in a cohesive way. Pronouns and demonstratives are the two well-known examples. Halliday & Hasan (1976) categorize these devices in two groups. One is exophoric, the other is endophoric. Exophoric reference indicates that a reference is identified in the linguistic context of situation accompanying the text, so it entails situational knowledge. Unlike exophoric uses, endophoric reference has connections to the context as the utterances connect to one another (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). Since the interpretation of endophoric references is found within the succeeding or previous utterances, endophoric referents are recoverable from the text itself. We adopted following quotations from Halliday & Hasan (1976; p. 35):

10. Three boys are playing football and one boy kicks the ball and it goes through the window and the ball breaks the window (…).

11. They're playing football and he kicks it and it goes through there and it breaks the window (…).

The only difference between the examples above is that the referents in example (10) do not imply to retrieve the information of the items somewhere else other than the text. However, it is difficult to interpret the items in (11) without witnessing the event narrated. So, the text (11) can be qualified as context-bound compared the other example.

Halliday & Hasan (1976) provide little account of exophoric reference and treat endophoric reference as the norm in creating cohesion. In their analysis, they further divide endophoric references in two groups: "anaphoras" referring to items that have been already introduced and "cataphoras" referring to items that is about to

be introduced in a text. Comparing to cataphoras, anaphoric references are employed quite usually in the unfolding discourse. Especially in long texts such as narratives anaphoric references become important in identifying the meaning of referents properly as they are introduced and re-introduced through the discourse (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

Hickmann (2003) expresses that the referential forms of denoting entities are in a continuum of definiteness at the discourse level. This continuum is illustrated as the following:

12. indefinite nominal < definite nominal < overt pronoun < zero pronoun

Since indefinite NPs introduce referents to the discourse that are not known to the text receivers, they have the function of marking new information. Given information, on the other hand, are marked via definite NPs and pronouns in the case of referring mutually known entities (Chafe, 1976; Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

2.3.2 Ellipsis

Halliday & Matthiessen (2004) state that ellipsis (including substitution) indicates relation between words or clauses, distinct from relation between meanings as reference indicates. He defines ellipsis as the cohesive mechanism that makes it possible to leave out some elements in the text. This mechanism is possible if the elements left out can be recovered from the previous relations that had been established before or from the immediate context. The reason that the author leaves something unsaid is the author's assumption that "something is understood" (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). According to the grammatical category of the elliptical item, the ellipsis branches into three groups: nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis, and

clausal ellipsis. One example of each category is given from Halliday & Hasan (1976):

13. Smith was the first person to leave. I was the second.

(nominal ellipsis- p. 161)

14. a. Have you been swimming?

b. Yes, I have.

(verbal ellipsis- p. 167)

15. So you knew the lawyer was responsible. I hadn't realized.

(clausal ellipsis- p. 223)

In some cases, the elliptical structures have exophoric character where the author mainly counts on the immediate situational knowledge and assumes that the text receiver can interpret the meaning of the elliptical referent from the context.

2.3.3 Conjunction

Another cohesive resource that creates continuity is conjunctions. Unlike reference and ellipsis, conjunctions do not direct the text receiver to search the referents in the preceding or following text, yet "they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse" (p. 226). So, Halliday & Hasan (1976) distinguish conjunctions according to the relation they set among different parts of a text in English. Their categories include additive, adversative, causal, temporal, and continuative.

Topbaş & Özcan (1995) arrange conjunctions in Turkish into the categories similar to those of Halliday & Hasan (1976)[9]. These are:

a.) Additive: *ve* (and)[10]

b.) Temporal or chronological: *sonra* (after), *ondan sonra* (and then), *o sırada* (meanwhile)

c.) Causal: *için* (so), *çünkü* (because), *bu yüzden* (because of, due to)

d.) Adversative: *ama* (but), *fakat* (but, though), *ancak* (but, except)

e.) Alternative: *veya* (or), *ya da* (either… or)

f.) Paraphrasing: *yani* (that is to say...), *öyle* (so, that), *demek ki* (therefore...)

2.3.4 Lexical cohesion

The last source of Halliday & Hasan (1976) depends on the choice of lexical items in a text called lexical cohesion. There are two resources of it: reiteration (repetition, synonymy, near-synonymy), and collocation (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). In reiteration, a lexical item can be repeated, or a synonym of it can be used in successive clauses to create cohesion. If the text producer forms the lexical cohesion by creating expectancy relation between lexical items, his/her strategy is called collocation.

Compared to the other cohesive resources, the source of lexical cohesion forms an open-ended class. Every lexical item has the potential to create cohesion

[9] In Turkish, compared to free conjunctions, there are also bound forms attached to the predicates, i.e. subordination. Since subordination indicates a different area of study, we only include free conjunctives in this work.

[10] If "*ve*" (and), "*ya da*" (or), and "*veya*" (or) are used to coordinate series of entities as in "Susan and Jack went shopping" they are not considered as functioning to create textual cohesion (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

through successive clauses. However, every instance of a lexical item does not lead to cohesive tie directly. The indication whether a lexical item is functioning cohesively or not can be implied only by "patterned occurrence of lexical items" with reference to text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; p. 288). That is to say, the occurrence of a lexical item achieves the cohesive-inducing function when its occurrences are significant in terms of the textual content. The following example is taken from Witte & Faigley (1981; p. 192) to illustrate how lexical cohesion is recruited to carry the topic and the setting:

16. The *ascent* up the Emmons Glacier on Mt. Rainier is long but relatively easy.

The only usual problem in the climb is finding a route through the numerous crevasses above Steamboat Prow. In late season a bergschrund may develop at the 13,000-foot level, which is customarily bypassed to the right.

The lexical occurrences form three types of cohesive ties in (16). In the first tie, the lexical items "ascent", "climb", "finding a route", "bypassed to the right" form a cohesive tie to carry the topic, which is "the way up to the mountain". The second chain is built by "Glaicer", "crevasses", and "bergschrund", and the third one by "Mt. Rainier", "Steamboat Prow", and "13,000-foot level". The main function of these two chains is to give the setting. In addition, the interpretation of unfamiliar items such as "crevasses" and "bergschrund" is provided through these chains by virtue of setting. For example, the meaning of "bergschrund" can be inferred by associating it with glacier that it indicates a type of obstacle.

Another factor in producing a cohesive chain between lexical items is the frequency of them to be used together in the language. This factor is especially decisive in collocation type of lexical cohesion. Recently, special computer programs

are developed to calculate such a frequency. Since a full calculation of collocational cohesive resources would require a separate study, collocation is beyond the scope of this thesis. We exclusively focus on reiteration in our analysis.

The pioneering work on cohesion done by Halliday & Hasan (1976) has influenced many researches dealing with cohesion. In addition to Halliday & Hasan's (1976) cohesive resources, some other grammatical clues such as temporality, aspectuality and modality are suggested to create cohesion in texts (Givón, 2001[11]; Witte & Faigley, 1981).

2.3.5 Temporality

Time is denoted in the language by using two distinct but related markings namely tense and aspect. Generally, tense is defined as the linguistic category that connects the time of a denoted situation to the time of utterance (Hickmann, 2003). For example, past tense refers to a time before the immediate time of utterance.

The temporal system in Turkish can be described along past and non-past dimensions. Aksu-Koç (1994) states that tense shifting in narratives functions to change temporal perspective and allow the narrator to speak in "different voices" (p. 336). In so doing, the narrator is able to make grounding distinctions between events in narrative. Furthermore, when the narrator intends to state his/her evaluation, tense shifting enables him/her to change narrative past time to discourse time of the evaluation.

[11] Although Givón (2001) does not clearly differentiate coherence and cohesion, he states that discourse coherence always has some grammatical consequences. Thereby, according to Givón's (2001) study temporality, aspectuality, and modality create surface connectivity to link the items in their local context.

In Turkish, there are two means to denote temporality. First, Turkish agglutinative morphology expresses the tense in the predicate where suffixes get attached to the verb root. Turkish past tense suffixes are –DI and –mIş. Whether the speaker directly experienced the past event or not determines the choice of these two. If the speaker had directly experienced the event, past tense suffix is –DI is used. If he/she infers or hearsays the event, –mIş is the proper tense to mark the past event. In addition, tense is also denoted lexically by temporal adverbs such as *yarın* "tomorrow" and *şimdi* "now".

2.3.6 Aspectuality

In languages, aspect marking refers to the internal structure of the event. The typical distinction between perfective and imperfective aspects is based on the semantic nature of predicates. For example, perfective aspect marks the event to have been completed before the time of utterance. If the text producer denotes that the event has not been completed, she/he uses imperfective aspect. Furthermore, the distinction between foreground and background of discourse is provided by aspectual marking. The foreground of discourse corresponds to the events that construct the main plot line of a narrative. Yet, the secondary situations that surround the foreground are given in the background of the discourse (Hickmann, 2003).

17. Sally was writing a letter. The telephone rang.
18. Sally wrote a letter. The telephone rang.

For example, in (17) the ringing of telephone is the foregrounded information that occurs while Sally was writing the letter, writing the letter is in the background. Compared to the sentences in (17), the ringing of the telephone in (18) is taken as an

event that occurred after Sally wrote a letter. In (18), the two events are foregrounded in the discourse.

The ways of expressing aspect in Turkish are either grammatical or lexical. Grammatical aspect is marked on verbal predicates by present progressive –iyor for imperfective aspect, -mIş for perfective aspect, and the aorist –Ir/Er for habitual aspect. Different than imperfective and perfective aspects, habitual aspect is recruited for generic statements about states or events in the text (Aksu-Koç, 1994). On the other hand, lexical aspect is expressed with aspectual verbs such as *başla-* "start" or *devam et-* "continue" denoting inception, protraction, and aspectual adverbs such as *zaten* "already" or *hala* "still".

Temporal and aspectual markings are another way of constituting endophoric links that are used to organize information in discourse besides referring expressions (Hickmann, 2003). With verbal inflections and time adverbials, temporal and aspectual markings provide local ways of anchoring and organizing information in discourse. Temporal-aspectual systems establish temporal relation between the denoted situations and either the immediate situation or some temporal reference point, thereby anchoring information across utterances (Hickmann, 2003, p. 82).

2.3.7 Modality

Modality is another grammatical category that may be marked on predicates. There are two main types of modality: epistemic and deontic. Deontic modality indicates ability, permission or obligation. Sentences in (19), (20), and (21) are examples of deontic modality.

19. Denize girebiliyorduk. (ABILITY)

    sea-DATIVE bath-ABILITY-IMPERFECTIVE-PAST-AGREEMENT

    "We could bath."

20. Denize girebilirsiniz. (PERMISSION)

    sea-DATIVE bath-PERMISSION-AORIST-AGREEMENT

    "You can bath."

21. Denize girmelisiniz. (OBLIGATION)

    sea-DATIVE bath-OBLIGATION-AGREEMENT

    "You sould bath."

Epistemic modality expresses the speaker's stance with respect to the possibility or the realization of the event. It encodes the information about the speaker's view on the possibility of realizing the event.

22. Yağmur yağabilir. (POSSIBILITY)

    rain rain-POSSIBILITY-AORIST-øAGREEMENT

    "It may rain."

23. Çağatay gelmeyebilir. (POSSIBILITY)

    Çağatay come-NEGATION-POSSIBILITY-AORIST-øAGREEMENT

    "Çağatay may not come."

24. Çağatay gelecek. (CERTAINTY)

    Çağatay come-FUTURE[12]-øAGREEMENT

    "Çağatay will come."

The sentences (22) and (23) indicate that the speaker thinks that there is a possibility that the event will happen or not. Yet, the speaker is sure about the realization of the event in (24).

[12] In Turkish, the future tense has aspectual functions (Aksu-Koç, 1994).

In the light of Halliday & Hasan (1976), Halliday & Matthiessen (2004), and Givón's (2001) studies on inter-clausal relations, we identified six types of resources for "sticking together" clauses in subsequent utterances. In order to analyze the cohesive properties in our data, we adopted the following inventory. The items (25a)-(25d) are taken from Halliday & Hasan (1976), Halliday (2004), and the rest from Givón (2001):

25. a. Reference
    b. Ellipsis
    c. Conjunction
    d. Lexical cohesion
    e. Temporality
    f. Aspectuality
    g. Modality

2.4 DEVELOPMENT OF COHERENCE

Coherence has been regarded by many linguists and other researchers as a vital part of text production quality. Hence, the global structure beyond the individual utterances in the texts produced by children from different age groups is examined in various language-related disciplines (e.g. Stein & Albro, 1997; Shapiro & Hudson, 1997; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). Since narratives are the earliest type of texts emerging in children's discourse, the majority of language development studies are carried out with narrative productions of young children. Expository texts, on the other hand, have been studied lesser in this respect. Therefore, most of the studies we mention in here are on oral narrative performance of children.

In the language development literature, Hickmann (2003, 2004) mentions two types of macrostructures considered in the literature of narrative discourse, namely scripts and story grammars. Since they prepare the cognitive schemata for the text producer to ground the events and at the same time affect the verbalization of these events (Hickmann, 2004; Aksu-Koç, 2004), these concepts receive considerable attention in developmental studies.

One of the essential types of macrostructures is scripts[13]. Scripts guide children to set up the representation of common behavioral routines (Hickmann, 2003). Scripts have logical, chronological and well-known sequences. For example, the script of going to grocery store contains taking a basket, choosing the items to be bought, and paying their prices.

In narratives, sequences of events are related to one another temporally and causally. Narrative discourse also includes motivating circumstances of those events (Aksu-Koç, 2004). The "story grammar" has been introduced into the literature to generalize the characteristics and structure of well-formed narratives. According to Labov & Waletsky's account (1967), a typical story has an orientation, a complication, a resolution, and an evaluation. In other words, story grammars refer to the basic units contained in narratives indicating structural properties of them (Hickmann, 2003). Hickmann (2003) argues that such properties have an effect on linguistic cohesive devices (cf. Section 2.5).

Developmental studies on narrative production show that story schemata has a central function in narrative productions of young children and it develops as the text producers' conceptual and linguistic competence develops (Aksu-Koç, 1994,

[13] There are different definitions of "script" used by various scholars. We gave one taken from Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) in Section 2.2. The definition we used in this section is recruited mainly by authors working in the field of language development.

2004). According to the results of the study of Aksu-Koç (2004), children at around the age of five are at the stage of relating events as episodic components of an overall theme. Between the age of seven and nine, they begin to add their evaluations and make summaries of the overall narrative. After nine, all the plot components are present. By analyzing the narrative organizations of children from different ages, she argues that although narrator's both conceptual and linguistic competence contribute to his/her narrative performance, well-formed structure of a narrative is determined primarily by the knowledge of narrative structure which is also partially determined by literacy background of children.

Applebee (1978) suggests a similar progressive path of the narrative structure evolving with age. According to him, children start with listing unrelated referents and events, then go through a stage where a series of events are linked by a common nucleus. Later, narratives in the form of focused chains appear where the children present a main character experiencing a series of events. Eventually, children expand the narrative structure by elaborating new aspects.

The important indications of these researches cited above are that children start with listings of unrelated events. Then, they go through differing stages in building a global schema in their productions.

2.5 DEVELOPMENT OF COHESION

In addition to the global structure of a text, it is also crucial for the text producer to connect the elements of a text in order to establish continuity (such as the continuity of topic, and theme etc.). Thus, the competence in using cohesion as a "unity-creating device" in Halliday & Hasan's terms (1976) has been considered an

important indicator of the improvement of text production ability. In this section, we will consider the studies on cohesion development in detail.

Following Halliday & Hasan (1976), the referential forms of denoting entities have received considerable attention in the literature. Jisa (2000) studies French children's use of grammatical devices to indicate subject referents in narratives. Regarding pronominal use, she states that although children start to use pronouns to maintain subjects across clauses from earlier ages on, this kind of early usage is different than the way adults use them in narrative discourse. As age increases, subjects tend to use referring expressions that indicate cohesive links packaged more tightly between clauses. That is to say, the use of anaphoric pronouns is followed by subject ellipsis and then nonfinite ellipsis by young narrators along a progressive path. Since the last two structures lead to tighter syntactic cohesion of information, Jisa's (2000) results support Berman & Slobin's (1994) study arguing for developmental mastery in packaging information through syntax.

Similarly, Hickmann (2004) states that children start to use linguistic expressions in order to regulate the information across utterances at two or three years of age. However, the ability to meet the discourse-cohesive requirements such as discourse anchoring, marking of information status, and grounding of information in a text develops relatively late. For instance, the use of referential expressions is prompted by external stimuli at the earlier phase of discourse development. This leads to the conclusion that the early productions of children are determined in a bottom-up process (Karmiloff-Smith, 1981; Hickmann, 2004). Later, children begin to organize discourse based on a main protagonist and employ subject pronominals for their protagonists. Hickmann (2004) calls their strategy "thematic subject strategy" at this top-down phase. The last phase brings flexibility to children's

discourse organization. They impose both bottom-up and top-down processes during this phase according to their choice of organization.

Küntay (2002) examines the means of introducing referents by Turkish children from different ages through a picture-description task. According to her results, Turkish children similar to their peers of other languages do not master the proper ways of introducing the referents by in/non-definite forms until 7 years of age. After 7 years, subjects gradually acquire to use proper ways of marking the indefiniteness status of first mention of referents in the discourse. Küntay (2002) also considers the implicit ways of introducing referents with nondefinite interpretations in Turkish among Turkish preschoolers. Younger children mainly tend to place the referential term of secondary characters in a non-subject grammatical role that do not get any case marking. In that way, the non-definiteness of the referents is indicated indirectly by argument structure or the semantic properties of the verb. However, such indirect ways of marking referents at first mention with non-definite interpretations are less frequent among children at 7 years of age and older. Rather, older children manage to mark information status of the first-mention referents explicitly.

Discourse functions are also important in determining the acquisition of cohesion devices. Bamberg & Marchman (1994) investigate the relation between children's use of aspectual markings and their discourse functions in German and English. In the "frog story" elicitations based on a picture book called "Frog where are you?" by Mayer (1969), they find that children's utilizations of particular grammatical devices such as aspectual markings are sensitive to their functions in discourse from earlier ages on. By using aspectual markings as one of the "contextualization cues", the text producer relates the events both to the previous and

to the subsequent contexts. It is this function of aspectual markings that gives this grammatical device a particular role in the organization of discourse at the global level. Consequently, Bamberg & Marchman (1994) argue that the motivation for "putting things together" in order to constitute the narrative whole forces children to identify and use such linguistic devices.

Aksu-Koç (1994) analyzes the development of textual cohesive strategies in the narratives produced by Turkish children at 3, 5, and 9 years of ages. First, Aksu-Koç (1994) considers the shifts of the tense, aspect, and modality through the text to determine the well-formedness of a narrative. She finds that children at 3 and 5 years shift tense and aspect unsystematically. However, at older ages tense shits are recruited for backgrounding the events in narrative. Likewise, preschoolers and 9th graders have difficulties in managing aspectual shifts at global level. The adult group, on the other hand, provides framing of the events narrated in the present or past by sketching the setting by shifting to stative aspects.

Hickmann (2003) provides a general description of development in both the coherence and cohesion of discourse. For example, inter-sentential links are found to be emerged at two or three years (Peterson & Dodsworth, 1991). The first common ties in children's utterances are lexical cohesion. The use of pronouns and connectives increases with age. At the same time the uses of temporal devices such as adverbials (Levy & Nelson, 1994), connectives (Bennett-Kastor, 1986), and verbal inflections (Fletcher, 1981) progress in children's discourse in time.

In the light of these research both on coherence and cohesion development; we expect to find that although children acquire linguistic devices early, it takes time for them to use those devices in the organization of discourse. As text production abilities of children improve, they develop sensitivity to the requirements of a text as

a part of discourse, which is to be coherent and cohesive from the beginning to the end, and at the same time discourse functions of linguistic elements that they have acquired already.

2.6 RELATION BETWEEN COHERENCE AND COHESION

Developmental studies dealing with development of coherence focus particularly on the existence of the cognitive schemata of narratives, whereas those on cohesion analysis address the question of how children use various linguistic devices in various discourse situations.

However, scholars like Hickmann (2003, 2004) emphasize the importance of looking into the relation between coherence and cohesion in discourse development. Hickmann (2004) mentions three approaches to this particular question. In the first approach, simultaneous parallel development between coherence and cohesion is suggested without any explanations about the relation between them (Orsolini, 1990; Shapiro & Hudson, 1991). Secondly, some studies argue that the acquisition of cohesive devices is heavily determined by the macro-structure of the text, i.e. scripts or story grammars (French & Nelson, 1985; Orsolini, 1990). According to those studies, children construct better narratives about familiar events. It suggests that scripts determine the use of linguistic devices of cohesion such as connectives. Third approach argues that coherence and cohesion interact and influence each other in a complex way while narrators gain competence in text production (Hickmann, 2003; 2004).

Hickmann (2004) argues in favor of the third approach which we will address in the remainder of our study. According to Hickmann (2004), cohesion is partly

constitutive of coherence. The suggestion of Hickmann (2003, 2004) is to search the effects of variables related to coherence and/or cohesion. She raises four questions to begin with in tracking the relation between coherence and cohesion in the development of children's narrative skills. The first one concerns the suggested opposition between global coherence and local cohesion in the literature. Hickmann (2004) mentions the approach in Berman & Slobin (1994) as an example to such an opposition. While Berman & Slobin (1994) analyze 'linguistic cohesion' on the micro-level of individual clauses and adjacent clauses, they analyze 'thematic coherence' on the macro-level of plot organization. According to Hickmann (2004), such a distinction between micro- and macro-levels also refers to another opposition between sequential and hierarchical organization. That is to say, while discourse cohesion is achieved basically through the linear organization of successive clauses, discourse coherence is provided essentially through the hierarchical organization of narrative into larger chunks such as episodes. However, Hickmann (2004) states that distinction between coherence and cohesion is not as clear-cut as it is suggested. She notes two factors making the picture more complicated. First, organization of clauses on the global level and in a hierarchical way affects the construction of cohesion, too. For example, Karmiloff-Smith (1981) finds that the appropriate information marking on referents is also affected by the organization of a global thematic subject. Likewise, sequential organization of linguistic elements affects the organization of coherence in a way. For example, it is certain that ordering of units within episodes and ordering of episodes within narrative schema affect the construction of coherent discourse (Hickmann, 2004).

Second, the units of story grammar should be considered in an analysis of the organization of discourse cohesion (Hickmann, 2004). For example, the construction

of a SETTING is essential for the interpretation of subsequent discourse because it provides the initial orientation of the narrative where main characters are introduced into the discourse within a spatio-temporal frame. The sufficient introduction of referents in the SETTING determines the information marking strategies driven by discourse-cohesive principles. Furthermore, temporal parameters are also built in the SETTING. Then, the marking of temporal anchors is achieved by the necessary temporal adverbials and inflections in the discourse (Hickmann, 2004).

The third question concerns the relation between the ordering of narrative units and the recruitment of cohesive devices in this ordering. Hickmann (2004) states the principle of information grounding also involves the principle of chronological ordering. In other words, text producers are aware of the general fact that events happened before they are denoted in discourse. Accordingly, they choose proper linguistic devices to mark such an ordering. At the same time, they have to indicate where this general fact is violated with particular linguistic devices. The other dimension of this question is related to the ordering of narrative units. The units of story grammar are chronologically ordered and therefore it is chained via causal relations among events or states. For example, initiating event leads to the action and to consequences that derived from that action. When this order is violated the text producer should use proper linguistic devices not to disturb the cohesive character of the discourse (Hickmann, 2004).

The fourth question deals with the relation between the existence of story schemata and their realization in discourse. Hickmann (2004) mentions two different approaches handling this relation. According to the first one, it is children's cognitive representation of story structure that mainly determines their narrative competence. In this approach, abstract cognitive structures that are independent of the language

faculty are assumed to be responsible in discourse organization. In contrast to the first position, the second one assumes children's representation of stories as a consequence of principles of discourse cohesion. That is, organizing principles of language determines children's narratives during production (Hickmann, 2004).

The common point of all these questions reviewed in this section is that they all put forward that coherence and cohesion are related and affect each other in an intricate way (Hickmann, 2004). This relation is noted primarily when same linguistic devices control both the construction of cohesion and coherence at the same time. In the light of all these approaches, it is suggested that the important contribution of studying the development of coherence and cohesion will be to relate these two concepts during discourse development.

CHAPTER III

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

2.7 DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

The conceptual and methodological basis for this study derives from an international research project called "The Spencer Project on Developing Literacy across Genres, Modalities and Languages" coordinated by Ruth Berman. The aim of the Spencer Project is to investigate the development of text production abilities of monolingual children and teenagers as a critical indicator of literacy across and beyond school ages (Berman & Verhoeven, 2002). The research is carried out in two modalities (speech and writing), across two text types (narrative and expository), in 4 age groups (grade school students, junior high school students, high school students, and university students), and between 7 languages (Dutch, English, French, Hebrew, Icelandic, Spanish, and Swedish).

Following the conceptual and methodological basis of the Spencer Project, we selected monolingual Turkish informants from 5th, 7th, and 9th grades[14]. Our adult

[14] The data analyzed in this study are the data collected for Doç. Dr. Aylin Küntay's and Dr. Mehmet-Ali Akıncı's research called "TÜRKÇE'DE OKUR-YAZARLIK EDİNİMİNDE PSİKOLİNGUİSTİK VE SOSYOLİNGUİSTİK ETKENLER" (project no: SBB-PIA-6008) supported by TÜBİTAK from Turkey and EGIDE from France. In addition to the Turkish monolinguals, both Turkish-French bilinguals and French monolinguals are recruited in the broader project. The writer of this thesis worked in both data collection and transcription processes for the broader project.

group includes Turkish university students. Each group consists of at least 20 subjects and each subject in each group produced one personal narrative and one expository text both elicited in written and spoken modalities.

In the rest of this chapter, we will describe our research population and data elicitation procedures in more detail.

2.8 RESEARCH POPULATION

In the present study, we selected Turkish monolinguals from an industrial town in Ege region[15]. The school that cooperated in this research is in a small district. The research population was organized according to their grade level. The texts were gathered from one group of 5th graders, one group of 9th, and one group of 11th grade students. Each group consisted of at least 20 subjects. A fourth group was composed of Turkish monolingual adults who were university students. In each group, the numbers of female and male informants were the same. TABLE 1 below gives the information about number and age of our subjects in each group.

TABLE 1. Age, Number, Mean Age, Age Ranges of Our Subjects

School grade	5th				7th				9th			
Group	A		B		A		B		A		B	
No. of subject	11		12		10		12		10		10	
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Number	5	6	5	7	5	5	6	6	5	5	5	5
Mean age	11;00				13;00				15;06			

[15] Since the task that we gave to our subjects is a school task, it is not expected to find great differences in terms of expository writing performances between our subjects and the other students living in different parts of Turkey based on the findings of Aksu-Koç, Erguvanlı-Taylan & Bekman (2002).

2.9 DATA COLLECTION

In the beginning, all the informants were told that they were recruited for an international project about the literacy skills of Turkish bilingual children living in Europe and Turkish monolingual children in Turkey. Three researchers were present during the data collection phase. First, the subjects saw a short video film with no words. The film is three-minute long and it shows different scenes of interpersonal conflicts between people in a school setting. These conflict scenes are categorized by Berman and Verhoeven (2002) in three groups: moral conflicts (cheating in an exam and finding money somebody has dropped); social conflict (to exclude somebody in a class); and physical conflict (fighting in a school, and spilling water on somebody). The events in the film do not have any resolution or concluding part.

After the film, a literacy questionnaire was handed out to all participants. This questionnaire was prepared to gather information about the social background of the subjects such as the education level of their parents and where they were born. There were also questions about leisure-time reading activities, about their hobbies and so on.

After they completed their questionnaire, the subjects were randomly divided into two groups: Group A and Group B. These groups were separated into two rooms. In one of the rooms, the recording of the oral elicitations of Group A students was carried out one by one. While one student from Group A told his/her narrative and exposition to the researcher, the other Group A students waited outside the room.

The subjects were each asked to tell a story about a problem that they had experienced personally[16].

As in Berman and Verhoeven's study (2002), they were clearly instructed not to describe the scenes in the video but to tell an event they experienced personally, and their narratives were recorded to a mini-disc. After they completed their elicitation, they were sent to another room to write down the same event that they told us. Once they completed their writing, they were asked to discuss the problems between people orally as if they were giving a talk in class. Again, they were clearly instructed not to tell a story or what happened in the video but discuss the issue and state their ideas while they were recorded in a minidisc.

Meanwhile, students in Group B followed the same procedure, but doing the written task before its oral counterpart. After Group B completed their writings, they were called one by one to another room to record their oral elicitations. The sessions of Group B began with the personal narratives and continued with expository texts as in Group A. The sessions and the texts elicited in these sessions are depicted in TABLE 2 .

TABLE 2. Order of Presentation across the Tasks and Groups

	GROUP A	GROUP B
Session I	Narrative spoken / Narrative written	Narrative written / Narrative spoken
Session II	Expository written / Expository spoken	Expository spoken / Expository written

[16] The Turkish instructions that we used are given in Appendix.

The sessions were carried out on the same day, or with one day interval. At the end of each session, each subject had produced two texts; one written, one spoken. The narratives were a personal narrative on the one event which happened to them, and the expository texts discussed the same issue, that is, conflict between people in the video.

2.10 TEXT TYPES

The participants were asked to produce two types of texts: (1) personal experience narratives; and (2) expository discussions[17]. They produced their personal narratives and expository texts both orally and in writing yielding a total of 4 texts per subject. However, in the present study we only focus on the expository texts where the informants discussed the issue of interpersonal conflict depicted in the video. Although each subject produced their expositions in two modalities in accordance with the interests of the broader project, we confined our present study only to written texts in our database.

To sum up, our database in this study is composed of one written expository text per subject. Consequently, we have 20 subjects in each four school-grade groups yielding 80 written expository texts.

[17] While giving instructions, we used the term "*kompozisyon*" for all groups for gathering expository texts.

2.11 DATA TRANSCRIPTION AND CODING

In the analyses of data, we followed the following steps. First, the written texts in our data were entered into computer according to the grade groups. This digitalized version of data represents the original texts as much as possible – including the paragraph indentation, orthographic and grammatical errors of our subjects. While giving examples from our database, we present the original version of the data with the errors corrected in the parenthesis. Then, we numbered all the sentences for the ease of references to be used in our analysis. Finally, in accordance with our analysis, the structural parts that we identify in the form of MOVEs and STEPs are marked both on the paper version and digitalized version of each texts.

2.12 DATA DESCRIPTION

To give an idea about the size of the texts to be analyzed in subsequent chapters, we present in this section the number of clauses for each subject group. "The clause" for the linguistic analysis is defined by Berman and Slobin (1994) as a unified predicate describing a single situation (an activity, event, or state). TABLE 3 gives text length with total number of clauses, and mean number of clauses per subject for each group.

TABLE 3. Text Lengths in terms of Total and Mean Number of Clauses per Group for Turkish Monolinguals in Written Expository Texts

School grade	5th	7th	9th	Adult
No. of subject	23	22	20	20
Total clauses	341	424	767	794
Mean cl./subj.	16,2	21,5	38,35	39,7

The table above shows that children produce longer texts at higher school grades. The gradual development in the text lengths beginning from 5th graders' productions on is evident at all grades. Adults' written expository texts are the longest ones with 794 clauses at total. 9th graders appear to have reached adult level in terms of length of texts.

CHAPTER IV

DEVELOPMENT OF GLOBAL STRUCTURE IN EXPOSITORY TEXTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In the text production studies, opening (or introduction) sections have a privileged status as the focus of research, while other parts such as development and conclusion are often neglected. Both child language studies (e.g. Berman & Katzenberger, 2004) and genre analysis studies (e.g. Swales, 1990) have extensively studied introductions of different types of text, because they assume that introductions affect the production of text globally[18]. According to Berman & Katzenberger (2004), for example, the way that a text producer establishes the initial context affects the development of the structure of a text. With respect to this function, the opening part of a text is considered "a window on the text as a whole" (p. 58). Since narrative is the earliest discourse type that is acquired by young children, the openings of narratives, especially in the spoken mode, are constructed better at earlier ages. However, the opening of other types of discourse such as exposition is a later development. As age and literacy level of children increase, they

[18] One exception is Tolchinsky et al.'s (2002) work on both the opening and the concluding parts of different text types.

begin to construct more complete openings in different texts and in different modalities (Berman & Katzenberger, 2004).

In this chapter, we present the kind of analysis we propose to study the acquisition of the global structure of expository texts. First, in Section 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, we review Britton's grammar of exposition and its implications for developmental research. Then, in Section 4.3, we consider an alternative analysis based on rhetorical moves our subjects made, which, we argue, enable us to study opening, developing, and concluding patterns of our young writers.

4.2 GLOBAL TEXTUAL STRUCTURE

4.2.1 Britton's grammar of exposition

The global organization of texts, in other words its coherence, is considered as a good indicator of the text producers' ability in conceptualizing and constructing their texts (Berman & Katzenberger, 2004). In this regard, the elements of the global organizational structure of a text in terms of opening, development, and conclusion indicate the ability to adjust the cognitive structure required by a particular genre.

First, let us begin by analyzing the opening sections in our data according to the criteria proposed by Berman & Katzenberger (2004). They show that the introductions of expository texts are in the form of generalizations. Information is organized from general to specific and back to general throughout the text. In determining the opening part of the texts, Berman & Katzenberger (2004) are inspired by Britton's (1994) psycholinguistic analysis of expository discourse (c.f.

Section 2.2.1). According to the Britton's (1994) rules that govern the structuring of expositions, the opening part of an expository text includes the first MOVE-ON statement with its EXPAND.

Berman & Katzenberger (2004) stated that all subjects in their sample, including the youngest age group (9-10 years of age), "made some kind of general statement or expressed some opinion at the beginning of the texts they produced when asked to discuss the topic of "problems between people"" (p. 66). According to them, however, an expository text opening is adequate only if it contains both "an explicit generalization and some specific elaboration of the content of the topic" (p. 72). The openings of the expository discourse are inadequate in the writings of the entire youngest age group, which means they lack both elaboration and explicitness. They called this type of opening as "vague generalization detached from reality". The following two examples are from the youngest age group of Berman & Katzenberger (2004; p. 75) to represent "vague generalization detached from reality". They stated that all the texts in this youngest group (20 texts out of 20) include such an opening:

1. "I think it's not nice to do something like that."
2. "In my opinion, violence is the worst thing there is."

Since organizing an expository text around an abstract topic, such as "problems between people", sets more of a challenge for immature writers than organizing narratives, these introductions need to be scrutinized more carefully. In other words, in order to categorize the initial clauses with an opening function, the entire text should be analyzed. To be more specific, we continue with an example from our database in complete version to present what kind of relation an opening statement has with "everything that follows" (Berman & Katzenberger, 2004, p. 58).

Let us consider the example (3) which represents a typical expository writing of 5th graders:

3. (a). "Kopye çekmek hırsızlık yapmaktır. (…)"

"Cheating is committing theft."

TL-P07A-WE

This is an opening statement of a general type similar to Berman & Katzenberger's (2004) examples in (1) and (2). It expresses some idea or opinion without being anchored to the video clip or to an external reality. Yet, we get a different picture when we consider this sentence in relation to the rest of the text stated in (3b)[19].

3. (b). "(1)Kopye çekmek hırsızlık yapmaktır. (2)*Mesala* bir adam (adamın) [20] bir kişiyi ayırması doğru olmaz. (3)Adam telefondan kartını çıkaramadıysa tamirci yapar (4)tamirci çağırmalı telefonu atmamalıydı. (5)Kızda kadının parasını geri vermeliydi. (6)Yani bu davranışlar çok kötüdür."

"(1) Cheating is committing theft. (2)For example, it is not proper if one man discriminates another. (3)When the man couldn't take out his (telephone)card from the telephone, the repairman can fix it (4)(he) should call repairman, but (he) shouldn't have thrown the phone. (5) And the girl should have given the woman's money back. (6) That is to say these behaviors are very bad."

TL-P07A-WE

In this example, representative of its group, it is difficult to say where the opening part is. Whether the opening part would be the first sentence, or it would be the first two sentences, the opening relation is not related with its following parts which are presumably the development and concluding sections. Clearly, it is hard to

[19] The sentences are numbered for ease of reference.

[20] While giving examples from our database, we present the original version of the data with its original paragraph indentation and its orthographic and grammatical errors. The corrections of some errors are given in the parenthesis where it is difficult to interpret the sentence.

speak of such a relationship between the first two sentences and the unfolding text, because the meaning relation between the first sentence and the second is not different from that of the relation between the second and the third sentences, although the presence of *mesela* "for example" in the beginning of the second sentence indicates an initiation of an example as a subtopic. As a result, we may conclude that the text (3b) lacks an opening part. Yet the question of how the presence or absence of any structural parts affects the positioning of the other structural parts in expository texts needs to be addressed. Ruling out the existence of an opening part does not directly lead us to rule out the existence of a development and conclusion parts. In example (3b), we may think that the last sentence "Yani bu davranışlar çok kötüdür" is the concluding part by assuming that the text producer employs a UNITIZE operation to wrap up.

Let us look at our second example to see the effect of the structure building operations proposed by Britton (2004) as a part of exposition grammar in detecting the structural parts in our youngest groups' texts.

4. "(1) Bu konu hakkında düşüncelerim iyi değil. (2) Bir kız parayı buluyor (3) ve sahibine vermiyor. (4) Hırsızlık gibi aynı. (5) Adam telefonla konuşuyor (6)sonra kartı gelmeyince telefonu parçalıyor.
(7) Bir kız koşarak suyu arkadaşının üstüne atıyor. (8) İki kişi kavga ediyor, (9) bir başka kişi onları ayırıyor.
(10) Bu konuyla ilgili düşüncelerim iyi değil. (11) Hepsinin davranışı yanlış."

"(1) My thoughts on this matter aren't good. (2)A girl is finding the money (3) and (she) isn't giving (it) back to its owner. (4)It is same as theft. (5)The man is talking on the phone (6) then when his (telephone)card didn't come back, (he) is crashing the telephone. (7) A girl is throwing water to her friend as running. (8) Two people are fighting, (9) another person is separating them. (10) My thoughts on this matter aren't good. (11) All their behaviors are wrong."

TL-P04B-WE

The first sentence of (4) is a better candidate to an opening section than in (3b). Besides its generality, it also has a personal judgment like an attempt to establish or to introduce the problem. We consider it more appropriate for an opening because of the following sentences exemplifying "bu konu", i.e. "the problem". However, as in (3b), it seems that the text producer narrates what happened in the video. The last two sentences seem to be an attempt to conclude the text. Sentence (9) simply repeats the initial sentence. This tendency appears in most of the expository writings of our youngest group. It seems that repeating the first sentence in the concluding section has a unitizing function at the end. Such a strategy builds a relation between the general statement at the beginning and at the last sentence to tie to a wrapping up statement: *Hepsinin davranışı yanlış* "All their behaviours are wrong." Although somehow we are able to use the UNITIZE operation in determining the concluding section, it appears that Britton's analysis is still insufficient in providing a consistent account in identifying the differentiation of structural parts such as opening and development in younger children's texts.

Consequently, we argue that for lately-acquired types of discourse such as expositions, it is problematic to study introduction parts in isolation in younger children's text such as 5th graders. Furthermore, we also would like to indicate that the development of one global part is closely related to the development of other parts. Therefore, considering the relation between structural parts of the texts such as opening, development, and concluding is essential in studying text production. However, it is difficult to identify the structural parts in texts and challenges the developmental analysis (van Dijk, 1997).

4.3 AN ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS: ANALYSIS OF RHETORICAL MOVES IN THE FRAMEWORK OF GENRE

Experienced text-producers who share certain knowledge in a particular genre are quite consistent in the way they organize the overall message in their texts. In so doing, they structure the texts based on the conventionalized regularities known as MOVEs (Bhatia, 2004; Johns, 1997; Swales, 1990). In genre analysis the structural parts are defined in terms of these rhetorical MOVEs that the text producers make in order to organize text on a global level to achieve their communicative purpose. In this respect, MOVEs are suggested as discriminative elements of generic structure since different text types are organized according to diverse generic knowledge in a particular way varying from one type to another (see Chapter I). Therefore, the MOVE-structure of a text type can only be identified after careful analyses of the text sample.

For our written expository texts, we identify a typical three-MOVE structure which is present in different frequencies across grade groups. Each three MOVE is realized by different rhetorical stages called STEPs. This typical MOVE structure and common STEPs that our subjects use to make their MOVEs are presented below:

MOVE 1: Establishing (or introducing) the problem

STEP a) anchoring to the video or to real life

(e.g. “videoda bir kız”)
(e.g. “a girl in the video”)

and/or

STEP b) specifying the problem

(e.g. “en büyük sorun güven”)
(e.g. “the biggest problem is trust.”)

and/or

STEP c) stating the evaluative judgment about the problem

(e.g. “kopya çekmek hoş bir davranış değil”)
(e.g. “cheating is not a nice act.”)

and/or

STEP d) question-raising

(e.g. “Fakat niye bu davranışları gösteriyorlar diye düşündünüz mü hiç?”)
(e.g. “But have you ever considered why they behave like this?)

STEP e) making a meta-textual commentary

(e.g. “Videoda gördüğüm hırsızlık olayını anlatmak istiyorum.”)
(e.g. “I’d like to refer to theft that I saw in the video.”)

MOVE 2: Characterization of the problem

STEP a) listing the types of the problem

(e.g. “Mesela arkadaşlarımızla itişiriz, kopya çekeriz, yaşlılara yardım etmeyiz.”
(e.g. “For example, we push our friend, cheat on an exam, (and) do not help the elders.”)

and/or

STEP b) ascribing key characteristics

(e.g. “Olaylara çok fazla tepki gösterip agresif davranışlarda bulunabilirler.”)
(e.g. “They react too much and behave in an aggressive way.”)

and/or

STEP c) specifying the source or the reasons

(e.g. “genelde ergen dönemde oldukları için çok fazla sorun yaratabiliyorlar.”)
(e.g. “because they are in adolescence they usually produce too much trouble.”)

and/or

STEP d) exemplifying with a narrative (fictive, video-based, and/or personal narrative)

(e.g. “Örnek vermek gerekirse. Okulun kantininde arkadaşlarla oturuyoruz, bir başka arkadaş içi ¼ dolu çay bardağını çöp kutusuna fırlatınca biz güzelce ıslattı, pantolonlarımız ve sweatlerimiz battı.”)
(e.g. “If an example is needed. When we were sitting in the canteen with friends, another one of us throw the teacup which is quite full to the trashcan and it caused us to become wet, our trousers and sweats get ruined.”)

MOVE 3: Claiming the solution

STEP a) stating the main point

(e.g. “önemli olan”)
(e.g. the important thing is”)

and/or

STEP b) stating what should be done

(e.g. “herkese yardım etmeliyiz”)
(e.g. “we should help everyone.”)

and/or

STEP c) speculating about the consequences of the problem

(e.g. “kopya çekersek önümüzdeki sınavlarda başarılı olamayız”)
(e.g. “if we cheat, we can’t be successful in the future exams.”)

STEP d) making a summary or generalization

(e.g. “Bence bu davranışların hepsi çok yanlıştı.”)
(e.g. “I think all these behaviours were very wrong.”)

STEP e) stating a coda

(e.g. “Komşu komşunun külüne muhtaçtır.”)
(e.g. “neighbour is in need of his/her neighbour’s trash.”)

According to this structure, the writer begins his/her exposition by establishing the problem. In the second MOVE, he/she characterizes the established problem. Through the end, the writer makes a concluding MOVE 3 where he/she claims a solution and consequences for the problem. Accordingly, the text producer

may choose to use either one or combination of more than one STEPs to realize each MOVE.

Although the identified tripartite MOVE structure is more or less present in the texts of all grade groups, it seems that as writers get experienced in expository text production through schooling, their texts become more complete in terms of the proposed structure. As for the inner structure of MOVEs, we also observe that, as they get older, the variety of steps employed in each move increases, while each group displays different preferences for certain steps.

Below we present an overview of the MOVES and then the STEPs used in our data in order to demonstrate the overall developmental pattern. The detailed qualitative analysis will follow this section. The following table presents the number of texts in each grade group according to the MOVEs they use.

TABLE 4. Number of Texts in each Grade Group according to the Present MOVEs

present MOVEs	5th grade	7th grade	9th grade	Adult
MOVE1+MOVE2	5	4	2	1
MOVE1+ MOVE3	4	3	1	0
MOVE2+MOVE3	2	4	2	0
MOVE1+MOVE2+MOVE3	5	6	13	18
List-types-proto M2	7	5	1	1
TOTAL	23	22	19	20

TABLE 4 indicates that subjects before 9th grade seem to have difficulties in organizing their texts globally based on three MOVEs. At 5th grade, texts that lack at least one MOVE seem to be the largest group among our youngest subjects. There are 16 texts out of 23 that lack at least one of the MOVEs. In contrast, only 5 texts

have all three MOVES. Interestingly, the missing move is either MOVE 1 or MOVE 3 but rarely MOVE 2. Among texts that are not complete in tripartite MOVE-structure, there are 9 texts with MOVE 1 and 6 texts with MOVE 3. As a result, it can be concluded that MOVE 1 develops earlier in 5th graders' productions.

Some of our subjects prefer to mention the episodes that they saw in the video in the form of listing without relating them globally. Such texts are categorized as list-types and considered as proto-forms of MOVE 2 because "listing types of the problem" is used as a rhetorical STEP in MOVE 2. Among 5th graders, list-type texts constitute the largest group with 7 texts.

As for 7th graders, list-type texts are still present yet their frequency diminishes significantly. At this grade, we also observe that the use of MOVE 3 develops and the complete tripartite MOVE structure is observed more than 5th graders.

In 9th graders' texts, on the other hand, the texts that include MOVE 1, MOVE 2, and MOVE 3 outnumber all other types of text construction, i.e. 13 texts out of 19[21]. Furthermore, list-type texts almost disappear, and the incomplete texts lacking one MOVE decrease significantly in number.

Adult group has the most stable pattern in terms of MOVE structuring. All adult subjects –with 2 exceptions- produce their texts with opening, developing, and concluding MOVEs completely.

In conclusion, it seems that list-type texts dominate in 5th and 7th graders' texts. This type of texts gradually fades away trough 9th grade and adults. Moreover, children acquire opening MOVEs earlier than the concluding MOVEs at 5th grade.

[21] In 9th grade, we ruled out 1 text because the child construct two narrative texts instead of 1 narrative and 1 expository text.

At 7th grade, children tend to recruit opening MOVE 1 and concluding MOVE 3 in similar frequencies. As for 9th graders and adults, there is less diversification in terms of MOVE structuring through the texts. The majority of texts at these levels have complete "MOVE 1+ MOVE 2+ MOVE 3" structure.

Regarding the inner rhetorical structure of each MOVE, subject groups differ in their strategies to realize MOVE 1, MOVE 2, and MOVE 3. We presented the tendencies to use these strategies across grade groups in the following tables:

TABLE 5. Types and Number of STEPs in MOVE 1 by Grade Levels

STEPs	5th grade	7th grade	9th grade	Adult
A-anchoring	4	4	8	9
B-specifying	1	1	9	13
C-judgment	13	12	9	14
D-question	0	0	3	1
E-metatextual commentary	0	0	2	1
TOTAL	18	19	29	38

TABLE 5 indicates that the number and variety of steps increase as the students get older. In MOVE 1, STEP C "making a judgment about the problem" is the most common STEP at almost all grades. Actually, it can be said that it is the only strategy used by 5th and 7th graders. It seems that both 5th and 7th graders employ similar STEPs in constructing MOVE 1. The second common STEP is STEP A "anchoring the problem to the video or to real life" in both groups with 4 texts in each of them. Neither 5th graders, nor 7th graders prefer STEP D "question-raising" and STEP E "making a meta-textual commentary" while establishing MOVE 1.

As subjects get older, they begin to use more diverse STEPs in MOVE 1 as 9th graders and adults do. The frequency of rhetorical STEPs used in realizing MOVE 1 are distributed evenly among 9th graders unlike the varying frequencies in 5th and 7th grade groups. Additionally, 9th graders recruit novel STEPs in MOVE 1 such as STEP D "question-raising" and STEP E "making a meta-textual commentary". Both STEPs D and E appear in similar frequencies in 9th graders' texts.

The peculiarity of adults' performances is the high frequency of STEP B "specifying the problem" in MOVE 1 which is infrequent in 5th and 7th graders. Yet, STEP A "anchoring the problem to the video or to real life" is still commonly used in MOVE 1.

When we consider the common STEPs used in MOVE 2, it appears that subjects from earlier grades on employ more diverse STEPs in MOVE 2 compared to MOVE 1. Consider the following table:

TABLE 6. Types and Number of Steps in MOVE 2 in by Grade Levels

STEPs	5th grade	7th grade	9th grade	Adult
A-listing the types	8	13	13	5
B-key characters	1	1	3	8
C-reason/source	2	0	4	18
D-narrative	1	3	2	1
other	0	0	1	4
TOTAL	12	17	23	35

All the common STEPs that we identified in MOVE 2 are present in 5th graders' texts. Yet, the broadest category in this grade group is STEP A "listing the types of the problem". Remember that there are a number of texts in 5th grade that

only give the listing of the problem types without any global MOVEs. “Listing the types of the problem” is also the most favorite strategy used in 5th graders’ texts that have at least one more MOVE in addition to MOVE 2. Although texts that only present listing of the problems depicted in the video diminish in 7th graders’ texts, it is still the most preferred strategy in these groups. 9th graders also prefer to use STEP A “listing the types of the problem” as the most common rhetorical strategy in realizing MOVE 2, though with a lower frequency.

Regarding adults’ STEPs in MOVE 2, the most common STEP of the previous groups is replaced by STEP C “specifying the source or the reasons”. Adults also prefer to use STEP B “ascribing key characteristics to the problem” more than the younger groups do. Furthermore, the diversification of the STEPs used in MOVE 2 by adults indicates that adults use more STEPs to characterize the problem in MOVE 2.

In MOVE 3, we identified five common STEPs used by our subjects. The distribution of these STEPs in MOVE 3 is given in the table below:

TABLE 7. Types and Number of STEPs in MOVE 3 by Grade Levels

STEPs	5th grade	7th grade	9th grade	Adult
A-important	0	0	0	5
B-should	2	9	17	13
C-future	3	0	5	9
D-generalization	7	7	4	9
E-coda	0	1	3	0
other	0	0	0	9
TOTAL	12	17	29	45

Again, the same developmental pattern is repeated here. The number and variety of the steps to realize MOVE 3 increase with age.

Among 5th graders, the occurrence of MOVE 3 is less frequent; however when it occurs we observe that there are a variety of steps they employ, most common of which is STEP D "making a summary or generalization regarding the problem"

According to TABLE 7, the texts that prefer STEP B "stating what should be done" increase in 7th graders' texts. 7 STEP D "making summary/generalization regarding the problem" is still common. Moreover, STEP E "making a coda" emerges at this grade in only 1 text.

9th graders recruit more diverse STEP repertoire in MOVE 3. While STEP D "making summary/generalization regarding the problem" diminishes, STEP B "stating what should be done" rises in number and becomes the most common STEP among 9th graders. STEP C "speculating about the consequences of the problem" and STEP E "making a coda" also increase slightly.

Based on the TABLE 7, it can be stated that the adult group is the one who uses the most diverse types of STEPs in their MOVE 3. STEP B "stating what should be done" is again the broadest group used by adults, while STEP C "speculating about the consequences of the problem" and STEP D "making summary/generalization regarding the problem" also appear in high frequencies. There is no STEP E "making a coda" in adults' MOVE 3 constructions, yet STEP A "stating what is important" emerges at this level. Also in 9 adult texts, different types of STEPs are used that appear once, so we group them under the "other" category.

Based on the tables presented so far, we conclude that 5th and 7th graders perform very similarly in terms of existent MOVEs. Furthermore, they tend to recruit similar STEPs in similar frequencies to realize each MOVE. 9th grade seems to be a breaking point in the patterns observed in the global structuring in 5th and 7th graders'

texts. The texts at 9th grade begin to be structured completely in terms of global MOVEs. In addition, the STEPs become more diverse in each MOVE compared to 5th and 7th grades. The adult group is similar in these respects to 9th graders' performances, yet the structure of MOVEs and STEPs develop further in this stage.

In the following section, we present the qualitative analysis of coherence properties of our subjects' expository writings based on the rhetorical moves they make. This analysis enables us to study opening, developing, and concluding patterns of our young writers who are assumed to work toward the different types of school discourse. Since we adopt a developmental perspective, we begin with 5th graders' writings proceeding to 7th, 9th graders', and adults' texts. This organization of analysis, at the same time, attempts to focus on the characteristics of children's and teenagers' writings rather than emphasizing the absent structures concluded from the characteristics of the adults' texts.

4.4 5th GRADERS' EXPOSITORY TEXTS

The qualitative analysis of global structure of 5th graders' texts begins with the most prominent construction type in this group; i.e. listing the episodes type. Subsequently, other existent structures like texts that have either MOVE 1 or MOVE 2 and texts that have complete tripartite MOVE structure will follow.

4.4.1 List-type texts at 5th grade

The main characteristic of list-type texts is that the child mentions more than one episode shown in the video. There is no connection between mentioned episodes at the global level in the forms of MOVEs. The following text (5) is an example:

> 5. (a) (1)Arkadasinin eline vurmuyor. (2)*Ayrımcılık*. (3)Baresini (parasını) Aldi. (4)Yerivermedi (geri vermedi). (5)*Haram* olur. (6)*Kavga* yaptılar. (7)Kalbini kirdi. (8)Telefon kutusunu vurdu (9)o herkesin mali. (10)Tek onun deyil. (11)Kopya neden cekti. (12)Calışmasi lazimdi. (13)Hirziliya yerekirdi. (14)Kendisi nin kavazini zalıştırmazı lazımdı. (15)8-9,10. sınıfta hep yaninda olmayaçakti. (16)O olay hic yüzel deyil. (17)2 tane kiz arkada ayrım çilik (ayrımcılık) yaptı.
>
> (1) (She) isn't hitting her friend's hand. (2) Discrimination. (3)(She) took her money. (4)(She) didn't give (it) back. (5)It will become illicit. (6)(They) made fight. (7)(She) broke her heart. (8)(He) hit the telephone box (9) but it is a common property. (10) Not only his. (11)Why did she cheat. (12) She should have worked. (13) It was theft. (14)She should have thought (on it). (15) (She/He) wouldn't always be with her at 8-9-10th grades. (16)That case isn't good. (17)The two girls made discrimination there.
>
> TL-P11A-WE

In the example above, the child choses discrimination ("*ayrımcılık*"), illicit behavior forbidden by religion ("*haram*"), fight ("*kavga*"), giving harm to public property, and cheating among depicted problems in the video. Represented by this example, all the list-type text first state the problematic behavior followed by the personal judgment. Such constructions form problem-judgment sequences as in the sentences (1)-(2) and (3)-(4)-(5)[22].

[22] The text also has cohesion problems that make it hard to comprehend what the author said. Especially, frequent use of ellipsis creates problems related with the building of referential chains. We deal with these kinds of cohesive problems of text while analyzing the cohesive properties in the following chapter.

Although the contents of most of the problem-judgment sequences are alike in (5), there are two statements differing in their communicative goal, repeated in (5b):

(5b) "(…) (14) Kendisi nin kavazini zalıştırmazı lazımdı. (15)8-9,10. sınıfta hep yaninda olmayaçakti."

"(…) (14) She should have thought (on it). (15) (She/He) wouldn't always be with her at 8-9-10th grades."

TL-P11A-WE

These two statements express what should be done, as well as speculate about the possible consequences of the problematic behavior. Since these two statements are two different steps that seem to serve to make the discourse progress, we may suggest text (5) has the proto-form of MOVE 3.

Until sentence (14), text (5) is structured based on several problem-judgment sequences. Although such list-type texts do not have any global MOVEs, the use of sequences in parallel ways indicates that it is not completely deprived of a structure. The parallelism is more evident in following example:

6. "(1)Yazılıda kopya çekmeleri hiç iyi bir davranış değildir. (2)Bu başkalarından hırsızlık yapmaktır. (3)Başkalarının bilgilerini çalmaktır. (4)Kendi bilgisi yerine başkalarının bilgisini kullanıyor.
(5)Arkadaşlar arasında ayrım yapmak kötü birşeydir. (6) Arkadaşımız bize hangimizi daha çok seviyorsun dediklerinde ayrım yerine hepinizi çok seviyorum demelidir. (7)Bir kişiyle selamlaştımı hepsiyle selamlaşmalıdır.
(8)Bir kişi parasını düşürürse o parayı alıp harcamak yerine sahibini biliyorsak vermeliyiz yada bir duvara bırakıp gidebiliriz.
(9)Telefonla konuşurken sözümüz bittiğinde telefonu düzgünce kapatmalıyız. (10)Katımız (kartımız) çıkmıyorsa bir yetkiliye haber vermeliyiz (11) telefonu kırmamalıyız."

"(1) Their cheating in the exam is not a good behavior indeed. (2) This is stealing from others. (3) This is stealing others knowledge. (4) Instead of using his/her own knowledge, he/she is using other's knowledge.

(5) Discriminating the friends is a bad thing. (6) When our friend ask(s) whom we like the most, instead of discrimination, (he/she) should say "I like you all a lot". (7) When he/she greets a person, he/she should greet all of them.

(8) If a person drops his/her money, instead of taking and spending the money, if we know the owner, we should give it (back) or we can leave it on a wall.

(9) While talking on the phone, when we finish our talk, we should hang up it properly. (10). If we can't take our (phone) card back, we need to inform someone responsible (11) We shouldn't break the phone."

TL-P01B-WE

The example (6) names four problems separated in four paragraphs. In the first paragraph, the child mentions the "cheating" problem and states his evaluative judgment about it. The parallesim between listed episodes is produced as the writer first mentions the problem and then comments on what should be done regarding the problem in all problem-judgment sequences. We will also suggest that using parallel structures ensures cohesion in the list-type texts where there are no global ties between statements in the following chapter.

Another common strategy among 5th graders other than the parallel statements is presenting reasoning about the consequences of the problem. Consider the following example:

7. "(1)Kavga kötü bir şeydir. (2)Kopya çekenler kopyaya alışır. (3)Sonra bunun kötü birşey olduğunu anlarlar. (4)Para bulduğumuzda sahibine vermeliyiz. (5)Eğer sahibi yoksa karakola götürmeliyiz. (6)Sahibi parasını kaybettiğini anlarsa karakola gelir. (7)Parayı karakola götürmezsek harcanırsak o para haramdır."

"(1) Fighting is a bad thing. (2) A person who cheats gets used to it. (3) Later s/he realizes that this is a bad thing. (4) When we find some money, we should give it back to its owner. (5) If there is no owner, we should take it to police station. (6) If the owner realizes that s/he had lost (his/her money), s/he

comes to police station. (7) If we do not take money to police station and spend it, that money is illicit (i.e. forbidden by religion)."

TL-P08B-WE

The example (7) cites three problems; fighting, cheating, and illicit money. The writer usually focuses only on the results of these problems, like *Kopya çekenler kopyaya alışır* "A person who cheats gets used to it." Compared to the problems of fighting and cheating, the most salient topic is constructed around "illicit money". Through the end of (7), the writer tries to present her negative evaluation about "finding some money" by setting a logical reasoning. The writer's reasoning in (7) takes the form of a fictive narrative as in the sentences (5), (6), and (7). In these sentences, she speculates about the consequences of finding some money and spending it. Consequently, she determines that finding some monay would be a problem of "illicit behaviour" at the end.

The text also differs from the previous examples in its relation to our trigger video. All the texts presented before (7) use the video as a direct trigger. As creating a direct link between the text and the episodes depicted in the video, they write about the students cheating in the exam, the girl finding some money that are depicted in the video. This is the way that they contextualize their texts. On the other hand, example (7) does not use the video as the context of his texts. It simply discusses fighting, cheating, and finding money without any reference to our prompt. Instead of the characters from the video, the writer of (7) uses nondefinite agents with first person plural. Thereby, she exposes on the general consequences of these behaviours in a decontextualized fashion independent of the video. There are only 2 texts of this type among 5th graders.

All the texts from (5) to (7), illustrates 5th graders' expository texts in terms of the tendency in listing the problems given in the video. The common

characteristics of these list-types texts are that the listed episodes are not interrelated on the global level. Whether given in separate paragraphs or not, there is not an opening or concluding statement to tie all these problems to one another. Therefore, these texts resemble to just listings without being integrated within an underlying structure.

4.4.2 Texts with MOVE structure at 5th grade

In addition to list-type texts, there are some expository texts with a general opening or concluding statements among 5th graders' writings. In the rest of this section, we discuss the texts that include opening or concluding statements. To begin with the following example[23]:

8. "(MOVE 1) [c] (1)Yaptıkları çok yanlıştı. // (MOVE 2) [a] (2) Ne olursa olsun kopya çekmemeleri lazımdı. (3)Kopya çekmek öğretmenine ve arkadaşlarına yapılmış çok büyük bir yanlışlıktı.
(4)Arkadaşlarına selam vermesi lazımdı.
(5)Orda kavga yapmaması gerekirdi. (6)Arkadaşlarını ayıran o kişi çok iyi birisiydi."

"(MOVE 1) [c] (1) (The things) that they have done were so wrong. // (MOVE 2) [a] (2) They should not have cheated in any case. (3) Cheating was a big fault committed to his/her teacher, and friends.
(4) (S/he) should have said hello to his/her friends.
(5) (S/he) shouldn't have fought there. (6) The person who separated their friends was a very good person."

TL-P01A-WE

The first statement in (8) functions as an opening to the exposition by establishing the problematical nature of the following events such as cheating, not

[23] The MOVEs and the STEPs are illustrated in the example in paranthesis and in square brackets, respectively.

greeting the friends, and fighting. The headless relative clause *yaptıkları* in the first statement refers to the video as its anaphoric referent. It also has the role of chaining the other events together to be illustrated as "problems" along the text. Moreover, the function of the first statement at the very beginning serves to establish the problematic status of the events as MOVE 1. In MOVE 1, the writer uses only STEP c "stating the evaluative judgment about the problem".

The example above also has a developing MOVE 2 where the child specifies the content of the headless relative clause in MOVE 1. In this MOVE, he uses only STEP a "listing the types of the problem". The structure of STEP a in MOVE 2 is first stating the problem and then briefly commenting on that specific problem.

In most of the 5th graders' expository texts, the statements in MOVE 1 are repeated at the end to function as concluding MOVE 3. The following is such an example:

9. "(MOVE 2) [a] (1) Yazılıda kopya çekmek çok yanlış bir durum. (2) Bence yazılıda herkes bildiğini yazmalıdır.
(3) Kavga yapmayada gerek yoktu. (4) Kaba kuvvetle hiç bir şey çözülmez , (5) konuşmalılardı.
(6) Telefona zarar vermemeleri gerekiyordu. (7) Çünkü, o telefonları herkes kullanıyor.
(8) İki arkadaş otururken yanına başka birisi geldiginde çekip gitmemeleri gerekir. (9) Çünkü saygısızlıktır. (10) Fotograf çekilirken arkadaşlarımıza iki kulak yapmakta saygısızlıktır.
//(MOVE 3) [d] (11) Bence bu davranışların hepsi çok yanlıştı."

"(MOVE 2) [a] (1) Cheating in the exam is a very bad situation. (2) I think, in the exam, everybody should write what they know. (3) Also there was no need to fight. (4) Nothing can be solved by violance. (5) They had to talk. (6) They shouldn't have damaged the phones. (7) Because everybody is using those phones. (8) While two friends are sitting, they shouldn't go away, when another approaches. (9) Because it is disrespectful. (10) When we are taken photos, doing (bad gestures) to our friends is also disrespectful. //(MOVE 3) [d] (11) I think all these behaviors are wrong."

TL-P07B-WE

At first glance, example (9) is similar to the examples (5-8). It refers to several problems by narrating what happened in the video and then stating the problematic nature of these events. However, in this example, there is a general statement at the end that functions to wrap up the events on the global level. This statement constructs the concluding section to sum up. As a result, we consider the text to have MOVE 3 at the conclusion to sum up. This repeating tendency is present in other expository texts, as well. Example (4) is repeated here as (10) to illustrate the point:

10. " (MOVE 1) [c] (1) Bu konu hakkında düşüncelerim iyi değil. // (MOVE 2) [a] (2) Bir kız parayı buluyor (3) ve sahibine vermiyor. (4) Hırsızlık gibi aynı. (5) Adam telefonla konuşuyor (6) sonra kartı gelmeyince telefonu parçalıyor.
(7) Bir kız koşarak suyu arkadaşının üstüne atıyor. (8) İki kişi kavga ediyor, (9) bir başka kişi onları ayırıyor. //
(MOVE 3) [d] (10) Bu konuyla ilgili düşüncelerim iyi değil. (11) Hepsinin davranışı yanlış."

"(MOVE 1) [c] (1) My thoughts on this matter aren't good. // (MOVE 2) [a] (2) A girl is finding the money (3) and (she) isn't giving (it) back to its owner. (4)It is same as theft. (5)The man is talking on the phone (6) then when his (telephone)card didn't come back, (he) is crashing the telephone. //
(7)A girl is throwing water to her friend as running. (8)Two people are fighting, (9) another person is separating them.
(MOVE 3) [d] (10) My thoughts on this matter aren't good. (11)All their behaviors are wrong."

TL-P04B-WE

The first statement opens the exposition with MOVE 1. It gives the personal judgment of the writer and is repeated at the end. These two similar general statements at the beginning and at the end seem to have the function of binding the problematic events listed in between. Since the text (10) makes an opening MOVE

and a concluding one, the part between these MOVEs gains the status of another MOVE. In this MOVE 2, the child lists the problematic events by narrating the episodes in the video. This type of listing may be viewed to be similar to examples (5), (6), and (7) where the writers also present the problems in the form of listing. However, in examples (5), (6), and (7) the problematic status is established at the end of each mentioned episode. In (10), on the other hand, the writer does not feel required to establish the problematic nature of the listed episodes at the end of each one because he/she accomplishes it by chaining the episodes as problems both at the beginning and at the end.

These three moves indicate a big step in creating a structure at the global level. Through them, the writer attempts to build a global textual structure with proto-forms of opening, developing, and concluding patterns of an exposition. As a result, this example constitutes evidence to the relation between rhetorical MOVEs on the global level to create coherence.

We observe that when the writer exposes only one specific topic in his/her text, it probably has a MOVE structure, too. However, it seems that children at 5th grade have difficulties in focusing only on one specific problem. In this group, only 3 texts particularly focus on one problem such as "cheating". Aside from them, there are 5 texts that talks about "the bad behaviour" but do not specify any. Our first example is the following which has MOVE1 and MOVE 3, but no MOVE 2:

11. "(MOVE 1) [c] (1)Bence kopya çeken, arkadaşlarına kötü davranan kişiler hiç bir şeyden sorumlu değillller, (2) hep kendilerini düşünüyorlar, (3) hırsızlık yapmış oluyorlar. // (MOVE 3) [c] (4)Bu gibi davranışlarda bulunduklarında alışkanlık yapar. [d] (5) Böylece bu çocuklar arkadaşlarını düşünmüyorlar (6) hep kendilerini düşünüp birbirlerine saygısızlık yapıyorlar."

"(MOVE 1) [c] (1) I think, people who are cheating, (and) acting badly to their friends, are not responsible from anything. (2) They are always thinking about themselves, (3) they have committed theft. // (MOVE 3) [c] (4) When they are being in such behaviors, it becomes a habit. [d] (5) Thus these kids are not thinking about their friends, (6) they always think about themselves (and) being unrespectfull to each other."

TL-P02B-WE

MOVE 1 establishes the problem by stating the personal judgment about "cheating", yet MOVE 2 is absent. In addition, there appears to be MOVE 3. Beginning from second sentence the author makes his/her MOVE 3 by "claiming consequences". The interesting case in (11) is the repeating of MOVE 1 after MOVE 3 without a MOVE 2. The statement "hep kendilerini düşünüp birbirlerine saygısızlık yapıyorlar" is repeated in the last part of the text in accordance with the concluding patterns in other texts.

As we analyze further examples of 5th graders' texts, we come across other STEPs to realize the MOVEs. Let's look at the following example (12):

12. "(MOVE 1) [a] (1) Ben televiz yonda gör düğümüz olayla ilgili oradaki çocukların okul kurallarına ve çevre kurallarına uymadıklarını gördüm.
[c] (3) Çocuklar çok yanlış hareketler yaptılar (4) ve bir birlerine saygısız davrandılar. // (MOVE 2) [c] (5)Bence bu çocuklarının böyle yapmaların nedenleri aileleridir. (6)Bazı aileler çocuklarını çok şımartır. (7)Çocuklar arkadaşlarına, okuluna, ve çevrelerindekilere çok saygısız davranırlar. // [d] (MOVE 3) (8)Bazıları fotoğraf çekilirken, oyun oynarken ve bir aradayken çoook yanlış davrandılar."

"(MOVE 1) [a] (1) Regarding the case we had seen in the television, I saw the children there do not comply with the school rules and environment rules.
[c] (3) The children acted very badly. (4) and they treated each other disrespectfully. // (MOVE 2) [c] (5) I think the cause of these children's acts is their families. (6) Some families spoil their children. (7) Children treat their friends, his/her school, and the ones in the environment very disrespectfully. // [d] (MOVE 3) (8)Some of them behave very badly while their photos were taken, playing games or they were together."

TL-P06B-WE

The example (12) starts with MOVE 1 with STEP a by anchoring the personal judgment to the video in the first paragraph. In the second paragraph, the writer tries to characterize the problem by stating its reasons and sources, i.e. “the families”. This step constitutes STEP c of MOVE 2 through which the child mentions the source or the reason of the problem. The personal judgment in MOVE 1 is repeated in MOVE 3 to emphasize the improperness of these behaviors.

Sometimes, MOVE 1 may exist in the heading of the text. There is one text from 5th grade as an example which is at the same time the only text with heading in this group that is also focuses on one specific problem “giving harm to communal properties”:

13. “(MOVE 1) [b] (1) Araçlara zarar verme :
[c] (2) Benim bu konuda düşüncem tek kelime ile kötü olur. // (MOVE 2) [c] (3) Türkiyede hemen hemen bazı okullarda araç yok. (4) Ama dış ülkede bu imkanlar mümkün (5) ama öğrencilerin araçları iyi kullanmadığını flimde gördük. (6) Ama Türkiye’deki okullarda bu mümkün olsaydı bence zarar verilmezdi.
// (MOVE 3) [d] (7) Benim düşüncem budur.”

“(MOVE 1) [b] Damaging equipments.
[c] (2) My opinion about this subject, in one word, it is bad. // (MOVE 2) [c] (3) There is no equipment in almost all schools in Turkey. (4) But abroad, these facilities are accessible, (5) but we have seen in the movie that they could not use them properly. (6)But if it were possible at schools in Turkey they would not be damaged.
// (MOVE 3) [d] (7) This is my opinion.

TL-P11B-WE

In the text above, the only place where the problem is introduced is the heading: *Araçlara zarar verme* “Damaging equipments”. Until the end of the first paragraph, there is no clear statement about the issue in the text. After the STEP c of

MOVE 1 in the second sentence, the child makes his MOVE 2 to characterize the problem. It is in the scope of MOVE 3 where the writer mentions the notion of *zarar* "harm" again. So, introducing the problem is achieved only in the heading. Among single-topic texts like (13), the other two do not have complete tripartite MOVE structure.

To sum, most 5th graders' texts only give listing of problems depicted in the video without any global structural parts. There are 3 single-topic texts where the writer exposes only on one problem chosen from the video scenes. We find that if the texts at this grade have opening and/or concluding MOVEs, these MOVEs are not fully developed yet. The basic MOVEs encountered are the MOVE 1 to "introduce the problem" and MOVE 3 "to claim the consequences of the problem". List-type texts resemble to MOVE 2 in terms of rhetorical function. That is to say, at this grade MOVE 2 is only realized with STEP a "listing the types of the problem" where the 5th grader mentions the episodes in the video one by one.

4.5 7th GRADERS' EXPOSITORY TEXTS

Since there is a gradual development from 5th to 7th grade, there are some 7th graders' texts similar to 5th graders' with some overlapping features between them. For example, some expository texts seemed to be in the form of listing of video-based interpersonal problems in this group. As 7th graders wrote longer texts, they give longer listing of interpersonal problems with more details from video-based events. Similar to most of the 5th graders' listings, the list-type texts in this group do not have any opening and closing MOVEs, either. Nevertheless, compared to the 5th graders' listings, the examples have more elaborate narrative structure. They simply

narrate what happens in the video followed by the writer's comment or critique for each episode. At this grade, we have only 2 texts lacking an opening or conclusion yet giving listing of problematic episodes in a detailed narrative schema. Totally, there are 5 texts (23%) that do not have any opening or concluding MOVEs among 7th graders.

The presence of these global MOVEs has a determining role in establishing coherence in an expository text. The text without a MOVE 1 is considered as disoriented like the following example (16) that fails to create coherence due to the lack of required MOVEs.

16. "(MOVE 2) [a] (1) Örneğin vidioda gördüğüm davranışlardan kopya çekmek. (2)Ben bu konuda kopya çekmenin çok kötü olduğunu biliyordum. (3)Ama hiçbir öğrencininde kopya çekmem dediğini duymadım. (4)Kopya çekmek bana göre bir tür hırsızlıktır ve (5) çok yanlıştır. (6)Bu yüzden çekmemeliyiz.

(7)Yalan söylemek. (8) yalan söylemekte bana göre çok kötü bir davranıştır. (9)İnsan kendi çıkarları için yalan söylememeli.

(10)Arkadaşlarımızı dışlamak. (11)Arkadaşlarımızı dışlamakta çok kötü bir şey (12) çalışkan veya tembel, güzel veya çirkin diye hiçbir kimseyi dışlamamalıyız. (13)Zaten bu da çok kötü bir davranıştır.

(14)İftira atmak. (15) iftira atmak çok yanlış bir davranıstır. (16)Kendisini kurtarmak için başkasını suçlamak çok kötü ve çirkin bir davranıstır.

(17)Telefon külübesine vurmak. (18)İnsan kartını alamayınca neden telefon kulübesine vurur. (19)O sadece onun malı değil tüm devletin malıdır. (20)Bu yüzden kimse telefon kulübesine vurmamalı. (21)Bu yanlış bir davranıştır. //

(MOVE 3) [d] (22) Bana göre vidioda izlediğim davranışların bazıları ve buna benzer tüm davranışlar yanlış ve terbiyesizliktir. [b] (23) Bunlar yapılmamalı (24) ve yapanlar uyarılmalı.

"(MOVE 2) [a] (1) For example cheating in the exam which I saw in the video. (2) I knew cheating in the exam is a very bad thing. (3)But I have never heard any student say they do not cheat. (4)Cheating in the exam in my opinion is a kind of theft (5) and it is very wrong. (6) For that reason we should not cheat.

(7)Lie. (8) Lying in my opinion is very bad behaviour. (9) People should not lie for their own good. (10) Isolating friends. (11) Isolating friends is very bad thing (12) we should not isolate (friends) because (they are) hardworking or lazy, beautifull or ugly. (13) Anyhow this is also very bad behaviour.

(14) Slandering. (15) Slandering is very wrong behaviour. (16) Slandering another in order to save oneself is very bad and ugly behaviour.

(17) Punching telephone booth. (18)Why does a person punch the telephone booth when he/she can not get the card back. (19) It is not only his property, it is the property of state. (20) Therefore nobody should punch telephone booths. (21) This is a wrong behaviour.

(MOVE 3) [d] (22) In my opinion some of the behaviours I watched in the movie and behaviours like those are wrong and being impolite. [b] (23) These should not be done (24) and people who does those should be warned."

TL-S07B-WE

This text above begins with MOVE 2 to characterize the problem by listing the types of the problem. Furthermore, the writer concludes with MOVE 3 in two steps. The first STEP d is to state the judgment about the problems characterized with MOVE 2 by anchoring the text to the video. The second STEP b is to state what should not be done. Since the writer does not introduce the problem with an opening MOVE 1, the text ends up having impaired coherence. Therefore, we conclude that the global MOVEs are required for a coherent text.

There are 17 expository texts out of 22 that have either an opening or closing or both. Furthermore, the items listed in the texts appear to be more locally connected to one another. In the following example, the 7th grade student begins by anchoring the text to the video. Unlike 5th graders, the succeeding items are not independent of the previous one. The writer connects them with some connectors.

17. "(MOVE 1) [a&c] (1)Bence izlediğimiz videodaki davranışlar hepsi kötü ve yapılmaması gereken davranışlardır. //

(MOVE 2) [a] (2)İlk önce kopya çekmişlerdi. (3)Orada kopya çekmemeleri lazımdı. (4)Çalışmaları gerekirdi. (5)Çalışmamış birşey bilmiyor olsalar bile çekmemeli, kendi seviyelerini ölçmelilerdi.

(6)Daha sonra kavga ettiler. (7)Kavga etmek yerine konuşmalılardı. (8)Sorunlarını konuşarak çözmelilerdi.

(9)Sonra bir bayanın çantasından bir şey düştü. (10)Onu bulan kız bayana vermeliydi. //

(MOVE 3) [d&b] (11)Bunun gibi davranışlar kötü davranışlardır. (12)Bunları yapmamak gerekir. (13)Sorunları konuşarak çözmek gerekir."

"(MOVE 1) [a&c] (1) In my opinion the behaviours we watched in the video are all bad and shouldn't be done. //

(MOVE 2) [a] (2)First they cheated in the exam. (3)They shouldn't have cheated there. (4)They should have studied. (5)Even if they would not have studiedi not knowing anything, they should not cheat, (but) have evaluated their levels.

(6)Then they fought. (7)Instead of fighting they should have talked. (8)They should have solved the problems via talking. (9) Later something fell from a lady's bag. (10) The girl who found it should have given it to the lady. //

(MOVE 3) [d&b] (11) Behaviours like these are bad behaviours. (12)We should not do those. (13) Problems need to be solved by talking."

TL-S06B-WE

It appears that 7th graders begin to construct expository writings where textual elements are more dependent on one another both on global level with openings and closings and on local level with sentential linkage. The text above is very similar to the most developed 5th graders' texts in terms of global structuring. It opens with MOVE 1 by anchoring the text to the video and by stating the judgment. Then, it continues with MOVE 2 by listing the types of the problem separated in paragraphs. Moreover, like most 5th graders, the lexical items of MOVE 1 are repeated in the last MOVE functioning as a concluding MOVE 3. The MOVE 3 at the end is similar to the one in 5th graders' writings in that it wraps up the previously listed episodes characterizing them with a moral judgement. However, this MOVE 3 is more developed than the 5th graders in that it presents what should be done as a result. Apart from global opening and concluding patterns, the listed problems in MOVE 2 are also connected to one another via local links such as connectors like *ilk once* "first", *sonra* "then", and *daha sonra* "later". Such sentential connectors also put the items in a temporal order. We will discuss this feature while analyzing the development of cohesion in Chapter 5 in detail.

Similar to narratives, an expository text may also have a coda at the end. The coda provides evidence to the writer's claim through the end. Adding a coda at the last MOVE shows up at this grade in one text given in (18):

18. "(MOVE 1) [c] (1) Gördüğüm olaylar karşısında çok şaşırdım. // (MOVE 2) [a] (2) Kopya çektikmi eğer üniversite sınavlarına girdiğinde başarılı olamaz. (3)Arkadaşlarımıza şaka yapmamalıyız (4) eğer yaparsak onlarda bize yapar diye düşünmeliyiz. // (MOVE 3) [e] (5) Yani çuvaldızı önce kendine batır (6) acımıyorsa arkadaşına batır."

"(MOVE 1) [c] (1) I was surprised very much at the events that I have seen. // (MOVE 2) [a] (2) If we cheat, we can not pass the university exam. (3) We should not mock our friends, (4) if we do; we should consider that they can do the same in the future. // (MOVE 3) [e] (5) That is to say, first you should prick the needle to yourself, (6) if it does not hurt; prick it to your friend.

TL-S03B-WE

The text (18) above, opens the exposition with MOVE 1 to introduce the problem by anchoring the text to the video. In the following sentences another MOVE characterizes the interpersonal problems. Although the writer seems to make a last MOVE at the end to conclude his/her exposition with a coda, this coda does not belong to his whole exposition, and rather it is about his statement in sentence (4). Despite making a finale with a coda emerges at this grade, since the children at this grade do not fully master the rhetorical MOVEs, this attempt at the example (18) is unsuccessful. The coda seems to belong only to the case of making jokes to the friends. However, the child attempts to paraphrase the statements in the previous parts with *yani* "that is to say" at the end. Moreover, all coda-statements in our data appear to be stated at the very end of the texts. Therefore, it is assumed that the writer tries to make a global concluding MOVE 3 in (18).

The anchoring of the text to the video or to the real life is an essential step in constructing expository texts (Berman & Katzenberger, 2004). Similar to 5th graders, children at this grade also try to anchor their texts to the video most of the time. Yet, different from the 5th graders, there are some 7th graders who prefer to anchor their text to reality. The following conclusion from a 7th grader's expository text constitutes an example of this sort:

> 19. "(…) (12) Bu olayların bir çoğunu görüyor veya yaşıyoruz. (13) Sunu söyleyebilirimki kendimize yapılmasını istemediğimiz şeyi başkasına yapmamalıyız."
>
> " (…) (12) We are witnessing or experiencing events like this (13) I can say that we shouldn't treat someone in the way that we don't want to be treated."
>
> TL-S09B-WE

After opening the text with MOVE 1 to state the judgment about the problem of exposition and extending it with MOVE 2 to characterize the problem, the writer of (19) makes MOVE 3 by anchoring the text to some external reality.

At this juncture it should be stated that all the examples given so far from 7th graders' expository writings are anchored to the video in some way. There are children who use the video as a direct trigger of their text whether at the beginning or at the closing among both 5th and 7th graders. This tendency is evident in the phrases like *izlediğimiz videodaki davranışlar* "the behaviours that we saw in the video", *gördüğüm olaylar* "the events that I saw", or *o çocukların davranışları* "the behaviours of those kids" in our data. However, there is a decrease in the frequency of this type of construction tendency among 7th graders compared to the 5th graders. Consider the following text:

20. “(MOVE 2) [a] (1) Sınıfımızdakı arkadaşlara daha saygılı olmalıyız. (2)Onlarla biz kardeş gibiyiz. (3)Onları hor görmemeliyiz. (4)Onları sevip saymalıyız.

(5)Hırsızlık asla ve asla yapmamalıyız. (6)Eğer bir para bulduysak ve bunun sahibini biliyorsak iade etmeliyiz.

(7)Kopya çekmemeliyiz. (8)Bu tabiki hırsızlığa girer. (9)Kopye çekmek veya hazırlamak yerine o derse çalışmalıyız.

(10)Okulun mallarına zarar vermemeliyiz. (11)Bunun yanında başkalarının mallarınada zarar vermemeliyiz. // (MOVE 3) [b] (12) Bunlar yanlış ve hatalı davranışlardır. (13)Bunlar yapılmamalıdır.”

“(MOVE 2) [a] (1) We should be respectful to the friends in our class. (2) We are like brothers with them. (3)We should not despise them. (4)We should love them and regard them.

(5) We should never and never steal. (6) If we find money and know its owner, we should return (it).

(7) We should not cheat in the exam. (8) This is of course theft. (9) We should study instead of cheating in the exam or preparing cheating.

(10) We should not damage the goods of school. (11)Besides we should not damage others goods. // (MOVE 3) [b] (12) These are wrong and faulty behaviors. (13)They should not be done.”

TL-S08A-WE

Similar to (20), 23% (5 texts) of 7th graders based their expositions on the notion of “cheating” or “giving harm to equipments” instead of the children from the video who were cheating or giving harm to the environment. In other words, more texts from 7th grade do not constitute the episodes from the video as a direct starting point of their texts. Among them, 4 texts particularly emphasize one specific topic, i.e. cheating and theft.

To sum up, as children gain more control over text production in school over the grades (Berman & Katzenberger, 2004), there seems to be a development in the text structuring abilities at the 7th grade. First, the list-type texts have a more developed “explanation-claim” structure, where the 7th grader writer first narrates what happened in the video and then state his/her claim about the problematic

episodes. Unlike 5th graders, the episodes are more connected to one another on the local level with the use of connectors at the beginning of each. Furthermore, compared to 5th graders, more children from 7th grade expose on the problems given in the video on the conceptual level instead of narrating what happened in the video followed by a comment like *Bu davranış çok kötüdür* "This behaviour is very bad." However, the distribution of single-topic texts among 7th graders is pretty much the same with 5th graders' productions.

In the next section, we continue by presenting the analysis of the 9th graders' expository texts to follow up such a development.

4.6 9th GRADERS' EXPOSITORY TEXTS

In the previous sections on the analysis of 5th graders' and 7th graders' expository texts, we indicated that the structural properties of these two younger groups are similar in some ways. In other words, some structural features of the texts of 5th graders are present also in 7th graders' texts. For example, both list-types and texts without an opening or closing patterns exist in these younger groups in different frequencies. On the other hand, 9th grade seems to be a breaking point where children's expository writings display novel structural characteristics different than the previous population.

To begin with, there is only one text that merely gives a listing of what happened in the video. Moreover, all the texts in this group have complete forms of opening and concluding structures. There is an increase in the frequency of single-topic texts in this goup. 11 texts out of 19 focus on one specific topic instead listing

some type of the problem. This kind of organizational preference is reflected also in structures of the texts. Consider the following example:

21. "(MOVE 1) [b&a] (1)Hırsızlık günümüzde yaygınlaşan bir tür kötülüktür. [c] (2) Hırsızlık yapmak çok kötü bir duygudur herhalde. (3) Hiçbir kimse hırsızlık damgası yemek istemez herhalde. // (MOVE 2) [c] (4)Ama günümüz Türkiyesin'de çok özentiler var. (5) Bunun için banka soyguncuları, canlı bir kişiyi sokak ortasında kaçırıp kolundaki, boynundaki takıları çalıp sonra o kişiyi öldüren var. (6) Bunun bu kadar büyük bir günah olduğunu bilmiyorlar. (7) Böyle insanlar cahile devrinden kalma insanlardır (8) beyinleri örümcek ağları ile dolmuş insanlardır. (9) Böyle kişilerin bilinçlendirilmesi gerekiyor. (10) Hatta ağır cezalara çarptırılmaları gerekir. [d] (11)Mesela bir baba evini geçindirmek için sokaktaki bir şahsın çantasını kapıp kaçsa ve o kişinin parasıyla ailesinin karnını doyursa bu hem günah, hem de haram paradır. (12) Mesela birgün bu babanın kızı da aynı o kızın düştüğü duruma düşse baba üzülmez mi? (13) Elbette üzülür (14) işte bunun düşünen kişiler ne yazık ki yok. [d] (15) Video programında da izlediğimiz gibi bir kadın bir gün yolda giderken çantasından telefonunu çıkarırken parası yere düşüyor (16) ve arkasından genç bir kız gelip o parayı alıyor (17) bir süre kadına bakıyor (18) kadın uzaklaştığı zaman parayı alıp geri dönüyor. (19) Belki o kadının evde hasta bakılacak birisi var idi, (20) belki o kadın o paraya muhtaçtı (21) yani bunları düşünerek yapmalıyız herşeyi. (22) Belki o kız parayı kadına geri verse idi o kadın bu iyiliğin karşısında onu ödüllendirecekti (23) ama kız bunu yapmadı. (24) Böyle insanlara ancak acımak kalır.

// (MOVE 3) [f] (25) Hırsızlık, herkesi olumsuz etkiler. [c] (26) Elbet o kişi yakalanır. (27) Yapmadım dese de o yalan muhakkak ortaya çıkar. (28) Bunu da şu sözden anlayabiliriz. [e] (29) "Yalancının mumu yatsıya kadar yanar". [b] (30) bunu asla unutmamalıyız.

"(MOVE 1) [b&a] (1) Theft is a kind of evil action which has become widespread. [c] (2) Committing theft is probably a very bad feeling. (3) Probably, no one would want to be called a thief. // (MOVE 2) [c] (4) But there are those people who imitate others at present in Turkey. (5) That is why, there are bank robbers, and those people who kidnap a living person in the street and kill him/her after stealing the jewelry in his/her wrist and neck. (6) They do not know how sinful this really is. (7) Those people must be from the time of paganism (8) and their brains are full of spider's web. (9) Those people need to become conscious. (10) Even they need to be sentenced to major punishment. [d] (11) For instance, if a father steals someone's bag in the street to support his family and buys food with the money he stole, this money is both sin and forbidden by religion. (12) For instance, will this father not be sorry for his daughter, if his daughter finds herself in the same condition? (13) Certainly, he will be sorry (14) but there are unfortunately no people who think of it. [d] (15) As we watch on the video, when a woman is walking down the street, when she is taking her mobile phone out of her bag, she drops her money on the ground (16) and a young girl coming from behind takes the money, (18) looks at the

woman for some time when the woman disappears she turns back and goes away. (19) Maybe there is a sick person she looks after, (20) maybe she really needs that money (21) that is to say we must do everything considering these. (22) Perhaps if the girl had given the money to the woman, the woman would have awarded her in return for her favor (23) but she did not do that. (24) Those people should be pitied.

// (MOVE 3) [f] (25) Theft affects everyone in a negative way. [c] (26) Of course that person will be caught. (27) The truth will be understood even if s/he says he dis not do it. (28) We can infer this from this saying; [e] (29) "It does not take long for a lie to come to light". [b] (30) We should never forget that."

TL-H06A-WE

In the example above, the writer discusses only one topic depicted in the video; i.e. theft. Focusing on just one problem from the video is a common strategy among 9th graders. Similar to (21), 11 expository texts out of 19 are based only on one singular problem such as theft, cheating, or complying with rules.

The first MOVE in (21) is realized by the first three sentences. It serves to establish the problem in three STEPs. In the first STEP, the child specifies the problem that she will expose on as theft and she states that theft is "so bad" that no one wants to do it. Yet, she also recruits STEP a "anchoring to the video or to real life" combined with STEP b. The third step in MOVE 1 is STEP c "stating the evaluative judgment about the problem". All the statements in MOVE 1 are of general and neutral quality. Then the writer begins to characterize the problem in MOVE 2. Her first STEP in MOVE 2 is to specify the source or the reasons of the theft problem in Tukey as "people who imitate others" (sentence 4). In the second STEP of MOVE 2, she exemplifies the problem with two narratives; one is a fictive narrative and the other is a video-based narrative. In contrast to general statements in MOVE 1, the STEPs in MOVE 2 are specific. In addition, they are topic oriented, that is, the discussion is organized around the "theft". The last paragraph of (21) is the beginning of MOVE 3. In MOVE 3, the writer posits the consequences of the

problem. The statements are general and impersonal again including a coda at the end. With 9th graders' texts, closing MOVE 3 acquires more complex structure than the previous groups. For example, the writer of (21) completes the rhetorical structure of her MOVE 3 in three STEPs. This rhetorical structure is very typical of 9th graders' text.

The same structure is also observed, albeit in proto-form, in writings produced by our younger subjects, i.e. 5th and 7th graders. Especially in some developed writings of 5th and 7th graders we identified a similar rhetorical MOVE pattern serving to create a coherent piece of discourse. Yet, the organization of the text (21) on one topic affects the structuring of the STEPs in these MOVEs. In other words, if the author chooses one problem as the overall topic through the text, the STEPs to realize the MOVEs differ from the case that the author chooses to mention the types of the problems and summarizing them under one heading. The structural difference between example (21) and the previous ones resulted from such an organizational choice by the writer.

As we analyzed other writings from the same age group, we find out additional steps to realize MOVEs. Another peculiarity of the writings in this age group is the emergence of meta-textual statements especially in MOVE 1. To exemplify, we give only the beginning part of such a text below:

22. "(MOVE 1) [e] (1) İzlediğimiz video programında gördüğüm hırsızlık olayını anlatacağım.
[a] (2) Bir kadın telefonunu çantasından çıkarırken yere bir miktar para düştü. (3) Kadının arkasından bir kız geliyordu. (4) Düşen parayı aldı (5) ve onu kadına vermeyip kendi cebine koydu. (…)"

"(MOVE 1) [e] (1) I am going to relate the incident which we watched on the video.

[a] (2) While a woman was taking her mobile phone out of her pocket, some amount of money fell to the ground. (3) A girl was coming behind the woman. (4) She took the money (5) and put the money in her pocket instead of giving the money to the woman. (…)"

TL-H07A-WE

In (22), the student starts with a meta-textual comment in her first sentence. Then she continues with anchoring the text to the video. There are 2 texts that include meta-textual statements among 9th graders.

To sum, our 9th graders' expository writings exhibit different features of structural organization. Regarding the rhetorical structure, there is little variance among the texts of 9th graders compared to 5th and 7th grades. Compared to the younger age groups, the expository writings of 9th graders appear to be structured alike. The structural proto-forms in the previous two grade groups can now be fully identified as 9th graders gain the ability to control the textual structure. It is evident in the 9th graders' examples above that the patterns of structural organization reach a steady shape where MOVEs and STEPs are clearly framed around one particular topic.

4.7 ADULTS' EXPOSITORY TEXTS

Although the three MOVEs exist in all grades in different frequencies, the structuring of each MOVE differs from one grade to another. Similarly, compared to 9th graders, adults also have the complete set of MOVEs[24]. Yet, the adults' texts

[24] In adult group, the texts are differentiating in terms of strong versus weak author orientation. However, such a difference is not reflected in the MOVE structure of the texts. Rather, its main effect is on the cohesion strategies, therefore we discuss such a differentiation in Chapter 5.

differ from 9th graders in the construction of MOVE 3. We begin with a typical example from an adult's text:

23. "(MOVE 1) [b] KOPYA

[c] (1) Kopya çekmekte, vermekte hoş bir davranış değil (2) [d] ama bence bütün öğretmenlerimizde gerek lisede gerekse üniversitede kopya çekmişlerdir. // (MOVE 2) [c] (3) Bu problem bence temelin iyi atılmamasından kaynaklanıyo [i] (4) yani benim bir hocam derdi ki: (5) insanın üniversiteyi kazanması veya hayatta iyi bir yerlere gelmesi ilkokul öğretmenimden geçer. (6) Ben ilkokulda iyi bir eğitim aldığıma inanmıyorum (7) bu sebepten dolayıda zaman zaman kopya çekmek gereksinimi duyuyorum. [J] (8) Başarı yüksek bir göktelene benzer, (9) eğer temellerinin iyi atarsan binanın hiç bir katkıya ihtiyacı olmaz (10) ve ufak tefek depremlerde yıkılmaz. (11) ama temeller iyi değilse zaman zaman yardıma yani katkıya ihtiyaç duyarız. (12) Bizler öğrenci olarakta kopya çekerek bunu sağlarız.

[c] (13) Diğer bir neden de eğitim sistemindeki bozuk çarpık yapıdır. (14) Ezberci zihniyetin ortadan kalkması sağlanmalıdır. (15) Bunun yerine araştırmaçı, teşvik edici yol gösterici bir sistemle insanlar daha başarılı olabilirler (16) ve böylece bir şeyleri yardım almaksızın yaptıkları için kopya çekmezler.

// (MOVE 3) [d] (17) Bir ülkenin kalkınması eğitimden geçer. [b] (18) Bizler Bu bozuk sistemi düzeltirsek insanlar kendi başlarına başarıya ulaşırlar (19) bu da büyümeyi yani ülkenin kalkınmasını sağlar. (20) Bunun için siz öğretmenlerin kopya çeken öğrenciyi aşşalamak yerine, onun yaptığı davranışın yanlış olduğunu iyi bir dille anlatmas gerekir. [c] (21) Böylece topluma Yarar getiren insanlar ortaya çıkar → (22) Eğitim düzeyi yükselir → (23) Ekonomik değerler yükselir → (24) Refah'a ulaşılır (25) ve böylece problem ortadan kalkar.

"(MOVE 1) [b] Cheating

[c] (1) It is not pleasant to cheat or help the others cheat. (2) [d] But to me all of our teachers must have cheated both at high school and at university. // (MOVE 2) [c] (3) I think this problem stems from not having a good background. [i] (4) That is to say, one of my teachers used to say that; (5) for a person to get into the university or a good position in life is in the hands of his primary school teacher. (6) I do not believe that I got a good education at primary school. (7) That is why I sometimes need to cheat. [J] (8) Success looks like a long skyscraper, (9) if you make a good foundation for it, it will not need any aid (10) and it will not collapse because of small earthquakes (11) but if the basis is not good we sometimes need help, that is, we need aid. (12) As a student, we get this help by cheating.

[c] (13) Another reason is the corrupt and ill structure in the educational system. (14) Memorizing mentality must be abolished. (15) People can be more successful in a system that leads to research (16) and then they will not cheat as they do these things without getting help.

// (MOVE 3) [d] (17) Education is so important for a country to develop. [b] (18) If we correct this wrong system people will succeed by themselves (19) this leads to the development of the country. (20) For this reason, instead of despising the students, teachers, using a good language, should tell the students that cheating is bad. [c] (21) Thus good people will emerge for the country. → (22) The level of education will increase → (23) Economic values will increase → (24) There will be welfare (25) and then the problem will vanish."

TA-01A-WE

In MOVE 1, the writer establishes the problem in three STEPs. The first STEP b is to specify the problem in the heading, i.e. cheating. Then he begins his text by stating his judgment in STEP c. Another step which is peculiar to adults' writing is "STEP d: question raising" beginning with the conjunction *ama* "but". In this step, the writer adopts a critical stance to the problem he exposed on. MOVE 2 begins with STEP c by specifying one of the sources of the problem which is related to the primary school education. Recall that adult group is the one that uses more diverse STEPs in MOVE 2 compared to the others. For example, in the text above, the writer refers to another source that he specifies as his former teacher to establish the trustworthiness of his source to support his claim about success in school life. STEP j is to establish an analogy to clarify his point. In this analogy, he compares "success" with "skyscraper". Then, he repeats STEP c of MOVE 2 to specify another source of the problem. Since MOVE 3 is to suggest a solution for the problem, it begins in the second paragraph realized by its STEP d. In STEP d, the writer makes a generalization about his judgment introduced in MOVE 1. In STEP b, he gives a specific solution regarding the problem stated in MOVE 2. In the second STEP c of MOVE 3, the writer speculates the implications of the suggested solution.

The main difference between a typical example in 9th grade and example (23) is derived from the structure of MOVE 3. Although the structuring of MOVE 1 and

MOVE 2 are more or less alike in these two populations, the steps taken in MOVE 3 are different. As shown with the example above, MOVE 3 acquires a distinct structuring where the writer begins from a specific solution and continues with a generalized one.

As we analyzed other texts from the same group, we find additional STEPs especially to realize MOVE 3. At first glance, in the following example, the structures of MOVE 2 and MOVE 3 may be considered as blended, or the last MOVE as lacking.

24. "(MOVE 1) [a] (1) Şuan içinde bulunduğumuz çağda sağlıklı bir psikolojiye sahip bireyler yetiştirilmesinin çok zor olduğunu gözlemliyorum. [c] (2) Medya televizyon ve hayat koşulundaki dengesizlik insanları tutarsız eğilimlere sürüklüyor. [b] (3) Ve buda şuanda kayıp bir gençlik kavramıyla bizi karşı karşıya getiriyor. // (MOVE 2) [c] (4) İnsanlar okumak yerine izlemeyi tercih ediyorlar. (5) Kavrama güçlükleri yada eksikliklerine yol açıyor.(6) Bu, sapmalara neden olup, özünde varolan gençlik olgularıyla ona empoze edilmeye çalışan olgulara arasında sıkışıp kalıyor. [b] (7) Gençlik şuanda kendine ne belli bir tanım yükleyebiliyor. (8)Ne de geçmiş nesiller.. * (9) Türkiyede Türk gibi davranmak yerine özenti nesil olarak davranıyor. (10) Buda bize teknolojinin zararlarından biridir belkide. (11)Teknolojiye ayak uydurmak şart ! (12) ancak biz bunların içinde varolmak yerine başka ülkelerden alıp uygulayan bir ülke ve nesil olduğumuzdan sadece uymakla yetiniyoruz. (13) Türkiye üreten bir ülke olmamamakla, yoğun bir şekilde üreyen bir ülke. (14) Bu üreme nüfus fazlalığına ve işsizliğe sebep oluyor. (15) Bizler üniversiteye girmemiz, gibi kaçınılmaz bir zorunlulukla yetiştik. (16) Hatta hiç istemediğimiz ya da aklımızın ucundan geçmeyecek bölümlere yerleştirildik. (17) Bu konuda yönlendirilme eksikliği en fazla rastlanılan sorunlardan. (18) Üniversite biter iş yok, iş olur para yeterli olmaz Gibi klişeleşmiş sorunlarımız var. [c] (19) Bunun temelinde yine klişeleşmiş olan eğitim eksikliği çıkıyor. // (MOVE 3) [f] (20) Ve bunun için birşeyler yapılması yerine yine eski sistemi bölüp parçalayıp, yıkıp yerine hiç olmadık sistemler getiriliyor. (21) Ve gelen gideni aratır oluyor…

"(MOVE 1) [a] (1) I observe that growing healthy and psychologically sound individuals is really hard in our time. [c] (2) Media, TV programs and the instability of the conditions of life make people inconsistent tendencies. [b] (3) Because of this we face a lost youth generation. // (MOVE 2) [c] (4) People prefer watching TV instead of reading. (5) This leads to the difficulty or loss of understanding or comprehension. (6) This also leads to the digression; the person is stuck between his feelings inherent to him and the feelings which he

is exposed to. [b] (7) Young people cannot attribute themselves a definition, (8) nor do the older generation. (9) Instead of acting like a Turk, behaves like an affected generation in Turkey. (10) This is perhaps one of the harms of technology to us. (11) It is imperative that we keep up with technology! (12) However, we are contended with keeping up with this as we are a country and generation that borrow and adapt these. (13) Turkey is not a country that produces much and reproduction rate is very high. (14) This causes increase in population and unemployment. (15) We were raised knowing that it is inevitable to get into a university. (16) We were placed in those department we did not like or those that we had never heard of it. (17) Concerning this, the lack of guidance is one of the commonest problems. (18) We have problems such as "the university education ends but there is no job" or "there is a job but the salary is not enough". [c] (19) When we go into the root of the problem we run into the lack of education. (MOVE 3) [f] (20) Instead of trying to find a solution for this, old systems are divided and revised and those systems which have no promise are deployed (21) and older systems are always wanted over the newer ones."

TA-08A-WE

Similar to our first example in adult group, the example above also starts with MOVE 1 to establish the problem and continues with MOVE 2 to characterize the problem with its sources and its key characteristics. By doing it, she anchors the problem to the real life as commenting on the relevant situation in Turkey. The text does not have a typical MOVE 3 to claim the consequences of the problem or to suggest a solution. Nevertheless, it also does not appear to be left incomplete. As Bhatia (1993) states, writers familiar with the conventions of a genre can manipulate them for special effects. Likewise, (24) above aims to strengthen her emphasis on the current conditions in Turkey, so she makes a unique STEP to realize her MOVE 3 in sentence (20). The only STEP of the last MOVE is "to criticize on the current situation" which is a part of claiming a solution.

To add up, we find the same rhetorical MOVE structure of 9th graders in adult's texts. However, the adult writers contribute to the tripartite-MOVE structure with new STEPs to illustrate their point. Their eminent contribution is to the

structuring of MOVE 3. Although the STEPs in MOVE 1 and MOVE 2 resemble each other in other grade populations, in adult group MOVE 3 is structured with novel STEPs that function to organize the pivot of generality of the exposition.

4.8 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, we analyzed the development of global structural parts in expository writings of 5th, 7th, and 9th graders, and adults. The ability to formulate opening, developing, and concluding rhetorical MOVEs in expository texts points to the typical structure that the writers adopt in the course of writing an expository prose. In addition, these rhetorical MOVEs establish a coherent text on the global level.

Most of our younger subjects mention the scenes from the video one by one with their evaluative judgment following them. When they do not have opening and/or concluding MOVEs, their texts are like lists that contain an ordered array of items. As children go through school grades, the ability to write an exposition based on the events in the video develops. So, none of the 9th graders' texts produced lists about what happened in the video. In other words, beyond description, exposing on the problems given in our trigger is a late development seen especially after 7th grade.

In our analysis of expository writings we come across three rhetorical MOVEs that give expository texts the significant and typical structure. These are:

MOVE 1: Establishing (or introducing) the problem

MOVE 2: Characterization of the problem

MOVE 3: Claiming the solution(s)

All these MOVEs are present in texts including 5th graders. Yet, their frequency differs along different grades. While there are only a few texts having all three MOVEs in fully developed forms among 5th graders, most of the 9th graders – with one exception- produce their text complete in these three MOVEs.

What we find out in 5th and 7th graders' texts at best can be described as the proto-forms of MOVE 1 and MOVE 3. When we compare their frequencies, MOVE 1 occurs twice as much as MOVE 3 among 5th graders. This case also holds for 7th graders' texts. Among 7th graders, the texts with only MOVE 1 outnumber those with MOVE 3. This finding shows that opening MOVEs are developed earlier than the concluding MOVEs.

Moreover, there are 7 texts among our younger subjects (5th and 7th graders) that have only the opening MOVE1 and concluding MOVE 3 without a characterization MOVE 2. In other words, some of the younger children only introduce the problem and claim a solution for it in their texts. Another characteristic related with MOVE 1 and MOVE 3 shared by 5th and 7th graders is their content. The tendency of six 5th graders and three 7th graders is to repeat the statements in MOVE 1 again in MOVE 3. This tendency fades away in 9th graders' expositions. Beginning with 9th graders' texts, MOVE 3 takes the form of independent statements realized in independent STEPs from MOVE 1.

As for MOVE 2, MOVE 2 has a crucial status in argument construction. While characterizing the problems introduced by MOVE 1, the writer provides support for his/her claims in this MOVE. He/she may specify the sources of the problem and/or ascribe key characteristics to it in order to characterize the problem. Our analysis suggests that MOVE 2 exists in listings of 5th and 7th graders. Without making MOVE 1 and MOVE 3, the writers tend to characterize the problem by

giving lists of episodes from the video. Since list-type texts are the broadest group in the 5th grade, the children produce MOVE 2 "characterize the problem" earlier than the other MOVEs. We observe that the rhetorical function of list-type texts is realized in MOVE 2 in later grades. So, it is concluded that MOVE 2 is the basic MOVE that is produced at earlier grades. In our older subjects' texts, i.e. 7th and 9th graders, it functions as a primary part of argument building realized in varying STEPs.

Although we find the same MOVEs across age groups, the subject groups differ in recruiting distinct STEPs in their MOVEs. At the level of each MOVE, the rhetorical STEPs serve to realize the structure (Bhatia, 1993).

To begin with, all the STEPs in MOVE 1 are related with the introduction of the problem. Among 5th and 7th graders the most prevalent STEP is to state the evaluative judgment about the problem. Sometimes we see attempts of anchoring the text to the video. Comparably, 9th graders' MOVE 1 has a more elaborate structure. For example, the introducing of the problem with a meta-textual comment appears at this grade. They also begin to anchor the text to the real life in addition to the video as STEP c and STEP d. Similar to 5th and 7th graders, they also use STEP a "specifying the problem" and STEP b "stating the evaluative judgment". Adult group adds the 9th graders' STEPs the STEP of "question-raising" as STEP e.

To continue, the STEPs in MOVE 2 serve to characterize the problematic event(s). MOVE 2 exists in most 5th and 7th, which use the STEP a "listing the types of the problem(s)". As for 9th graders, two new STEPs in MOVE 2 emerge. These are STEP b "ascribing the key characteristics" and STEP c "exemplifying with a narrative". The narrative may be of fictive, video-based, and/or personal type. The

writer may use any or all of them in MOVE 2. In this MOVE, a new STEP d "specifying the source/reason(s)" is introduced by adult group.

Finally in the last MOVE 3, we come across the STEPs of claming the solution(s) to the problem established and characterized in previous MOVEs. Since the evaluative judgment is repeated in MOVE 3 in 5th graders' expositions, MOVE 3 has a similar STEP to MOVE 1 in this group. Yet these two similar STEPs are distinct in character because they are realized in different MOVEs. Since MOVEs in genre analysis are considered as pieces of discourse that carry the discourse forward, each MOVE has a distinct place in text. Therefore, it is impossible by definition to repeat one MOVE in somewhere again in the text even though the statements are repeated. For example, the statements in MOVE 1 have the function of introducing the problem, whereas the same statements in MOVE 3 have the character of "suggesting a solution". Additionally, 5th graders' also use a STEP b to speculate about the consequences of the problematic behavior(s). The 7th graders' texts are different from 5th graders in construction of MOVE 3. The STEP c of "providing a coda" emerges at 7th grade, as well as the STEP d of "stating what should be done". Even though STEP of "anchoring to the real life" belongs to MOVE 1 in most of our subjects' text; it is used in MOVE 3 by 7th graders. As for the STEPs in MOVE 3 of 9th graders and adults, they have the similar characteristics, yet they differ from other populations in a singular way. While claiming the solution(s) to the problem, they begin with specific solution of the specific problems characterized in MOVE 2. Then, they generalized the solution(s) to wrap up their texts through the end.

To conclude, we posited a three-MOVE structure for typical Turkish expository writings that develop from 5th grades through adult stage. Since these rhetorical MOVEs also arrange the relation between statements in global level, the

development of them also reflects the development of coherence in Turkish expository texts. As they are constructed precisely, the text acquires a global structuring, hence the quality of coherence.

CHAPTER V

DEVELOPMENT OF COHESION

5.1. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, we analyze the cohesive properties of the texts based on the cohesive resources used in the texts. The seven cohesive resources mentioned in the literature are reference, ellipsis, conjunction, lexical cohesion, temporality, aspectuality, and modality (see Chapter 2). We first focus on how these grammatical categories appear in 5th, 7th, 9th graders' and adults' texts. Then, we present the way that our subjects recruit them to create cohesion in their expositions.

The chapter is organized as follows. In Section 5.2, we provide an overview of cohesive properties of the texts. In Section 5.3, 5th graders' texts are analyzed qualitatively in terms of their cohesive properties. Then we present in Section 5.4 the analysis of 7th graders' texts, 9th graders', and the adults' texts, respectively. In each section, we also consider the use of cohesive strategies across different rhetorical MOVEs that we presented in the previous chapter.

5.2 DEVELOPMENT OF COHESION: AN OVERVIEW

Our youngest subjects in the 5th grade have a limited repertoire of cohesive devices. Among these devices, tense, aspect, modality markers are the ones they use most accurately. As the subjects get older and gain mastery in school genres through literacy practices, they acquire new cohesive strategies and learn to use them effectively such as establishing referential chains and various conjunctions.

Building referential chains as a cohesive strategy is a relatively late development. In TABLE 8, we exhibit the strategies of introducing agent subject NPs across grades. Here, we focus only on agent subject NPs because the type of subject NPs preferred at each grade reflects the development of a topic-oriented structure in expositions. As children begin to construct texts independent of immediate context (i.e. the video) at older grades, they begin to use abstract notions such as *şiddet* "violence" as subject NPs in their texts instead of people fighting with each other in the video.

TABLE 8. First-Mention Strategies of Agent Subject NPs (Tokens)

	Grade groups			
	5th grade	7th grade	9th grade	Adult
Indefinite NPs	10	16	17	10
Ellipsis	26	12	1	0
Definite NPs	34	20	0	1
Generic NPs	6	8	23	17
TOTAL	76	56	41	28

The group that uses the agent subject NPs most frequently in their texts is 5th graders. They introduce the agents depicted in the video such as students cheating in

an exam etc. mostly in definite and/or elliptical forms[25]. This tendency indicates that 5th graders depend heavily on the video context, and they have not acquired the ways to introduce referents properly in in/non-definite forms at first mention. Although 7th graders still recruit definite NPs in introducing the agent subject referents, the proportion of improperly introduced referents in the forms of ellipsis and definite NPs diminishes. 43 % of agent subject NPs is introduced properly to the discourse at this grade. It seems that 9th graders and adults have acquired the proper way to introduce subject NPs. Ellipsis and definite NPs are almost non- existent in both groups. Instead, the generic agent subject NPs like *insanlar* "people" become more frequent. Furthermore, the striking decrease in the number of agent subject NPs over school grades indicates that the older subjects tend to stop talking about agent subject NPs referring directly to the video; and instead they prefer to talk about the abstract notions such as cheating or discrimination among people in the subject position.

In addition to referent introduction, referential ellipsis is considered as another cohesive strategy in the literature. Using referential ellipsis is also an indicator of how tight the writer prefers to establish referential chains in his/her text (Givón, 2001; Jisa, 2000). In the table below, we show the frequency of matrix clauses where there is at least one elliptical referential construction in each group:

[25] We do not count elliptical subject constructions at first mention as one of cohesive resources. Using such ellipsis at first mention indicates that the author still has trouble with referent introduction (Hickmann, 2004).

TABLE 9. Number of Matrix Clauses and Frequencies of Referential Ellipsis across Grades

Grade groups				
	5th grade	7th grade	9th grade	Adult
No of matrix clauses	216	240	363	345
Tokens of referential NP ellipsis	57	42	65	72
% matrix clauses that contain referential NP ellipsis	26[26]	18	17	21

Unlike the developmental patterns observed in other cohesive devices, the use of ellipsis follows an unusual path. The highest frequency of ellipsis after first mention belongs to 5th graders' texts, then it decreases in 7th and 9th graders, then it somewhat goes up again in adults' texts. Although both subject and non-subject ellipsis is highly accessible in Turkish, which is a pro-drop language, the tendency to use referential ellipsis appears to diminish through the older grades. With age, subjects prefer to produce referents in full forms rather than leaving them in zero forms. However, the amount of data we have do not lend itself for a reliable explanation of the learning curve of ellipsis observed here. Further research on additional data is necessary.

Conjunctions are another way to link statements of any length on the surface. In this analysis, we only focus on free sentential conjunctions. The token of conjunctions used in the expositions increases with school grade as shown in the following table:

[26] Here too, we do not count elliptical subject constructions at first mention. If we add, the number of tokens would be 83 for 5th graders, 54 for 7th graders, and 66 for 9th graders. There would be no difference in adult group because they do not use any elliptical subjects at first mention.

TABLE 10. Number of Free Coordinative Conjunctions in each MOVE across Grade Groups

	Number of coordinative conjunctions			
	5th Grade	7th Grade	9th Grade	Adult
List-type	12	2	2[27]	10[28]
MOVE1	2	1	4	5
MOVE2	13	32	41	48
MOVE3	2	4	12	22
TOTAL	29	39	60	85

There is a steady increase in both the variability of coordinative conjunctions and their tokens from 5th grade through the university level. At 5th grade, subjects use the most varying types of conjunctions in list-type texts. The other grade groups use a great variety of conjunctions such as *oysa* "nevertheless", *fakat* "but", *çünkü* "because" in MOVE 2. This kind of parallelism between 5th graders' list-type texts and older groups' MOVE 2 supports our previous finding that list-type texts at 5th grade are proto-form of MOVE 2. Comparably, subjects at all grades use the lowest frequency of conjunctions in MOVE 1. As for MOVE 3, 5th and 7th graders tend to use few conjunctions like MOVE 1. However, as age and school grade increase, 9th graders and adults prefer to recruit more conjunctions in MOVE 3 more than MOVE 1.

Another grammatical resource that we consider in building textual cohesion is temporal, aspectual, and modal marking. Beginning with temporality, the following table shows that children even at 5th grade prefer present tense in their expositions.

[27] Recall that there is only one text of list-type among 9th graders.

[28] Here, again there is only one list-type text.

TABLE 11. Temporal Marking in each MOVE across Grade Groups[29]

	MOVE 1	
	past %	present tense %
5th grade	43%	57%
7th grade	22%	78%
9th grade	27%	71%
Adult	5%	95%
	MOVE 2	
	past	present tense %
5th grade	38%	62%
7th grade	24%	76%
9th grade	8%	91%
Adult	9%	89%
	MOVE 3	
	past	present tense %
5th grade	6%	94%
7th grade	6%	94%
9th grade	10%	84%
Adult	0	95%
	List-type text	
	past	present tense %
5th grade	37%	57%
7th grade	16%	84%
9th grade[30]	0	100%
Adult[31]	12%	88%

The overall pattern observed in the table is that present tense is preferred over past at all grades and MOVEs. Given the topic of the texts, this is not surprising. Nevertheless, we can still observe certain developmental patterns across groups. First of all, the rate of present tense increases steadily as the subjects get older. The lowest rate of present tense belongs to MOVE 1, because in that MOVE, the writers anchor their texts in reference to the video they have seen. As mentioned earlier, 5th graders are the ones who depend most on the video, and accordingly they use the highest rate

[29] The percentages do not add up to 100% in some groups, because we do not include the future –AcAK which is small in frequency.

[30] Recall that there is only one text of list-type among 9th graders

[31] Here, again there is only one list-type text.

of past tense (all in reference to the video) in MOVE 1. MOVE 3, on the other hand, has the highest rates of present tense at all grades.

In Turkish, it is well-known fact that verbal inflectional suffixes of tense, aspect and modality can be multifunctional and one suffix can simultaneously mark all three categories (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005). Accordingly, it is difficult to separate each morpheme and analyze them quantitatively in our data. Instead, we focus on certain aspect and modality morphemes (henceforth TAM) that are widely used and, more importantly, seem to have a significant role in their respective MOVEs. These morphemes are the aorist –Ir/-Ar, progressive/imperfective –Iyor, factive[32] –DIr, and obligation/necessity modal –mAlI. Their distribution according to MOVE 1, MOVE 2, and MOVE 3, and list-type texts are given in the following table:

TABLE 12. Distribution of Aorist –Ir/-Ar, Progressive/Imperfective –Iyor, Factive –DIr, and Obligation/Necessity -mAlI in each MOVE

	% AOR	%Iyor	%-DIr	%mAlı	%other	total
List-type texts	24	12	22	16	26	100
MOVE 1	17	20	24	7	32	100
MOVE 2	24	23	17	13	23	100
MOVE 3	24	12	18	22	24	100

According to TABLE 12, certain aspect and modality morphemes are extensively preferred in particular MOVEs by all our subjects. In list-type texts, the aorist –Ir/-Ar, is the most frequent morpheme. Beside the aorist, –DIr appears also

[32] Sansa (1986) states that –DIr morpheme in Turkish marks either factivity or non-factivity. However, almost all usages of -DIr is factive in our data which also lead us to conclude that writers do not tend to make non-factive statements while exposing on a topic. Instead, they prefer to present their ideas as general facts.

quite common. Notice that –DIr in nominal predicates is semantically equivalent of aorist in verbal predicates.

Regarding the overall preference of TAM markings in different MOVEs, we observe that the preference of particular TAM marking(s) in specific MOVEs correlates with the rhetorical function of that MOVE. In MOVE 1, the mostly used TAM marker is –DIr on nominal predicates where the writer begins with stating his/her judgment(s) as general facts. The progressive/imperfective –Iyor is mostly used in MOVE 2 to present the characteristics of the event. Although the aorist is frequently recruited in almost all the MOVEs as well as in list-type texts, its comparably lower percentage in MOVE 1 indicates that the writers do not prefer to use the aorist while introducing the problem. In MOVE 3, the aorist, and obligation/necessity –mAlI are all commonly used in speculating about the general consequences of the problem.

There is a clear developmental pattern in the use of TAM markings above in specific MOVEs which can be observed in TABLE 13.

TABLE 13. Distribution of Aorist, Progressive/Imperfective –Iyor, and Factive -DIR in each MOVE across Grades

	List-type texts		
	% AOR	%iyor	%DIr
5th grade	25	3	16
7th grade	10	33	39
9th grade	28	0	17
Adult	37	18	21
	MOVE 1		
	% AOR	%iyor	%DIr
5th grade	10	33	5
7th grade	15	7	37
9th grade	20	12	25
Adult	19	36	22
	MOVE 2		
	% AOR	%iyor	%DIr
5th grade	19	20	10
7th grade	13	23	22
9th grade	34	13	21
Adult	23	39	11
	MOVE 3		
	% AOR	%iyor	%DIr
5th grade	45	23	10
7th grade	14	3	30
9th grade	24	0	14
Adult	21	19	20

Recall that list-type texts are commonly produced by 5th and 7th graders. While the aorist is the dominant TAM marking in 5th graders' lists, factive –DIr begins to appear extensively in 7th graders' texts. Regarding MOVE 1, our youngest grade group prefers progressive –Iyor in the opening. However, they use aorist and –DIr less frequent compared to older groups. On the other hand, factive –DIr is a widely recognized marker of formal language. The use of factive –DIr in 5th graders' texts indicates that even at younger ages, the subjects are aware of some markers of written formal register. Different than 5th graders, 7th graders begin to use aorist more frequently in MOVE 1. 9th graders resemble to 7th grade groups in preferring –DIr

most commonly in their opening MOVE. On the other hand, adults prefer –Iyor over the aorist and –DIr.

As for MOVE 2, -Iyor is the most preferred marking by 5th, 7th graders, and adults. In addition to –Iyor, 5th graders use the aorist and 7th graders use –DIr as the second most frequent morpheme to create continuity between their utterances. Compared to these three, 9th graders switch from –DIr in MOVE 1 to the aorist in MOVE 2.

For the TAM marking in MOVE 3, our two older groups show similar tendencies to recruit the aorist. However, while 9th graders do not choose –Iyor dominantly in any MOVEs, adult writers use all the three forms with similar rates in MOVE 3. This differentiation between older groups may result from their literacy level. As the subjects become more literate, they may begin to use some other TAM markings supplementary to the generally preferred TAM markers such as present progressive -mAktAdIr. We will discuss this divergent tendency in the qualitative analysis below.

Of all modal categories necessity/obligation modality merits some discussion as in all grades the subjects comment on the proper behavior in contrast to the "wrong behavior" in the video. Necessity/obligation is expressed either by independent lexical forms such as *gerek* and *lazım* "necessary" or by the suffix –mAlI. The distribution of the use of obligation and necessity modality in different MOVEs through grade groups is illustrated below:

TABLE 14. Distribution of Obligation/Necessity Modality in Different MOVEs through the Grade Groups

	5th grade	7th grade	9th grade	Adult
List-type texts	19	4	39	11
MOVE 1	5	7	8	6
MOVE 2	24	12	15	5
MOVE 3	13	38	33	12
TOTAL	61	61	85	34

TABLE 14 clearly shows that at all grades, obligation/necessity modality is preferred most in MOVE 3, and to a lesser extent in MOVE 2 (including list-type texts). We also observe that its use decreases significantly in adults' texts. It is likely that as becoming more experienced in expository writing adult writers choose other modalities in their conclusions. Alternative strategies of experienced writers in MOVE 3 are left to the following section to discuss further.

Our last category of cohesive resources is lexical cohesion. For this category, we focus on lexical repetitions particularly of evaluative statements because during our analyses we observed that there is a tendency to repeat these statements to create continuity. TABLE 15 illustrates the number of texts in each grade group that extensively contain repeated evaluative statements:

TABLE 15. Number of Texts with Repeated Evaluative Statements across Grades

	5th Grade	7th Grade	9th Grade	Adult
no of texts	13	4	2	1

The number of texts that use lexical repetitions decreases as subjects gets older. While 13 texts out of 23 in 5th grade count on the repetitions of evaluative statements, there are only a few texts that use lexical repetitions extensively among

7th and 9th graders. There is likely to be a correlation between the abundance of repetition of evaluative predicates and the lack of MOVE 1 and/or MOVE 3. The fact that global structural MOVEs in 5th graders' texts are usually missing to state their evaluations in the beginning and bind everything that follows under that evaluation may be the reason behind their tendency to repeat evaluative predications more than expected to create cohesion.

The quantitative analyses of cohesive resources presented in this section provide us with an overview of the trends observed in the data. Along these trends we can also track the developmental path in the use of cohesive resources in ensuring the connectivity between statements on the surface. In the following section, we aim to enrich the analysis by qualitative discussions.

5.3 COHESION IN 5TH GRADERS' TEXTS

5.3.1 Referential Cohesion

The striking point that is most relevant to the referential cohesive properties in 5th graders' texts is their dependency on the immediate context provided by the video film as the following text exemplifies:

1. "(MOVE 1) [c] (1)Yaptıkları çok yanlıştı. // (MOVE 2) [a] (2) Ne olursa olsun kopya çekmemeleri lazımdı. (3)Kopya çekmek öğretmenine ve arkadaşlarına yapılmış çok büyük bir yanlışlıktı.
(4)Arkadaşlarına selam vermesi lazımdı.
(5)Orda kavga yapmaması gerekirdi. (6)Arkadaşlarını ayıran o kişi çok iyi birisiydi."

"(MOVE 1) [c] (1) (The things) that they have done were so wrong. // (MOVE 2) [a] (2) (They) should not have cheated in any case. (3) Cheating was a big fault committed to his/her teacher, and friends.

(4) (S/he) should have said hello to his/her friends.

(5) (S/he) shouldn't have fought there. (6) The person who separated their friends was a very good person."

TL-P01A-WE

Representative of the 5th graders' texts, the writer above uses definite elliptical constructions such as a headless relative clause construction *yaptıkları* (do-RELATIVIZER-AGREEMENT) as the subject of the first sentence. Beginning with this headless expression in the example (8), the writer anchors the referents both exophorically and endophorically. First, it refers to the video as its anaphoric referent exophorically by signaling that the writer will comment about the things that the children did in the video. Introducing the episodes from the video by using a headless construction indicates that the child mainly depends on the immediate context, i.e. our video, while constructing his texts. In this respect, the use of such a headless construction at the very beginning may seem as a mistake in referent introduction, yet it is likely that the child uses it as a part of his cohesive strategy in two ways. First, recall that there is no speech in our video; the people in it do not have a name. That may render the agents in the video impersonal, and the message of the video impersonal and generalized. So, using headless relative clause also brings impersonal and generalized voice in the text above, hence creating cohesion by exophoric links to the context. Furthermore, headless relative clause also has the role of anchoring the following events (such as cheating, and fighting in MOVE 2) to the evaluative judgment in MOVE 1. Therefore, with a headless construction the writer establishes a kind of referential dependency between the lexical items in two MOVEs as tight as possible. In the other 5th graders' texts as well, the statements like

yaptıkları (do-RELATIVIZER-AGREEMENT) or *bu davranışlar* "these acts" are used extensively in MOVE 1 to link the evaluative judgment about the episodes in MOVE 1 to the whole text.

Furthermore, the heavy use of referent ellipsis in the text (8) such as in sentences (2), (3), and (5) makes it difficult to follow referents in the text, because it is not clear who is doing all the wrong acts to whom. The referential chain built by elliptical agent constructions leads to the inference that the agents are all the same, yet the child mentions different agents from the video.

Similar to (8), most of our 5th graders use subject ellipsis and also deictic referents that have exophoric ties with the immediate context, i.e. our video. These elliptic subjects do not have any referent in the text most of the time. Therefore it seems difficult to construct cohesive ties in the text itself at this grade, since 5th grader writers count most of the time on the immediate context.

5.3.2 Conjunction

Using conjunctions is not a developed cohesive strategy among 5th graders' texts, yet. We come across only 8 different coordinative conjunctions from 5 semantic categories used in the data: additive *ve* "and", temporal *sonra* "then", and *o zaman* "then", adversative *ama* "but", paraphrasing *yani* "that is to say", causal *için* "so", *çünkü* "because", and *böylece* "thereby". Since list-type texts dominate in 5th graders' texts, at least one of each type is present in this group of texts. However, the most frequent conjunctives are additive *ve* "and" and adversative *ama* "but"; the first is being used dominantly in list-type texts, and the latter in MOVE 2. Moreover, the highest number of conjunctives appears in MOVE 2. Consider the following text:

2. “(MOVE 1) [b] (1) Araçlara zarar verme :
[c] (2) Benim bu konuda düşüncem tek kelime ile kötü olur. // (MOVE 2) [c] (3) Türkiyede hemen hemen bazı okullarda araç yok. (4) Ama dış ülkede bu imkanlar mümkün (5) ama öğrencilerin araçları iyi kullanmadığını flimde gördük. (6) Ama Türkiye’deki okullarda bu mümkün olsaydı bence zarar verilmezdi.//
(MOVE 3) [d] (7) Benim düşüncem budur.”

“(MOVE 1) [b] Damaging equipments.
[c] (2) My opinion about this subject, in one word, it is bad. // (MOVE 2) [c] (3) There is no equipment in almost all schools in Turkey. (4) But abroad, these facilities are accessible, (5) but we have seen in the movie that they could not use them properly. (6)But if it were possible at schools in Turkey they would not be damaged. //
(MOVE 3) [d] (7) This is my opinion.

TL-P11B-WE

In this example, the child uses all three conjunctions in MOVE 2 and all are adversative conjunction *ama* “but”. He emphasizes the source of the problem in MOVE 2 by repeating *ama* “but” conjunction successively in a cohesive way. Yet, note that the repetitious use of one conjunction, i.e. *ama* “but” through the text indicates that the attempt to bind sentences via conjunctions is not mature enough at this grade.

We come across only 2 texts at this grade that utilize the sentential conjunctions such as paraphrasing *yani* “that is to say” and resultative *böylece* “thereby” while concluding MOVE 3 like the following text.

3. “(MOVE 2) [a] “(1)Kopye çekmek hırsızlık yapmaktır. (2)*Mesala* bir adam (adamın) bir kişiyi ayırması doğru olmaz. (3)Adam telefondan kartını çıkaramadıysa tamirci yapar (4)tamirci çağırmalı telefonu atmamalıydı. (5)Kızda kadının parasını geri vermeliydi. (6)Yani bu davranışlar çok kötüdür.”

“(1) Cheating is committing theft. (2)For example, it is not proper if one man discriminates another. (3)When the man couldn’t take out his (telephone)card from the telephone, the repairman can fix it (4)(he) should call

repairman, but (he) shouldn't have thrown the phone. (5) And the girl should have given the woman's money back. (6) That is to say these behaviors are very bad."

TL-P07A-WE

The use of the connector *yani* "that is to say" at the beginning of sentence (5) in example (3) shows that the writer is about to say the final word to paraphrase all her statements in one sentence. The resultative *böylece* "thereby" has the similar function in MOVE 3. Instead using conjunctions in MOVE 3, all our 5th graders prefer to repeat the statements in MOVE 1 again in MOVE 3 (see Chapter 4).

5.3.3 Temporal, aspectual, modal cohesion

In example (8), we observed that the temporal continuity is obtained through the use of the narrative past tense. Along MOVE 1 and MOVE 2, the child uses past tense "-DI" without making any shift between the two MOVEs.

In the texts which have MOVE 3, writers change temporal, aspectual, and modal parameters when passing from MOVE 2 to MOVE 3. For example, the previous example (3), lacks opening MOVE 1 yet MOVE 2 and MOVE 3 are present. The writer concludes her text with MOVE 3. In differentiating two MOVEs, there is a clear temporal and aspectual distinction between MOVE 2 and MOVE 3. The child uses present aorist along MOVE 2 for presenting her ideas and judgment. However, she switches to necessity modality in past tense in MOVE 3. Since MOVE 3 has two STEPs, the writer builds the coherence inside the MOVE accordingly. In STEP 1, she states what should have been done in the video, so she uses necessity modality in past tense. On the other hand, in STEP 2 she states her evaluative

judgment to wrap up. In the last STEP, the writer uses again present aorist to state her final judgment at the end.

In Turkish, an additional way to state what should be done together with necessitative "-mAlI" is to use impersonal "*biz*" as the subject with 1st person plural marking on the verb. The impersonal "*biz*" shows up in MOVE 3 in several texts among 5th graders. Here is one example:

> 4. "(MOVE 1) [c] (1) Hareketleri çok kötüydü. // (MOVE 2) [a] (2) Kopya çekiyor, kavga ediyordu. (3) İyi olmalıydı. // (MOVE 3) [b] (4) Saygılı olmalı başkaları (başkalarının) hakkını *yememeliyiz*. (5) Herkezi *saymalıyız*."
>
> "(MOVE 1) [c] (1) His/her acts were very bad. // (MOVE 2) [a] (2) S/he was cheating, (and) fighting. (3) S/he should have been good. // (MOVE 3) [b] (4) We should be respectful, and not cheat others. (5) We should respect everybody."
>
> TL-P02A-WE

The example above has three MOVEs. In MOVE 1, the child states his judgment about "the behaviors" that have direct links to the video. The behaviors are specified in the succeeding MOVE 2. Finally, MOVE 3 states in the first STEP what should be the right behavior for the agent who is given in ellipsis through the text. Among 5th graders, the 1st person plural marking is present mainly in MOVE 3. In the example above, the writer shifts from the specific 3rd person agreement to the unspecific and impersonal 1st person plural marking in MOVE 3. This change also makes the shift from specific event of cheating and fighting to general voice of advice. Although we called 1st person plural markings in the last two sentences as impersonal, it also indicates that the child talks through a group identity, which is presumably "students". The inclusion of oneself in a student group is clear when the writer talks about cheating or fighting, yet it gets blurred when he/she uses 1st person

plural marking while making a statement in the case of illicit money. Since stealing money from someone is something that no one should do, the use 1st person plural marking indicates more impersonality than it does in the example (4). So, we concluded although 1st person plural marking has some specific sense through the group of students; it still carries the impersonal and general tone of giving advice.

5.3.4 Lexical cohesion

A last and most common strategy of 5th graders is repetition, which is observed in two forms in creating cohesion. It may be the repetition of lexical elements; or it may be the repetition of a structure, i.e. parallelism.

To begin with lexical repetition, when the writer has difficulty in binding his/her statements, it seems that he/she attempts to repeat especially evaluative statements through the text as in the text below:

> 5. " (MOVE 1) (1) [a&c] Filim *çok kötüydü*. // (MOVE 2) (2) [a] Kopya çekmek *çok kötü* birşey. (3)Bara yere düştüğünde onu geri vermeliyiz. (4)*Çok kötü*. (5)O parayı geri vermeliyiz. (6)Hirsızlık, haram. (7)Kopyada çekmemeliyiz. (8)O da *çok kötü*.
>
> "(MOVE 1) (1) [a&c] The film was very bad. // (MOVE 2) (2) [a] Cheating is a very bad thing. (3) When the money drops, we should give it back. (4)Very bad (5) We should give that money back. (6) Theft, illicit. (7) We shouldn't cheat, too. (8) That is very bad too."
>
> TL-P08A-WE

In (5), the predicate *çok kötü* "very bad" is repeated at the end of each statement. Besides, sentence (3) is paraphrased in sentence (5). Although this 5th

grader uses also tense and aspect markers to bind her statements, another major cohesion resource seems to be the lexical repetitions in the example above.

Similar to lexical repetitions of 5th graders, parallelism is also a feature of texts that do not have complete global MOVEs. As indicated in the previous chapter, the common characteristic of this group is to list several problematic episodes from the video. Consider the following text:

6. "(1)Televizyonda izlediğimiz gibi kopya çekenler, kopya çektikleri arkadaşlarını her yazılıda kopya çektikleri arkadaşlarını bulamazlar. (2) Bunun için başarılı olamazlar. (3) Arkadaşlarıyla kavga eden çocuk, kendisi darda kaldığı zaman onu arar (4)ve yaptığı hatayı anlar. (5) Çok üzülür.

(6) Arkadaşını sevmeyen insan, onu küçümseyen olan o zaman ondan yardım ister (7) ve arkadaşını küçümsediği için üzülür. (8)Yaptığı hatayı anlar.

(9) Telefonu tekmeleyen, yumruk atıpta devletine verdiği zararı anlamaz. (10) Kötü bir davranış haline gelir. (11) İnsanlar onu kötü davranışı yüzünden küçümserler.

(12) Bir kişi arkadaşını sevmeyip öbür arkadaşının da onu sevmemesini teşvik ederse, onu zorlarsa ben kötü bir davranış olduğunu anlarım.

(13) Kadının düşürdüğü parayı alıp kaçması kötü bir davranıştır. (14) Bu hırsızlık olur. (15) Bu da kötü arkadaş ve iyi öğretmeyen anne baba olur."

"(1) As we watch on TV (studies) cheating in the exam can not find their friends in all the exams. (2) Therefore, they can not be successful. (3) The kid, who fights with his friends, needs him when he is in a tough situation (4) and he understands his mistake. (5) (He) becomes very upset.

(6) (He) who doesn't like his friend, humiliates him, asks his favor and (7) becomes very upset because he humiliated him. (8) Then he understands the mistake.

(9) (He) Who kicks and also punches the phone, doesn't understand that he/she does harm to his state. (10) It becomes a bad habit. (11) People humiliate him because of his bad attitude.

(12) If a person doesn't like his friend (and) also if encouraging his other friend not to like him, if he forces him, I understand that it is a bad attitude.

(13) Taking the women's dropped money (and) running away with it is a bad attitude (of her). (14) It becomes theft. (15) He/it becomes bad friend and ignorant mother and father." TL-P03B-WE

The paragraphs in the text above are constructed parallel to another by repeating the same structures. Except the last two, all the paragraphs start with a relative clause identifying the agent of wrong behavior, which are the subject of the matrix clauses. Moreover, the same temporal and aspectual markers are used in each paragraph. "-DIr" marking for nominal predicates and the aorist attached to verbal predicates are repeated in characterizing the possible consequences of each behavior as normative statements.

In addition, the contents of every paragraph are almost the same. First the agent of the problematic behavior is given in a relative clause construction at the beginning of the paragraphs. After the agent and the wrong behavior are mentioned, the writer speculates about the consequences of the behavior and states what the behavior will lead to at the end of each paragraph.

To sum up, the 5th graders tend to use subject ellipsis or definite NP subjects that lead to establish exophoric referential chains to the video. It appears that the development of references endophorically is difficult for 5th graders. In different MOVEs, they use different temporal, aspectual, and modal cohesive resources. Nevertheless using sentential conjunctions for marking MOVE switching is not developed yet. Furthermore, the recurrence of structures and lexical items -including TAM markers- is another cohesion strategy to be used in especially list-type texts at 5th grade.

5.4 COHESION IN 7TH GRADERS' TEXTS

It was seen that the properties of coherence of 7th graders' texts are similar to those of 5th graders' texts. There are also a number of similarities between these two groups in terms of cohesion.

5.4.1 Referential cohesion

To begin with, introducing referent and establishing a proper referential chain through the text seem to pose problems for 7th graders although they show improvements compared to the 5th graders. One such example follows:

> 7. "(MOVE 1) [a] (1) *İzlediğimiz video filminde bir kızın* önündeki bayanın çantasından düşen parayı bayana vermek yerine alıp cebine koyduğunu gördük.
> (2) *Bu kız* paranın bayana ait olduğunu bilerek parayı ona vermek yerine *kendisi* alıyor. [c] (3)Bu bir nevi hırsızlıktır. // (MOVE 3)
> [d] (4) *Bu kızın* yaptığı kötü bir davranıştır."
>
> "(MOVE 1) [a] (1) In the video we watched, we saw that a girl put the money, which was drop from the bag of a lady in front of her, in her pocket instead of giving money back to the lady. (2) As knowing that the money belongs to the lady, the girl takes the money instead of giving it to her. [c] (3) This is a kind of theft. //
> (MOVE 3) [d] (4) What this girl did is a bad behavior."
>
> TL-S10A-WE

The example above begins with the expression *İzlediğimiz video filminde* "In the movie that we watched", which tells the reader that the starting point of this exposition is a movie that they watched. Represented by the example above, 7th graders can successfully anchor their texts to the video because they support that attempt with proper referent introduction.

As in the example above, 55% of 7th graders achieve introducing the referents in the movie with an indefinite NP like *bir kız* "a girl". In (7), after its first mention, the subject NP is mentioned three times again, but this time as a definite referent such as *bu kız* "this girl", *kendisi* "herself", and *bu kız* "this girl". These references establish a referential chain and thereby create cohesion of the referential kind. Even when the text lacks argument development or global structural MOVEs, referential chains are constructed properly most of the time as is evident in (7).

5.4.2 Conjunction

We find that 7th graders have acquired the cohesive function of sentential connectors in their texts. There are 11 different types of coordinating conjunctions from 6 semantic categories amounting to 39 tokens used at this grade: additive *ve* "and", temporal s*onra* "then", and *önce* "before", adversative *ama* "but", and *fakat* "but", alternative *veya* "or", *ya da* "or", and *oysa* "nevertheless", paraphrasing *yani* "that is to say", and causal *çünkü* "because", and *bu yüzden* "because of that".

7th graders use the highest frequency of coordinating conjunctions in MOVE 2. Almost all of the conjunctions appear in the texts at this grade are recruited in the developing MOVE where the problem is characterized, i.e. 32 tokens. It indicates that 7th graders begin to count on conjunctives to create cohesion in MOVE 2 more than the other MOVEs. Our following example does not have MOVE 3, yet it has a quite developed MOVE 2 thanks to the conjunctions:

> 8. "(MOVE 1) (1) [c] Arkadaşlarımızın bu tür olaylardan uzak durmasını isterdim. (2) [a] Vidyo'daki abilerimizin yaptıkları pis şeyler aslında çok *kötüdür*. // (MOVE 2) [a] (3) Arkadaşlarımız yazılı oluyorlar (4) evlerinde

çalışmadan gelip okulda yazılı olur kan (olurken) kopya çekiyorlar. (5)*Aslında* kopya çekerken öğretmenlerini kandırdıklarını sanıyorlar. (6)*Ama aslın da* kendilerini kandırıyorlar.

(7)*Ikinci bir olay* ise okulun koridorunda kavga yapıyorlar. (8)Herkez kendilerini efe sanıp kendilerini güçlü sanıp hemen bir omuz atıyorlar (9) ve kavgaya tutuşuyorlar. (10)*Üstelik* en ufak bir çarpmayla kavga yapıyorlar. (11) *Ve* ordaki bütün herkezin huzurunu kaçırıyorlar. (12)*Oysa* kavga yerine özür dileyip arkadaşımızın gönlünü almalıyız. "

"(MOVE 1) (1) [c] I would prefer my friends staying away from these kinds of events (2) [a] The bad things done by our fellows in the video, are very bad. // (MOVE 2) [a] (3) Our friends are taking the exam without having worked at home, (4) (so) they are cheating. (5) In fact, they think that they deceive their teachers while they are cheating. (6) But actually they deceive themselves.

(7) Secondly, they are fighting in the school corridors (8) As students consider that they are mighty, or the strongest one, they immediately shoulder through the crowd and (9) get into fight. (10) Furthermore, they put one fight caused by a little crash. (11) And they are disturbing other people there. (12) However, instead of fighting, we should propitiate our friends with an apology."

TL-S01B-WE

Most sentences in (8) include more elaborated cohesive conjunctions as opposed to the ones used by 5th graders. The conjunction *aslında* "infact" appears in the second sentence and is repeated three times successively. In sentence (6), the adversative conjunction *ama* "but" accompanies *aslında* "infact". The writer initiates the second episode with a sequential conjunctive *ikinci bir olay* "secondly" in sentence (7). After this sentence till the last one, every sentence has a conjunction in it that serves in the system of continuity such as *ve* "and", *üstelik* "furthermore", and *oysa* "however". They function in argument development in MOVE 2 by stating additive and adversative sides of the issue in a cohesive way.

5.4.3 Temporal, aspectual, modal cohesion

Besides its conjunctives, the last example (8) is a very representative one among 7th graders' texts in terms of its temporal, aspectual, and modal cohesive resources.

To begin with, (8) makes a statement in MOVE 1 with "-DIr" modal marking on the nominal predicate *kötüdür* "it is bad" in sentence (2). As the writer switches from presenting ideas and judgments in MOVE 1 to MOVE 2, he also switches the marking on predicates from generic aorist to the specific "–Iyor". Thereby the writer describes the events in MOVE 2 via successive uses of progressive "-Iyor" in a cohesive way. The use of "-Iyor" with 3rd person plural marking on the verb continues until the last sentence of that MOVE.

The last sentence of (8) again differs in modality and person marking. The last sentence switches to necessity modality and impersonal 1st person plural marking on its predicate in accordance to its voice to state what should be done. Note that the text does not have a global concluding MOVE 3, yet "-mAlIyIz" marking on the last predicate resembles a cohesive strategy in MOVE 3; therefore it may be a better candidate to end the text, rather than to end with a predicate marked with aorist.

Furthermore, the example (8) makes a statement in MOVE 1 with "-DIr" modal marking on the nominal predicate *kötüdür* "It is bad." in sentence (2). In 7th graders' texts, the modal marker "-DIr" appears in nominal predicates in MOVE 1 and in MOVE 3 more frequently than MOVE 2. It is particularly used when making a judgment about the problem and its solution like exemplified in the first MOVE of the following example:

9. "(MOVE 1) [c] (1) Arkadaşlarımız böyle olaylardan uzak durmalılardır. (2) Bütün davranışlar *yanlıştır*. (…)"

"(MOVE 1) [c] (1) Our friends should stay away from these kinds of events. (2) All the behaviors are wrong (…)"

TL-S02B-WE

The writer of (9) employs two –DIr's while making his judgment about the problematic event in the video.

5.4.4 Lexical cohesion

The example (8) also constitutes a model for the ways that 7th graders create cohesion in their texts based on lexical items. In the first sentence of (8) the problem is introduced with *bu tür olaylar* "these kinds of events", which, in the following sentence, is referred to as *vidyo'daki abilerimizin yaptıkları pis şeyler* "the bad things done by our fellows in the video". The referent of *bu tür olaylar* "these kinds of events" in MOVE 1 is elaborated in MOVE 2 with the use of hyponymy and repetition. That is to say, cheating and fighting are two types of bad behaviors shown in the video. Since the relation is based on classification, the cohesive function performed by the lexical items *kopya çekmek* "cheating" and *kavga etmek* "fighting" is of hyponimical type. After this attributive relation is established, it is supported by lexical repetitions of *kopya* "cheat" and *kavga* "fight" through the second MOVE.

Moreover, 7th graders repeat evaluative predicates in different parts of their texts, yet less frequent than 5th graders. One such example follows:

10. "(MOVE 1) (1) [c] Arkadaşlarımızın (arkadaşlarımız) *böyle olaylardan uzak durmalılardır*. (2)Bütün davranışlar yanlıştır. // (MOVE 2) (3) [a] Çünkü ;

kopya çekmek iyi birşey değildir. (4)Kavga ederken yaralana biliriz. // (MOVE 3) [b] (5)*Böyle şeylerden uzak durmalı bir birimizi anlayışla karşılamalıyız.* (6)Birbirimizin problemlerini beraber çözmeliyiz. (7)Aramızda konuşarak butür olayları çöze biliriz. (8)*Arkadaşlarımızı anlayışla karşılamalıyız.*

(9)Arkadaşlarımızı aramıza almalıyız. (10)Bizle dertleşçek birşeyi olabilir. (11) Onları küçümsememeliyiz. (12)*Onları anlamlı karşılamalıyız*."

"(MOVE 1) [c] (1) Our friends should stay away from these kinds of events. (2) All the behaviors are wrong. // (MOVE 2) (3) [a] Because, cheating is not a good thing. (4) We can be injured while fighting. // (MOVE 3) [b] (5) We should keep away from these kinds of things and have tolerance to one another. (6) We should solve the problems together. (7) We can solve all these kinds of problems via talking. (8) We should be insightful to our friends.

(9) We should mingle with our friends. (10) They may have something to talk with us. (11) We shouldn't belittle them. (12) We should be insightful to them."

TL-S02B-WE

There are 4 texts at this grade that reside on the repetitious use of predicates and clauses to emphasize their evaluative judgment. Similarly, in (10) two different evaluative judgments stating "*böyle davranışlardan uzak durmalıyız*" ("we should stay away from these kinds of behaviors") and "*arkadaşlarımızı anlayışla karşılamalıyız*" ("we should be insightful to our friends") are repeated several times.

To sum up, the cohesive features of 7th graders texts are similar to 5th graders in some aspects such as the wide use of temporal, aspectual, and modal resources to attain the cohesion in their expositions. As opposed to 5th graders, 7th graders seem to be more successful in introducing the referents and building referential chains along the text. The lexical cohesion achieved by repetitions of lexical items in 5th graders' texts is enhanced with the use of hyponymy at this grade. As the statements become more connected to one another, the items become more related on the surface level via coordinative conjunctions. These conjunctions are used especially in MOVE 2 in order to enable the argument development. Moreover, the modal marker "-DIr"

begin to appear in nominal predicates more frequently in MOVE 1 in 7th grade, compared to 5th graders.

5.5 COHESION IN 9TH GRADERS' TEXTS

9th graders were noted to differ remarkably in the rhetorical MOVEs they made in their texts than those of 5th and 7th graders. They begin to construct more complete rhetorical structure with opening and concluding MOVEs. In addition, 9th graders as a group write more similar texts with less variance. As for cohesion, the picture is more or less the same. At this grade, the cohesive resources that are in the process of developing in 5th and even in 7th graders' texts acquire full-fledged expression both in form and function.

5.5.1 Referential cohesion

Most of the 9th graders construct their texts around one topic extracted from the video such as *hırsızlık* "theft" or *şiddet* "violence". The following example illustrates a typical 9th graders' text:

11. "(MOVE 1) [b] ŞİDDETE HAYIR
(1) [c] Şiddet ; *insanlar* arasında çıkan anlaşmazlıklardan kaynaklanır.
(2) *Her insan* bir sorunu varsa bu şiddetle değil, konuşarak olumluya bağlamaları gerekir. // (MOVE 2) [c] (3) Okul içinde şiddet genellikle *öğrencilerin* oluşturdukları gruplar arasında çıkar. (4)Okul dışında şiddet genellikle *bir işi yok, kalitesiz insanlar (insanlardan)* kaynaklanır. (5)Okul içinde şiddet olmamalı, *öğrenciler* birbirine karşı saygılı, sevgili olmalı, dışarıya karşı birbirini korumalı, birbirine bağlı olmalıdır. [b] (6)*Bilgisiz, kültürsüz insanlar* genellikle şiddete başvurur.

[g] (7)*İnsanları* diğer canlılardan ayıran özelliklerden bir tanesi de; konuşmalarıdır. (8)Herşeyi konuşarak olumluya bağlırız. (9)Şiddet insanların kişiliğini gösterir. //

(MOVE 3) [d] (10)Ben şiddete karşıyım. [b] (11)Herşeyi konuşarak düzeltmeliyiz."

"(MOVE 1) [b] NO TO VIOLENCE

(1) [c] Violence results from the disagreements between the people

(2) Everyone should solve their problem by talking instead of violence. // (MOVE 2) [c] (3) Violence in school, generally occurs between the groups formed by students. (4) Violence outside the school, generally results from the unemployed (and) ignorant people. (5) Inside the school, there shouldn't be violence, students must be respectful and loving to each other, and they should protect one another from the outsiders and should be faithful (to one another). [b] (6) Ignorant, barbarian people generally employ violence.

[g] (7) One of the special feature that separates human beings from the other living beings is talking. (8) We always end up with a favorable result with the help of talking. (9) Violence shows the humans' character. //

(MOVE 3) [d] (10) I am against the violence. [b] (11) We should revise everything via talking."

TL-H10A-WE

As described before, there is more than one episode depicted in the video. To choose one or several of them depends on the writer. It is an increasing tendency with school grade to construct texts based on only one episode from our trigger. Some of our 9th graders choose one episode from the text such as cheating, while some others abstract a notion from the video such as violence as in (11).

All subjects and objects in (11) ("*insanlar, her insan, öğrenciler*"- "people, every person, students") are non-definite and non-referential, so they serve to generalize the statements in the text. Recall that almost all of the 5th and 7th graders use definite NPs that have referents exophorically anchored to the video in contrast to the 9th graders' non-definite and non-referential subject and object NPs.

Furthermore, it is also remarkable that all the sentences in (11) have fully expressed subject and object referents as opposed to elliptical subject NPs of 5th and 7th graders. *İnsanlar* "people" in the 1st sentence is chained with *her insan* "every

person" in the following one. The general meaning of *insanlar* "people" is reduced a bit by confounding it to the groups that students form in school. Again *öğrenciler* "students" is non-definite and non-referential. Although the writer qualifies the subject and object NPs with some adjectives like *bilgisiz, kültürsüz insanlar* "ignorant, barbarian people" in sentence (6), they still bear that kind of non-definiteness. So, the general voice is created with the help of the referential chains build in this 9th grader's exposition in (11).

Mastering referential cohesion makes a significant difference in the cohesive features of a text. In other words, the most successful texts in our data set are the ones which properly introduce, maintain, and reintroduce the referents in clearly constructed chains throughout the text. As the texts begin to be longer at 9th grade, this feature becomes even more important as exemplified in the following text:

12. "(MOVE 1) [e] (1) İzlediğimiz video programında gördüğüm hırsızlık olayını anlatacağım.

[a] (2)*Bir kadın* telefonunu çantasından çıkarırken yere bir miktar para düştü. (3)*Kadının* arkasından *bir kız* geliyordu. (4)Düşen parayı aldı (5) ve onu *kadına* vermeyip *kendi* cebine koydu.

[b] (6) *İnsanların* bir takım alışkanlıkları vardır. (7) Bu alışkanlıklar iyi yönde de olabilir, (8) kötü yönde de olabilir. (9)İzlediğim olayda da bir hırsızlık olayı vardı. [c] (10)Hırsızlık çok kötü bir davranıştır. (11) Bir kere yaptığımızda , birkaç kez daha yapma isteği duyarız. // (MOVE 2) [d] (12)*Yere düşen parayı bulan kız çocuğu* (çocuğunun yapması gereken) bu parayı o kadına geri vermek olmalıydı. (13)Bu yüzden *o çocuk* kötü bir davranış yapmış oldu. (14) *Belki parayı düşüren kadının* o paraya gerçekten ihtiyacı vardı. (15) Parasını düşürdüğünü anlayınca ve bulamayınca yapmak istediği şeyi yapamayacak ve çok üzülecekti. (16)*Parayı bulan kişi* ise; belki bir gün *kendisi* de aynı duruma düşecek ve geçmişte yaptığı şeyden utanç duyacaktı. (17)Bu yüzden utanç verici şeyleri yapmadan önce iyi bir düşünmeli ve daha sonra yapmamamız gerektiğini anlamalıyız.

// (MOVE 3) [d] (18)Gerçekten toplumumuzda bu alışkanlık çok fazla olmasada vardır. [c] (19)*Böyle insanlar* hep kaybeden insanlar olacaklardır. (20)Yani yaptıkları şeyden pişman olacaklar (21) ama iş işten geçmiş olacak. (22)*İnsanlar* böyle yaptıkça küçüklerimize bunun yanlış bir davranış olduğunu anlatmak da zor oluyor. (23)*İnsanların* birbirlerine güveni azalıyor. [b] (24)Bunu toplumumuza anlatmalı ve onları bilinçlendirmeliyiz. (25)Bu

davranışın tekrarlanmaması gerektiğini yaptığımız hatayı tekrar yapmamazın gerektiğini, eğer istemeyerek de yapmış olsak bundan kendimize bir ders çıkarıp yaptığımız hatanın farkına varıp bunun tekrarlanmaması için kendimize söz vermeliyiz.

(26)Her ne durumda olursak olalım hiç bir zaman hırsızlık vb. şeyler yapmamalı, diğer insanlara zarar vermemeliyiz."

"(MOVE 1) [e] (1) "I am going to relate the incident which we watched on the video.

[a] (2) While a woman was taking her mobile phone out of her pocket, some amount of money fell to the ground. (3) A girl was coming behind the woman. (4) She took the money (5) and put the money in her pocket instead of giving the money to the woman.

[b] (6) People have certain habits. (7) These habits can be in a good way (8) or in a bad way. (9) There was a theft in the event I watched. [c] (10) Theft is a very bad act. (11) When we do it once, we want to do it a couple of times. // (MOVE 2) [d] (12) *The girl who found the money* should have given it to the woman. (13)Thus she did a very bad thing. (14) Perhaps the woman who dropped the money really needed it. (15) She would not do what she wanted to do and she would be so sorry when she realized that she dropped her money. (16) The person who found the money would one day be in the same situation and be ashamed of what she had done in the past. (17) Therefore, we should think before we do something bad and figure out that we should not do it. //

(MOVE 3) [d] (18) This habit really exists in our society although it is not so common. [c] (19) Those people will always be losers. (20)That is they will regret what they have done (21) but it will be too late. (22)As people behave in this manner, it is really hard to tell the youngsters that it is bad. (23) People seem to trust them less. [b] (24) We have to explain this in our community and make the people become conscious. (25)This kind of behavior should not be repeated again, we should not make the same mistake again. Even if we make the same mistake unintentionally we have to promise ourselves that we should learn a lesson from that and that it should not happen again.

(26)We must not commit theft and harm other people under any condition."

TL-H07A-WE

The example above is different from the previous example in its rich rhetorical structure. Its rhetorical MOVEs are realized by nearly all the STEPs that we identified in the last chapter. For example, the student anchors the texts to the video, makes a general evaluative statement, exemplifies it with a fictive narrative, and lastly speculates about the consequences and gives advice. While doing all these

rhetorical STEPs, the referents are introduced several times and shift from specific to general[33]. First, the referents are properly introduced with indefinite NPs like *bir kadın* "a woman" in sentence (2) or *bir kız "a girl"* in sentence (3). These referents are picked up through anaphoric expressions several times in the unfolding text forming referential chains. The first chain is built in sentence (4) with a definite NP *kadın* "a woman" and the indefinite *bir kadın* "a woman" in sentence (2). The second one is established with a reflexive pronoun *kendi* "herself" coreferential with the indefinite NP *bir kız "a girl"* in sentence (3). One of the main strategies of this 9th grader is to avoid referential chains built by ellipsis. Although she uses one subject ellipsis in sentence (4), she takes it up with a reflexive pronoun *kendi* "herself" in the same sentence. After several sentences these referents are reintroduced again in sentences (10) and (12) with relative clauses identifying the woman and the girl, and anchoring them to the previously introduced woman and girl. Since referents are properly introduced and maintained across the text via some referential cohesive resources, the writer can easily shift between specific and general referents without a break in cohesion. The main referential chain that presents such a shift is given in the following list:

Referent	sentence no.
1. *bir kız* "a girl"	(3)
2. (*kız*)[34] – *kendi* ("girl")-"herself"	(4)
3. *insanlar* "people"	(5)
4. (*biz*) ("we")	(9)

[33] The reason that we put the referential cohesion at the first place in this example is the resemblance of it tense, aspect, and modality cohesion to that of other younger groups.
[34] The elliptical referents are given in paranthesis.

5. *yere düşen parayı bulan kız çocuğu* (10)
   "the girl that found the money dropped"
6. *o çocuk* "that child" (11)
7. *parayı bulan kişi - kendisi* (14)
   "the person that found the money"-"herself"
8. (*biz*) ("we") (15)
9. *toplum* (society) (16)
10. *böyle insanlar* "such people" (17)
11. *insanlar* "people" (19)
12. (*biz*) ("we") (22) & (23)

The mentioned referents in the previous list construct the frame of the theft by sketching the responsible agents of that behavior. The first two are the specific referents involved in the theft taken from the video. Then with the 3rd referent the specific representative of the theft is generalized with a non-definite and non-referential *insanlar* "people". With the 4th elliptical referent *biz* "we", the writer adds the impersonal voice to her exposition. The following three referents are made specific as being anchored to the video. The writer repeats the impersonal *biz* "we" in the ellipsis with the 8th referent. After impersonal *biz* "we", the three referents *toplum* "society", *böyle insanlar* "such people", and *insanlar* "people" carries the pivot back to general. As a last referent, the writer uses the impersonal *biz* "we" once again to state what should be done. It is also important to note that the structure illustrated in this list is based on cycles. Every cycle ends with the impersonal referent *biz* "we" resulting in three cycles. The first CYCLE out of 1st, 2nd, and 3rd referents bears both specific and general. The second CYCLE (5th, 6th, and 7th referents) maintains only specific referents. And the last CYCLE (9th, 10th, and 11th

referents) is only of general type. Every CYCLE in our model ends with an impersonal referent *biz* "we". As a result, such an inner construction of these cycles enables the writer to manipulate the flow of information in a cohesive way. In order to build the objective generalities in the exposition, the writer first articulates the specific and general referents together in CYCLE 1. Then in CYCLE 2, she takes up the specific referents to elaborate her exposition by a specific commentary. Lastly, she binds all the referents with general ones in CYCLE 3 to end up with generalizations.

It is also interesting to consider the relation between the cycles and the MOVE structure. Our three- partitioned MOVE structure can be traced in the structuring of generality cycles, as well. The first cycle ends with MOVE 1, the second with MOVE 2 and the third with MOVE 3. That is to say, the rhetorical functions of the MOVEs coincide with the axis of generality of the cycles. For example, the specific-general character of the first CYCLE represents the establishment of the problem in the first MOVE. Then, the specific second CYCLE lays out MOVE 2 to characterize the problem. Lastly, the third CYCLE which is of general type corresponds to the general solution claiming of MOVE 3. So, the interdependent structure with MOVEs and referent building is a characteristic of 9th graders whose most developed example is given in (12) above. Our 5th and 7th graders lack this kind of mature structure.

5.5.2 Conjunction

The types of conjunctions used in 9th graders' texts do not differentiate from the ones in the previous groups. Similarly, 9th graders recruit 7 different coordinative

conjunctions from 5 semantic categories: additive *ve* "and", temporal *sonra* "then", adversative *fakat* "but", paraphrasing *yani* "that is to say", and causal *için* "as, because", *çünkü* "because", and *bu yüzden* "because of". Although the tokens of coordinative conjunctions in this group increase dramatically there is no difference in the usage of this cohesive resource between 9th graders and the younger groups.

5.5.3 Temporal, aspectual, modal cohesion

As children at 9th grade begin to produce texts having more complex rhetorical structure especially with newly-used STEPs, they adjust also TAM marking according to the demands of such a complex structure. Example (12) is also representative of complex TAM shifts observed among 9th graders. In MOVE 1, the writer begins with a meta-textual commentary by stating which problem she will address. This step is carried out by future –AcAK. As she switches to STEP "anchoring the problem to the video" in the same MOVE, she also switches the tense to past. Her last STEP in MOVE 1 is to "state the evaluative judgment about the problem" where the tense changes to present and normative/generic aspect with factive –DIr in sentence (6). Along this STEP, the writer switches constantly between factive –DIr on nominal predicates and its counterpart aorist on verbal predicates. In MOVE 2, a video-based narrative comes in to characterize the problem in past tense. Similar to this 9th grader, children in younger groups also prefer to use past tense as the dominant temporal marking. MOVE 3 changes the temporal pivot back to the present tense of general and factive voice of giving advice. Factive –DIr again takes up in the first STEP yielding factive generalization about the existence of theft. With the second STEP "speculating about consequences of the problem", tense

switches to the future –AcAK accordingly where factive –DIr accompanies it. In the last STEP, as the writer concludes by giving advice the obligation/necessitive modality –mAlI becomes the dominant mood together with 3rd person plural marking on the predicates.

5.5.4 Lexical cohesion

The strategy to use lexical items in creating cohesion changes as 9th graders produce one-topic constructions more frequently. For example, some sort of a definition statement about the topic may be provided at the beginning like the one in the previous example (11) repeated here as (13):

13. "(MOVE 1) [b] ŞİDDETE HAYIR
(1) [c] Şiddet ; *insanlar* arasında çıkan anlaşmazlıklardan kaynaklanır.
(2) *Her insan* bir sorunu varsa bu şiddetle değil, konuşarak olumluya bağlamaları gerekir. // (MOVE 2) [c] (3) Okul içinde şiddet genellikle *öğrencilerin* oluşturdukları gruplar arasında çıkar. (4)Okul dışında şiddet genellikle *bir işi yok, kalitesiz insanlar (insanlardan)* kaynaklanır. (5)Okul içinde şiddet olmamalı, *öğrenciler* birbirine karşı saygılı, sevgili olmalı, dışarıya karşı birbirini korumalı, birbirine bağlı olmalıdır. [b] (6)*Bilgisiz, kültürsüz insanlar* genellikle şiddete başvurur.
[g] (7)*İnsanları* diğer canlılardan ayıran özelliklerden bir tanesi de; konuşmalarıdır. (8)Herşeyi konuşarak olumluya bağlırız. (9)Şiddet insanların kişiliğini gösterir. //
(MOVE 3) [d] (10)Ben şiddete karşıyım. [b] (11)Herşeyi konuşarak düzeltmeliyiz."

"(MOVE 1) [b] NO TO VIOLENCE
(1) [c] Violence results from the disagreements between the people
(2) Everyone should solve their problem by talking instead of violence. // (MOVE 2) [c] (3) Violence in school, generally occurs between the groups formed by students. (4) Violence outside the school, generally results from the unemployed (and) ignorant people. (5) Inside the school, there shouldn't be violence, students must be respectful and loving to each other, and they should protect one another from the outsiders and should be faithful (to one another). [b] (6) Ignorant, barbarian people generally employ violence.

[g] (7) One of the special feature that separates human beings from the other living beings is talking. (8) We always end up with a favorable result with the help of talking. (9) Violence shows the humans' character. //

(MOVE 3) [d] (10) I am against the violence. [b] (11) We should revise everything via talking."

TL-H10A-WE

The single-topic texts seem to contribute to the lexical cohesion of the text. As in the example above, the topic "violence" is introduced in the heading and repeated in almost every succeeding sentence in the text. Such a lexical repetition is one way to create cohesion. An additional way is to use the antonym of the lexical item which is repeated. Here in (13), the writer uses both of them. When she does not repeat *şiddet* "violence" in a sentence, she employs its antonym *konuşmak* "talking" such as in sentences (7), (8), and (10). Thereby, the opposition between "violence" versus "talking" extends her exposition. In addition, she brings in a spatial contrast between *okul içi* "in school" versus *okul dışı* "outside the school" where violence is practiced. These spatial phrases are repeated in MOVE 2 in full form creating another resource for lexical cohesion. As a result, this 9th grader ends up with a tight lexical cohesion in her text with the repetition of the lexical items that are related with the core argument.

To conclude, 9th graders begin to construct cohesively tight texts in terms of TAM, lexical and referential cohesion. Along MOVE 1 and MOVE 2, 9th graders present their expositions in aorist aspect contributing the generic reading of their statements. In MOVE 3, they shift to necessitative "-mAlI" with mostly impersonal subject marking "biz". Their ability to use objective and general voice in their expositions evolved with their recruitment of general and non-definite subject and object referents that are expressed in full form compared to the 5th and 7th graders'

texts. Furthermore, tracing general referents in the 9th graders' texts evinced a more interdependent structure of coherence and cohesion that is absent in the group of our younger subjects.

In Chapter I, we indicated the main requirement of expository discourse as presenting information as objective generalities (Jisa & Vigué, 2005). In order to have an objective and general voice, one novel strategy of 9th graders is to use impersonal and non-definite subject and object referents through their discourse. Although the awareness of the objective and general voice begin to evolve from 5th and 7th grades, the recruitment of general subject and object referents cohesively in the expository texts seems to be a late development, because very few of our younger subjects (5th and 7th graders) attempt to build referential chain between definite and non-definite referents in their texts. The main reason of this inability is that younger subjects do not acquire the way to introduce non-definite referents in their texts yet.

5.6 COHESION IN ADULTS' TEXTS

In Chapter IV, we have observed that 9th graders' and adults' texts are more or less similar in terms of their rhetorical structure. As for cohesive features, adults' texts present more variation than they did in terms of coherence with 9th graders. At this stage, adult writers begin to recruit an additional strategy of downgrading the specificity of agency in their texts, i.e. passive voice. Recall that 9th graders only use general and non-specific subjects and object referents to achieve this function in their expositions. The following example instances a typical adult writing that uses passive voice and thereby left the agent unspecified:

14. “(MOVE 1) [b] (1)Okul yıllarında *yaşanan* problemler // (MOVE 2) [c] bence aileden kaynaklanmaktadır. (2)Okulda sorun yaşayan ya da yaşatan öğrencilerin; aile içerisinde bir kenara *itilmiş*, konuşma hakkı olmayan, yapabileceği ve isteyebileceği şeylerden yoksun *bırakılmanın* etkisiyle bu hale *getirildikleri görülmektedir*.

(3)Okulda arkadaşlarıyla geçinemeyen, sürekli kavga eden bir öğrenci, aile içerisinde şiddete maruz kaldığı ve bunun ancak bu şekilde yaparak kendini mutlu edeceğini düşünmektedir.

(4)Özellikle bu yaşlardaki çocuklar şiddet sahneleri içeren filmlerden de çok çabuk etkilenmekte ve o filmdeki karaktere uymak ve onlara benzemek için şiddete yönelmektedir.

(5)Sınavda kopya çeken bir öğrenci için ise; ailesi tarafından *cesaretlendirilmemiş*, *cesareti kırılmış*, kendine güveni olmayan bir insan olarak *yetiştirilmemesinden kaynaklandırılmaktadır*. //

(MOVE 3) [f] (6) Sonuç olarak bir çocuğun kişiliğini ve karakterini bulunduğu çevre ve özellikle aile belirlemektedir. (7)Bu konumda aileye çok önemli görevler düşmektedir. [b] (8)Ayrıca bir insanı özgür bırakmakla herşeyin güzel olacağı kanısına varmayın. (9)Çocuğunuzu sıkmayın, (10) özgür de bırakmayın. (11)O’nun kişiliğini oluşturmasında yardımcı olun (12) ve duygu ve düşüncelerini size açmasında güven verin. (13) Çocukların yaşadığı tüm problemlerin temelinde güvensizlik yatmaktadır. (14) O güveni çocuk görmeli.”

“(MOVE 1) [b] (1)To me, the problems in the school years // (MOVE 2) [c] stem from the family. (2) It seems that the students who have problems or make troubles at school are those who do not have the right to talk or deprived of what s/he wants or does within the family.

(3)A student who does not get along well with his friends or always fights is exposed to violence in family and s/he thinks that he can be happy by acting this way.

(4)Especially, children of this age are easily affected by the movies which contain violence and tend to become like those in the movies.

(5) A student who cheats in an exam must have been discouraged by his/her family, and this is because s/he has been raised as a person who does not have trust in him/herself.

MOVE 3) [f] (6) Finally, the personality and characteristics of a child are determined by his environment and especially his family. (7) The family has very important duties. [b] (8) Also, you should not think that everything will be nice by letting someone free. (9) Do not bore your child, (10) do not let him free. (11) Help them form their personality (12) and make them trust you so that they can easily tell their feelings. (13) It is always mistrust in the basis of children’s problems. (14) The child should see the trust.”

TA-04B-WE

It is evident in the example above that the writer’s heavy use of passive voice creates a neutral, impersonal and authoritative voice. As opposed to the first person

pronouns, with the passive constructions such as *"isteyebileceği şeylerden yoksun bırakılmanın etkisiyle bu hale getirildikleri görülmektedir*" in sentence (2), and "*yetiştirilmemesinden kaynaklandırılmaktadır*[35]" in sentence (5) add the text completely neutral voice resulting in detached author orientation. Use of passive voice in expository texts is a new strategy in adult group; 5th and 7th graders do not attempt to use passives while constructing their texts. Although 9th graders employ the strategy of implying unspecified agents with general and non-specific referents, passives are very rare in their texts. On the other hand, among adults there are 8 texts out of 18 that downgrade the agency by using passive voice. Surely, we can not argue that children up to the university level can not use passives based on their absence in even 9th graders' texts. However, it seems that adults discover discourse function of passives to suppress the agent as they get acquainted with the register of formal language which is a characteristic of academic writing (Tolchinsky & Rosado, 2005). So, they begin to recruit passive constructions a lot in their expository texts.

Another distinguishing trait of adult texts is the diversity in TAM marking used. Throughout the text, the author of (14) uses "-mAktA" on the predicates instead of the aorist. According to Akar (1998), this progressive aspect marker "-mAktA" is abundant in business writing. It contributes to the generality of statements by making them permanent normative states. So, adults seem to employ it as an indication of their familiarity with formal language. The appearance of "-mAktA" only in adults' texts may be the result of adults' encounter of different registers through their experience with literacy.

[35] The heavy use of passives leads to some bizarre statements like "yetiştirilmemesinden kaynaklandırılmaktadır" in sentence (5).

Together with "-mAktA" aspect, "-DIr" modals are used in every MOVE attached after "-mAktA". The combination of "-mAktA" and "-DIr" are used to generalize some statements as facts by the writer (Sansa, 1986) in (14). Compared to 7th and 9th graders, as "-mAktAdIr" are employed a lot by adults, "-mAlI" modality is getting used less in number (cf. TABLE 14 in Section 5.2). Especially in MOVE 3, the function of necessitative "-mAlI" is substantial for 5th, 7th, and 9th graders. Comparably, there is one "-mAlI" in the last sentence in the example text above. Instead of a heavy use of "mAlI" in MOVE 3, the author addresses families about what should be done by using imperative voice. The example indicates that adult writers abandoned necessitative "-mAlI" and seem to opt for alternative TAM markings while claiming a solution for the problem they exposed on such as factive "-mAktadIr" in MOVE 3.

It is also evident in other adults' texts that the dominance of aorist especially in MOVE 2 and "-mAlI" in MOVE 3 is disappearing. Consider combination of lexical "*gerek*" in combination with "-mAktAdIr" in MOVE 3 instead of "-mAlI" in the following excerpt from an adult's text:

15. " (…) // (MOVE 3) (8) Bence gençleri bu konuda da bilinçlendirmek ve sağlıklı bir birey olmasını sağlamak *gerekmektedir*. (9) Eğer yapılmazsa birey kendine kötü davranışlar ve alışkanlıklar edinecektir."

" (…) // (MOVE 3) (8)Young people should be made conscious about this case and it should be ensured that they will be healthy individuals.
(9)If not, teenager will get bad behaviours and habits"

TA-09A-WE

The combination of "-mAktadIr" with "*gerek*" creates obligation modality in the predicate "*gerekmektedir*" in sentence (8). It has a more formal and complex

construction than "-mAll" modality, and belongs to the formal register (Akar, 1998). In addition, the use of conditionals followed by future mood together with "-DIr" modal, which is also a common strategy of the adult group.

Beside weak author oriented texts; there are 4 texts where author directly starts from his/her feelings and/or experiences. Although less in number, such texts merit a discussion because they exemplify how author orientation affects cohesive strategies. In such texts, the writer does not use passive constructions, and the TAM marking differs accordingly as opposed to passive-dominant texts as illustrated in the following example:

16. "(MOVE 1) [b] (1)Okulun, giderek insanları bir tüketim çılgınlığına götürdüğünü *düşünüyorum*. [a] (2)öyle ki yapılan yapılan yatırımların çoğu öğrenciye dönemiyor bile. (3)Özellikle kaynakların kullanımı, fırsat eşitsizliği gibi… [c] (4)Biz sanki müşteriyiz (5) ve onlarda bu malı yani okulu nasıl pazarlayacağını düşünen ticaret adamları. (6)Durum giderek bu hali aldığı içinde eğitimciler ve öğrenciler arasında da bir güvensizlik ve iletişimsizlik var. // (MOVE 2) [I] (7)Zamanla okulun yerini kitle iletişim araçlarının alacağına *inanıyorum*. (8)O zaman insan, üzerindeki bu sınav, ezber ve para baskısında kurtulup, sertifika uğruna değil, kendini tanıma adına öğrenecek (9) ve öğrendiklerini paylaşacak. (10)Tabi yaşadığım ülkede bu ütopyadan önce fırsat eşitliğine dayalı ve öğrenci merkezli bir eğitimi *savunuyorum*. (11)Böylece sayfalarca ezberden ve zaman kaybından kurtuluruz belki. (12)Zaten yaşama dair öğrendiğimiz birçok bilgiyi arkadaşlarımızdan öğrenmiyor muyuz? // (MOVE 3) [a] (13)Önemli olan mezun olan robotlar yetiştirmek değil, (14) hayata hazır, kendini keşfetmiş ve üreten insanlar yetiştirmek.

"(MOVE 1) [b] (1) I think school lends the people to the crazy consumption more and more. [a] (2) Moreover, the investments made do not return to the students. (3) Especially the use of resources, equal opportunity etc. [c] (4)We are like customers (5) and they are like business men thinking how to market this good that is school. (6) Due to these situations, there are lack of confidence and communication between educators and students. // (MOVE 2)

[I] (7) As time goes by, I believe mass communication means will replace the school. (8)At that time people is going to get rid of the pressure of exam, memorization and money on themselves, thereby (they) begin learning not to get certificate, but to get familiar with themselves (9)and just to share learning.

(10) Of course in my country, other than this utopia I defence a student-centered education that is based on equal opportunity. (11)Then we may get rid

of memorisation of many pages, hence waste of time. (12)Anyhow do we not learn about life from our friends? //

(MOVE 3) [a] (13) The important things is not to raise not university-graduate robots, (14) but productive people who have explored themselves and get ready to life."

TA-09B-WE

We categorized texts similar to the example above as strong author oriented texts because the author uses first person pronouns and mental verbs in several places in the texts. For example, 1st person pronouns on the verbs like *düşünüyorum* "I think", *inanıyorum* "I believe", and *savunuyorum* "I defend" indicate the personal involvement of the author to the exposition. Furthermore, repeating of these perception verbs creates a lexical cohesion in (16). Note that aorist and necessitative markings prevalent in 7th and 9th graders are not preferred in this text, either. Instead of aorist "-Ir/Ar" and necessitative "-mAlI", there are progressive aspect and nominal predicates in MOVE 2; on the other hand what is important is given in a contrastive condition marked with infinitival on the predicate in MOVE 3. The semantic parallelism between "-Iyor" and zero marking on the predicates (Sansa, 1986) creates TAM cohesion in this text above. When the writer of (16) begins with "-Iyor" such as in sentences (1) and (2), she continues with zero marking on nominal predicates as in sentences (3) and (4), hence contributing the cohesion of her text. This tendency is evident in 3 out 4 strong author oriented texts.

In summary, we find that adults produce two types of expository texts differentiated in terms of author involvement. One is the group of texts having distanced and impersonal author perspective. This differentiation of adults' texts is also reflected in cohesive resources that the writer uses. In first group, i.e. with distanced author perspective, passive constructions and general nonspecific referents

are used widely. The second group of texts with involved and personal author perspective, on the other hand, contains 1st person pronouns together with perception verbs. The progressive aspect and zero marking on nominal predicates are prevailing in the second group of texts. Whether it is a strong or weak author oriented text, the dominant grammatical forms in the younger subjects decreases in frequency in the adult group, and adult group employs new forms to realize the targeted rhetorical structure such as "-mAktA", "-DIr" modal, and conditionals. The use of such constructions belongs to the acquisition of formal register which seems to be related to the literacy level of our subjects. As a result, it can be concluded that as our subjects mastered the novel uses of some grammatical forms, they attempt to use them as new cohesive resources. Also note that with the employment of other grammatical forms by adults, some dominant forms in 7th and 9th graders' texts such as impersonal *biz* "we" decreases slightly in expositions.

5.7 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, we analyzed the development of cohesion properties in expository writings of 5th, 7th, and 9th graders, and adults. The cohesive resources that we based our analysis on are reference, ellipsis, conjunction, temporality, aspectuality, and modality cohesion, and lexical cohesion. It seems that as our subjects have more experience in school they begin to construct tighter cohesion in their texts. Similar to coherence structure, 5th and 7th graders' texts resemble each other in terms of textual cohesion. On the other hand, the cohesive features in 9th graders and adults' texts do not correspond to each other as much as they did for coherence.

To begin with, we analyzed referential cohesion that is established by referential relationships between things or facts in our database. First, in 5th graders' texts it is hard to talk about the existence of referential cohesion due to their heavy use of ellipsis without having properly introduced the referents. Since 5th graders depend on the immediate context of our video extensively while writing their expositions, they introduced the referents from the video in the form of ellipsis. So, it is concluded that 5th graders rely on the immediate context that causes introducing the referents improperly. Without introducing referents with indefinite NPs, they use definite subject and object NPs in their texts. So, it becomes hard for the reader to follow referential chains in the text. In other words, since subject and object referents are mostly given in ellipsis without their antecedents in the text, referential cohesion fails in 5th graders' texts. On the other hand, it is also noted that elliptical subjects establish strong links with the immediate contexts, i.e. the episodes in the video. 5th graders may fail in building endophoric dependency within the text, yet surely indicate strong exophoric dependency on the video. 7th graders are better in introducing referents and maintain them along the text. Therefore there are improvements in creating referential cohesion in 7th graders' texts. Even when the global structural MOVEs are lacking in the text, most of them construct referential chains properly with first an indefinite NP, then with anaphoras. From 9th grade on, subjects seem to work out how to establish the dimension of generality in their expositions through referential chains. As Jisa & Viguié (2005) indicate generality is a must in expositions. It concerns the writer's generalized or specific reference to the referents in texts. 9th graders and adults achieve this type of generality by using impersonal and non-definite subject and object referents through their discourse. For example, we analyzed the referential chains of subjects in one of 9th graders' text and

concluded that referential chains are built based on a cyclic structure in terms of generality. In CYCLE 1, the author mentions the specific and general referents together. Then, in CYCLE 2 she takes up the specific referents to elaborate her exposition by a specific commentary. Lastly, she uses general referents in CYCLE 3 to end up with generalizations. Adults' texts also have this cyclic referential structure in order to obtain an objective and general voice in their expositions. The only difference in terms of referential cohesion between 9th graders and adults has resulted from passive constructions in adult's texts. Since passive constructions leave the agent unspecified and silent, the non-agentive NPs construct dominant referential chains in such texts.

As for ellipsis, we come across referential chains built by subsequent to first mention of a referent mainly in our younger subjects' texts such as 5th and 7th graders. Comparably, our older subject groups -9th graders and adults- do not prefer ellipsis as one of their most common cohesion resources. Especially 9th graders avoid using elliptical referents. 9th graders and adults simply repeat their referents throughout their texts when needed instead of using ellipsis.

Moreover, using conjunctions is a means of coordinating clause complexes via logical relations. Conjunctions do not seem to be prominent cohesive resources in 5th graders' texts. 5th graders particularly recruit paraphrasing conjunctions in MOVE 3 to state their final word. The cohesive function of sentential conjunctions appears to be learned from 7th grade on. In some 7th graders' texts, MOVE 2 is enriched with additive and adversative statements to develop the main argument combined with conjunctions such as *ve* "and", *ama* "but" and in MOVE 3 *yani* "that is to say". In 9th graders' and in adults' texts, the statements become more connected to one another on the surface with the help of conjunctions. At these levels, we come across

conjunctions both in MOVE 2 to characterize the problem and in MOVE 3 to state a solution. Conjunctions are relatively less in MOVE 1. So, we can conclude that conjunctions are the cohesive strategy to get used mostly in MOVE 2 and MOVE 3 by our subjects except 5th graders.

Another cohesion strategy is lexical cohesion which is established by repeated sequences of lexical items, and thereby, their relation to the core sentences in the text is reactivated. Lexical cohesion is 5th graders' favorite strategy. Occasionally, they repeat their evaluative judgment such as *çok kötü* "very bad" several times along the text. Such lexical recurrences are specifically a feature of list-type texts. In addition to lexical items, structures and contents of paragraphs are repeated as well in 5th graders' list-type texts. Since MOVE 1 and MOVE 3 are responsible in establishing a global framework, the lack of them in list-type texts seems to result in repetition of the lexical items and structures in the exposition to build a relation between parts of the text. 9th graders and adults also use lexical repetition to create cohesion in their texts. However, they also recruit additional ways of lexical cohesion such as using antonyms. The antonyms of the core statements are also added to the exposition and repeated several times. So, repetition is one of the common cohesive resources at all grades. Yet, the repeated items differ as subjects gets older in school grade. As indicated, 5th and 7th graders repeat essentially the evaluative judgment that seems to be the result of their inability to construct global MOVEs. Since 9th graders and adults make their evaluative judgments in MOVE 1 and MOVE 3, they repeat the notion that they have abstracted from the video such as *şiddet* "violence" and its antonym rather than the evaluative judgment.

The last three cohesive resources we analyzed are temporality, aspectuality, and modality marked on predicates. Since they show an interdependent function in

creating cohesion in texts, we gather them in one category here. Although generally it is difficult to analyze TAM continuity separately in our texts, our younger subjects appear to be constrained in managing these three grammatical resources together in their texts. At 5th grade, children tend to count on particularly temporal continuity via past tense marker "-DI" because they based their expositions on the episodes from the video directly. Past tense continuity is especially a feature of texts where MOVE 3 is absent. It seems that MOVE 3 brings its temporal, aspectual, and modal characteristics in. Aspectual aorist and modal necessitative continuity come forth where MOVE 3 is present, even when the text lacks a MOVE 1. 5th and 7th graders resemble each other in using aorist aspect and necessitative modality while stating what should be done in MOVE 3. They also recruit the impersonal "biz" together with necessitative "-mAlI" in giving a general advice. Contrary to the past tense continuity in 5th graders' texts, 7th graders attain the TAM continuity by using progressive aspect "-Iyor" in MOVE 2. It indicates that 7th graders shift from narrative past tense to descriptive "-Iyor". In spite of the fact that the modal marker "-DIr" appears on nominal predicates in some texts at 5th grade, the development of its use is from 7th grade on. The aorist aspectual continuity becomes dominant in 9th graders' texts. They recruit aorist aspect mainly in MOVE 1 and MOVE 2. Thereby, 9th graders' texts recede from factivity and acquired non-factive aspectual characteristics.

The great divergence in terms of temporal, aspectual, and modal characteristics is observed in adults' texts. First of all, the extensive aorist especially in MOVE 2 and "-mAlI" with impersonal "biz" in MOVE 3 are disappearing in this group, and there arise new temporal, aspectual, and modal features. Moreover, the use of these cohesive resources seems to be affected by the writer's involvement in

the text, i.e. detached versus involved. In the texts categorized as having detached author stance, the authors use passive constructions as a result of their encounter with formal language register through their school years. Instead of aorist, progressive aspect marker "-mAktA" together with "-DIr" modal appears in every MOVEs in this type of texts. As "-mAlI" is used less in MOVE 3, the adult writer adopts new marking on the predicates such as imperatives. So, the necessities of our young writers in MOVE 3 turn out to be factive generalizations in adults' texts. The predicate "gerek" is used at every grade of our subjects, yet the combination of it with "mAktAdIr" is only recruited by adult writers who prefer a detached voice as well. "*Gerekmektedir*" ("necessitate-PRESENT PROGRESSIVE-MODAL") has obligation modality in meaning. The more formal and complex construction of "*gerekmektedir*" ("necessitate-PRESENT PROGRESSIVE-MODAL") than "-mAlI" modality may be one cause why it is not used by our subject groups other than adults. Besides, effects of literacy may be another cause of its preference over "-mAlI" by adults. Since adults have encountered different text types and registers through years, they have become experienced in different discourse types such as official discourse. In this respect, the switch from "-mAlI" to "*gerekmektedir*" ("necessitate-PRESENT PROGRESSIVE-MODAL") may indicate that they give up textbook discourse to some extent and approach to official discourse.

Another group of text that is especially seen in adult group involves bears an author involved stance. In this group, instead of agentless passive constructions, the author places himself/herself as a reference point. The TAM cohesion in this group is produced by the use of progressive aspect "-Iyor" and zero marking on the predicates which are also parallel semantically. Such a TAM strategy is too complicated to get to be used by our younger writers. However, as subjects get experienced in different

functions of grammatical forms they can use complicated cohesive strategies in their texts.

To conclude, the cohesive strategies analyzed in this chapter show different developmental path in our subjects' texts. Some of them get acquired earlier than the others such as lexical and conjunctive cohesion resources. Although the strategy of referential cohesion is also present early on, our subjects make more sophisticated use of it by extending its function for another uses such as establishing the pivot of generality in their expositions after they get mastered it. As for temporal, aspectual, and modal cohesive strategies, the repertoire of these grammatical devices is expanded as writers gain experience in different types of discourse such as official discourse. In addition, as literacy level increases our subjects tend to use more complicated combinations of that repertoire.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION:

THE RELATION BETWEEN COHERENCE AND COHESION DEVELOPMENT

This study has analyzed the development of coherence and cohesion in Turkish expository texts written by children ranging from 5th graders to university level.

In order to analyze the coherence properties of our texts, we adopted the MOVE analysis of genre theory proposed by Swales (1990) and Bhatia (1993). It was observed that the subjects at each grade make similar opening, developing, and concluding MOVEs in their texts. Students as early as 5th grade start acquiring common genre knowledge without fully mastering it. Eventually, this genre knowledge brings about stable global structural parts in expositions around 9th grade. As the writers encounter with this situated practice of "*kompozisyon yazma"* "writing expository texts" again and again within literacy-based activities through 9th grade and university education, the MOVEs become more clearly structured at these levels.

The MOVE structure that we identified in our data has the following tripartite structure:

MOVE 1: Establishing (or introducing) the problem

MOVE 2: Characterization of the problem

MOVE 3: Claiming the solution

The ability to formulate all the three MOVEs in their exposition is fully developed at 9th grade. Before they reach the level of maturity, most of our younger subjects give lists of the events that happened in the video without a MOVE 1 and/or MOVE 3. Though few in number, some 5th and 7th graders tend to write about one topic chosen from the video. In these texts, the children also attempt to include rhetorical MOVEs compared to the children who merely give listings. Furthermore, the relative frequency of MOVE 1 over MOVE 3 in these texts indicates that opening MOVEs are developed earlier than the concluding MOVEs.

As the frequency of list-type texts decreases after 7th grade, the texts exposing on one topic increase significantly at 9th grade and adult stages. This also indicates that children beginning from 9th grade on have developed the ability to go beyond description and focus on one point to elaborate. In addition, all three MOVEs are present in almost all 9th graders' and adults' texts. Another distinguishing characteristic among grades is that the older subjects recruit a variety of rhetorical STEPs to realize their MOVEs. Although there are some texts at 5th and 7th grade that recruit a limited number of STEPs, older subjects have a fairly elaborate MOVE content realized by distinct STEPs. As a result, we observe that it is mainly the existence of STEPs that differs from one grade group to another, rather than the MOVEs themselves.

Since global organization of a text in terms of MOVEs determines the quality of coherence in it, the development in the ability to produce a complete MOVE structure indicates the development of coherence. While 5th and 7th graders performances are similar to each other, 9th graders seem to differ. At 9th grade and

adult levels, texts are more complete regarding the MOVE structure with its STEPs, and reflect mastery in creating coherence.

Furthermore, this study assumes that every clause is also dependent in its local context as well as in its global, i.e. textual context. The ability to relate clauses to one another on the surface is another aspect of text production maturity. Therefore, besides coherence we also studied cohesive properties in our data. It is observed that in written expository discourse some of the cohesion strategies such as lexical cohesion in forms of repetitions and TAM markers are put to use as early as 5th grade to create surface continuity between textual items. While lexical repetitions do not differ much between grades, use of TAM repertoire gets enhanced up to adult group. On the other hand, children seem to use some resources like coordinative conjunctions after 5th grade more frequently. Similarly, referential cohesion develops at around 7th grade, yet it acquires new functions in building cohesion across age groups.

Although we have discussed coherence and cohesion in separate chapters, we adopt here Hickmann's proposal (2003, 2004) that coherence and cohesion are two interacting processes during discourse development. In order to discuss how the features of coherence and cohesion might be related in text production abilities, some of our findings should be reconsidered here.

It is noticed that children's use of cohesive resources shows sensitivity to the rhetorical function of global parts of the discourse from early grades on. Among others, coordinative conjunctions, TAM markers, and referential chains deserve some concluding remarks.

We observe that writers at all grades use the widest range of coordinative conjunctions while characterizing the problem in MOVE 2. Especially the

frequencies of adversative and resultative conjunctions increase steadily through the adult stage as children acquire the ways of characterizing a problem in development part with different arguments.

The recruitment of TAM markers also gets differentiated along different MOVEs at different grades. For example, there is an overall preference for present tense in our expository texts. Present tense is especially preferred in MOVE 1 and MOVE 3. Only the 5th graders deviate from this general pattern. In their MOVE 1s, we do not see the prevalence of present tense. Instead, the present and past tense usage is distributed almost evenly. Recall that 5th graders have problems in constructing MOVE 1. Only 60% of their texts have it and when they have it they still run into problems in establishing temporal cohesion. After 7th grade, together with mastery over MOVE structure, the present tense preference in MOVE 1 and MOVE 3 becomes dominant in the expositions.

Likewise, certain aspect and modality morphemes are dominantly preferred in particular MOVEs in accordance with the rhetorical function of that MOVE. These morphemes are factive –DIr in MOVE 1, progressive –Iyor and aorist –Ir/Er in MOVE 2, and aorist –Ir/Er and necessitative –mAlI in MOVE 3. At younger ages (5th and 7th graders) children may also use other aspect and modality markers, however, these usages end up in less successful attempts in cohesion construction. As the preference of tense, aspect, modality usage converge especially at 9th graders' texts, a learning curve appears. As 9th graders have fully acquired the MOVE structure, the aspectual and modal pattern at 9th grade gets closest to the overall pattern. Similar to 9th graders, adults also use this aspectual and modal pattern in their texts. However, the frequency of these dominant aspectual and modal markings diminish in adults' texts, since adults opt for novel forms such as factive progressive

marker {-mAk+tA+DIr} and passive voice both of which are prime indicators of formal written language.

The other cohesive strategy that is observed as related to the MOVE structure is referential chains. In other words, as children gain more experience in expository writing, they begin to use referential chains to build tighter cohesion in their texts. Interestingly enough, the use of this cohesive strategy has the effect of strengthening the coherence, as well. Although the proper referential chains are begun to be constructed in 7th graders' texts, in later stages of development such as 9th grade, the subjects recruit referential chains to build generality cycles in their expositions. Each generality cycle marks a MOVE with a peculiar configuration of general and specific referents, hence gives the MOVE the required generality meaning. That is to say, according to the discourse function of MOVE 1 "introducing the problem" both general and specific referents are included in MOVE 1. Since MOVE 2 characterizes the problem, almost all the referents in MOVE 2 are of specific type. Finally, MOVE 3 claims a general solution to the problem; therefore the referents in MOVE 3 have mostly general meaning. As a result, especially with the uptake of referential chains with new cohesive function at 9th grade, we observed that the three-partite MOVE structure gets perfected in the texts.

Such tendencies to mark MOVE boundaries with temporal-aspectual devices and referential cycles lead us to conclude the partial constitutive role of cohesion in coherence which is also argued in Hickmann (2003) for narratives from different languages. We find in Turkish expository text that not all cohesive strategies but some of them such as coordinative conjunctions, temporal-aspectual-modal marking and referential cohesion appear to be more determining in marking the overall global structure from 5th grade on. As a result, children who are working toward mastery in

expository texts are likely to receive benefit from these cohesive strategies more. As the MOVE structure gets perfected gradually in children's texts, "new forms acquire old functions" (Slobin, 1973) as in temporal-aspectual-modal marking and "old forms acquire new functions" (Slobin, 1973) as in referential chains.

The second observation about the relation between coherence and cohesion is associated with coherence anomalies (i.e. weak coherence) in the data. It is noticed that the structural violations in younger children's texts may cause the writer to depend on mainly cohesive strategies such as lexical repetition. If the child skips a MOVE, he/she attempts to ensure the cohesive well-formedness of the text by overusing some cohesive strategies such as lexical repetitions and parallel structures. We remark that in texts where either MOVE 1 or MOVE 3 is absent, the child tends to recruit phrasal repetitions of his/her evaluative judgment through the text. In addition, when both MOVE 1 and MOVE 3 are missing, the child uses more parallel constructions than mere lexical repetitions.

Furthermore, it is argued that, compared to 5^{th} and 7^{th} graders, 9^{th} graders as a group write more similar texts with less variance in terms of both coherence and cohesion. The less variance among 9^{th} graders may be the result of the fact that they have acquired the global structure already. This finding supports the argument that the global structures keep more items active during text production processes (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981). As the global structure has been gradually mastered, the role of some cohesive strategies gets diminished accordingly.

However, it remains to be seen what kinds of effects the two modalities of speech and writing have on the coherence and cohesion properties of texts produced by school-age children. As indicated elsewhere by many scholars, generalizations based on a single modality may result in inadequate account of discourse

development especially in later levels of schooling. So, it will be interesting to compare the written expository texts with oral productions and observe how the two modalities influence the performances of children in creating both structurally and procedurally well- organized texts.

Another factor to be considered is the role of genre distinctions on the production of coherence and cohesion. It has been well studied up to now that the coherence and cohesion in narratives develops before school years. So, it is expected that children who have once developed the notion of coherence and cohesion in one discourse type transfer their skills to a new discourse such as expositions. However, the effects of early acquired narrative versus late acquired expository discourse on the structural and procedural aspects remain to be examined.

Moreover, a number of cross-linguistic studies have indicated that children's performances differ from language to another according to the available linguistic properties of the ambient language. At the same time, these studies have provided the sketch of general developmental patterns based on universal cognitive factors. Therefore, a study comparing the performance of children from different language communities as well as the performance of bilingual populations in a developmental perspective will clarify the general developmental patterns and language ambient effects on the production of coherence and cohesion.

Finally, this thesis enables us to study opening, developing, and concluding patterns of our young writers who are assumed to work toward mastery in the different types of school discourse. By using the tools of genre analysis, we end up with a tripartite MOVE model for Turkish expository texts which gives us the parameters for a successful structure of *kompozisyon* "expository texts" both at global and local levels. The power of genre analysis lies in its application for

language teaching purposes; therefore such a study about structural and procedural aspects of expository text production is relevant in teaching effective expository writing. Since expository texts are one of the critical discourse types to reach academic success, the application of our analysis requires further investigation.

APPENDIX

Projenin amacı

"Üniversite için bir araştırma projesi gerçekleştiriyoruz. Bu projenin amacı tek dilli ve çift dilli çocuklar ve yetişkinlerin yazılı ve sözlü becerilerini incelemektir. Bunun için veriler toplayıp, sizden konuşmanızı ve yazmanızı isteyeceğiz. Dilerim ki sizi kasete aldırmamızda bir sakınca görmezsiniz. Hiçbir şekilde amacımız sizin kişisel becerilerinizi ölçmek değil, değişik yaşlarda dil kullanımını ortaya çıkarmaktır. Ayrıca, araştırma tamamen gizli tutulacaktır (yani anonimdir)".

Ses kaydına başlamadan önce, birinci aşamada yapılacaklar

- "İlk önce, sizlerden kişisel bilgilerinizi öğrenmek için bir form doldurmanızı isteyeceğiz " (→ Formu doldurtunuz veya dolduran kişiye yardımcı olunuz) .
- "Biraz sonra sizden, insanlar arasındaki sorunlar, okul hayatındaki sorunlar ve çelişkili durumlar hakkında konuşmanızı ve yazmanızı isteyeceğiz. Ama ilk önce size bir okulda çekilmiş, çeşitli olayları gösteren bir video filmi izleteceğiz. Bu film size konumuz hakkında bir fikir edinmenizi sağlayacaktır."

KASETİ İZLETİNİZ (filmin sonundaki fotoğraflar hariç)

→Araştırmacı der ki: “Başlamadan evvel, sormak istediğiniz sorular var mı ?”

BİRİNCİ KISIM

Sözlü anlatım

→Araştırmacı deneğin yanına veya karşısına oturur, deneğin ismini kayıt cihazına söyler ve der ki:

Biraz önceki video filminde, değişik şekillerde sorunlar gördünüz. İnsanlar arasındaki veya okul yaşamında karşılaşılan problemleri kapsayan bir yazı dizisi oluşturmak istiyoruz. Şimdi sizden, biriyle başınızdan geçen bir olayı anlatmanızı isteyeceğiz.

İKİNCİ KISIM

→ Araştırmacı deneğin yanına veya karşısına oturur, deneğin ismini, kayıt cihazına söyler ve der ki:

(Duruma göre) “Dün / birkaç gün önce / biraz önce, insanlar arasında veya okul yaşamında gözlenen değişik şekillerdeki problemleri içeren video filmini izledik. Şimdi, insanların ve çocukların yukarıda belirtilen olaylar hakkındaki fikirlerini öğrenmek istiyoruz”.

Sözlü açıklama

" Gördüğünüz gibi sorunlar hakkında veri topluyoruz. Bu konu hakkında konuşmanızı istiyoruz. Sanki sınıf önündeymişsiniz gibi düşüncelerinizi tanıtın ve açıklayın. Bana hikaye anlatmayın. Konu hakkındaki görüşlerinizi açıklayın. İsterseniz, biraz düşünebilirsiniz, hazır olduğunuzda bana haber verin".

→Araştırmacı deneğin sözlü açıklaması esnasında hiçbir şekilde uyarıda bulunmaz. Onu sadece dinlemekle yetinir.

Eğer denek sorarsa	Verilecek cevap
-Kendi görüşümü de açıklayacak mıyım?	-Nasıl isterseniz.
-Hemfikir olmadığımı da söyleyecek miyim?	-Nasıl isterseniz.
-Konuyla ilgili düşüncelerimi açıklayacak mıyım?	-Nasıl isterseniz.

→Denekler, fikirlerini ve bilgilerini dahil edebileceklerini hissetmelidirler.

Yazılı açıklama

→ Araştırmacı deneğin yanına veya karşısına oturur ve der ki:

" Şimdi de konu (yani insanlar arasında veya okul yaşamında gözlenen değişik şekillerdeki problemler) hakkında bir kompozisyon yazmanı

isteyeceğiz. Konuyu kendi kendinize tartışın ve fikirleriniz açıklayın. Tabii istediğimiz hikaye yazmanız değil, kompozisyon yazmanız. İsterseniz biraz düşünebilirsiniz ve sonra yazmaya başlarsınız."

Eğer denek sorarsa	Verilecek cevap
-Not alabilir miyim?	- Nasıl isterseniz.
- Daha önce söylediklerimi mi?	- Aynı konu üzerinde yazınız.
- Kendi fikrimi de açıklayacak mıyım?	- Siz bilirsiniz.
-Farklı görüşümün nedenlerini açıklayabilir miyim?	- Siz bilirsiniz.

→Denekler, fikirlerini ve bilgilerini dahil edebileceklerini hissetmelidirler.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akar, D. (1998). *Patterns and variation in comtemporary written business communication in Turkey: A genre study of four companies.* Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Michigan.

Aksan, Y. & Çakır, Ö. (1997). İlkokul öğrencilerinin yazılı anlatımlarının metinsellik ölçütleri ve metin konusu oluşumu açısından değerlendirilmesi. In Şükriye Ruhi & Deniz Zeyrek (eds.) *XI. Dilbilim Kurultayı Bildirileri Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi 22-23 Mayıs 1997. Ankara: ODTÜ* – Eğitim Fakültesi Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü. (pp. 105-128).

Aksu-Koç, A. (1994). Development of linguistic forms: Turkish. In Ruth A Berman, Dan I Slobin (eds.). *Relating Events in Narrative: A Crosslinguistic Developmental Study.* Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ. (pp. 329-385).

Aksu-Koç, A. (2004). Role of the home-context in the relations between narrative abilities and literacy practices. In D. Ravid and H. Bat-Zeev Shyldkrot (eds.) *Perspectives on language and language development*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. (pp. 257-274).

Aksu-Koç, A., Erguvanlı-Taylan, E., & Bekman, S. (2002). Türkiye'de okul öncesi hizmete duyulan ihtiyaçların belirlenmesi ve çocuğun dil yetisi düzeyinin değerlendirilmesi. *Boğaziçi Bilimsel Araştırma Projeleri ve Anne Çocuk Eğitim Vakfı'na Sunulmuş Rapor* (Proje No: 00R101)

Applebee, A. N. (1978). *The child's concept of story: Age two to seventeen*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bamberg, M., and Marchman ,V. (1994). Forshadowing and wrapping-up. Linguistic forms and the constitution of part-whole relationships of a text. In R. Berman & D. I. Slobin (Eds.), *Different ways of relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic study*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. (pp. 555-590).

Beaugrande, D. R., & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics.* London; New York: Longman.

Bednarek, M. A. (2005). Frames revisited—the coherence-inducing function of frames. *Journal of Pragmatics, 37* (pp. 685–705).

Bennett-Kastor, T. (1986). Cohesion and predication in child narrative. *Journal of Child Language, 13*, (pp. 353–370).

Berkenkotter, C. (2002). Response(s) to William Grabe's "Narrative and expository macro-genres" In: Johns, Ann M. (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. (pp. 285-288).

Berman, R. A. and Katzenberger, I. (2004). Form and Function in Introducing Narrative and Expository Texts: A Developmental Perspective. *Discourse Processes* 38. (pp. 57-94).

Berman, A. and Nir-Sagiv, B. (2004). Lingustictic indicators of inter-genre differentiation in later language development, *Journal of Child Language, Vol 31*, (pp. 339-380).

Berman, R., Ragnarsdóttir, H., Strömqvist, S. (2002). Discourse stance. *Written Language and Literacy* 5, (pp. 255–290).

Berman, R. & Slobin, D. I. (eds.) (1994). *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Berman, R. & Slobin, D. I. (1994). Filtering and Packaging in Narrative, In R. Berman, and D. I. Slobin (eds.), *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study.*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum (pp. 515-554).

Berman, R. A., & Verhoeven, L. (2002). Crosslinguistic perspectives on developing text-production abilities in speech and writing. *Written Language and Literacy* 5, (pp. 1–44).

Bhatia, V. K. (2002). Applied genre analysis: Analytical advances and pedagogical procedures. In: Johns, Ann M. (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. (pp. 279-283).

Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Worlds of written discourse: A genre-based view.* UK: Continuum.

Bhatia, V. K. (1993) *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings.* Harlow: Longman.

Britton, Bruce K. (1994). Understanding Expository Text. In M.A. Gernsbacher (Ed.), *Handbook of Psycholinguistics* San Diego : Academic Press. (pp.641-674).

Bronckart, J.P. & Schneuwly, B. (1991). Children's production of textual organizers. In G. Pieraut-Le Bonniec & M. Dolitsky (Eds.), *Language bases ... discourse bases*. Amsterdam: Benjamins (pp. 143-156).

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second language writing.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

Eisenberg, A. R. (1985). Learning to describe past-experiences in conversation. *Discourse Processes,* 8, (pp. 177-204).

Enkvist, N.E. (1990). Seven Problems in the Study of Coherence and Interpretability. In U. Connor and A.M. Johns, (eds.) *Coherence in Writing: Research and Pedagogical Perspectives*. Alexandria, Virginia: TESOL. (pp. 11-28).

Esperet, E. (1991). The development and role of narrative schema storytelling. In G. Pieraut-Le Bonniec & M. Dolitsky (Eds.), *Language bases ... discourse bases*. Amsterdam: Benjamins (pp. 209-227).

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fivush, R., Gray, J. T. & Fromhoff, F. A. (1987). Two-year-olds' talk about the past. *Cognitive Development* 2, (pp. 393-409).

Fletcher P. (1981) Description and explanation in the acquisition of verb-forms. *Journal of Child Language,* Feb;8(1). (pp. 93-108).

French, L.A., & Nelson K. (1985). *Children's acquisition of relational terms. Some ifs, ors and buts.* New York, Springer Verlag.

Geertz, C. (1983). *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology.* New York: Basic Boks.

Givón, T. (2001). *Syntax: An Introduction. Vol. 1& 2.* Amsterdam; Great Britain: Benjamins.

Gopnik, M. (1989). The development of text competence. In M. E. Conte, J. S. Petofi & E. Sozer (Eds.), *Text and discourse connectedness. Studies in language companion series XXIV.* Amsterdam: Benjamins (pp. 225-244).

Göksel, A. & Kerslake, C. (2004). *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Routledge: Britain.

Grabe, W. (1987). In Ulla Connor, & Robert B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: analysis of L text Reading*, Mass. : Addison-Wesley, c1987. (pp. 115-137).

Grabe, W. (2002). Narrative and expository macro-genres. In A. Johns (ed.) *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives*. Mahwah , NJ: L. Erlbaum. (pp. 236-258).

Grabe, W. & R. B. Kaplan. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective.* London: Longman.

Guindon, R. & Kintsch, W. (1984). Priming Macropropositions: Evidence for the Primacy of Macropropositions in the Memory for Text. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior,* 23, (pp. 508—518).

Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London : Longman.

Halliday, M.A.K., & Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (Third Edition). London: Arnold.

Hickmann, M. (2003a). Coherence, cohesion, and context in narrative development: some comparative perspectives. In S. Strömqvist & L. Verhoeven (Eds.), *Relating events in narrative: Typological and contextual perspectives* (pp. 281-306). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hickmann, M. (2003b). *Children's discourse: person, space and time across languages*. Cambridge ; New York : Cambridge University Press.

Hickmann, M., Hendriks, H., Roland, F. & Liang, J. (1996). The marking of new information in children's narratives: A comparison of English, French, German, and Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Child Language* 23, (pp. 591-619).

Hinds, J. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: Expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Tai. In Connors and Johns (Eds.), *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives*. Alexandria: TESOL. (pp. 89-109).

Hume, D. (1955). *An inquiry concerning human understanding : with a supplement An abstract of a treatise of human nature* , Indianapolis : Bobbs-Merrill Co.

Jisa, H. (2000). Increasing Cohesion in Narratives: A Developmental Study of Maintaining and Reintroducing Subjects in French, *Linguistics 38–3*. (pp. 591–620).

Jisa, H. (2004). Trends in Language Acquisition Research 3. In Berman, Ruth A. (ed.) *Language Development across Childhood and Adolescence* (pp. 129-161).

Jisa, H., Reilly, J. S., Verhoeven, L., Baruch, E., & Rosado, E. (2002). Passive voice constructions in written texts. *Written Language and Literacy* 5, (pp. 163–182).

Jisa, H. & Viguié, A. (2005). Developmental perspectives on the role of French on in written and spoken expository texts, *Journal of Pragmatics* 37. (pp. 125–142).

Johns, A. M. (1997). *Text, Role and Context: Developing Academic Literacies* Cambridge Applied Linguistics: Cambridge University Press.

Kail, M. & Hickmann, M. (1992). French children's ability to introduce referents in narratives as a function of mutual knowledge. *First Language* 12, (pp. 73-94).

Kail, M. & Sanchez-Lopez, I. (1998). Referent introductions in Spanish children's narratives as a function of contextual constraints: *A Crosslinguistic perspective.First Language* 17, (pp. 103-130).

Karmiloff-Smith, A. (1981). The grammatical marking of thematic structure in the development of language production. In Werner Deutsch (ed.) The *Child 's Construction of Language,* New York: Academic Press. (pp. 121-147).

Karmiloff-Smith, A. (1986). From meta-processes to conscious access: Evidence from metalinguistic and repair data. *Cognition,* 23, (pp. 95-147).

Kaplan, R. B. (1983). *Learning to write : first language/second language : selected papers from the 1979 CCTE Conference, Ottawa, Canada.* In Aviva Freedman, Ian Pringle, and Janice Yalden (Eds.) London ; New York : Longman, 1983. (pp. 139-161).

Keçik, İ. (1991). *Text Processing Skills of Elementary School Children: A Study Based on Expository Text Type*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Hacettepe University.

Kehler, A. (2000). Coherence And The Resolution Of Ellipsis, *Linguistics and Philosophy 23. Kluwer Academic Publisher: Netherlands*. (pp. 533–575).

Kintsch, W. & van Dijk, T. A. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and production. *Psychological Review*, 85, (pp. 363—394).

Küntay, A. (2002). Development of the Expression of Indefiniteness: Presenting New Referents in Turkish Picture-Series Stories *Dıscourse Processes*, *33*(1), (pp. 77–101).

Labov, W., & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experiences. In J. Helm (Ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts.* Seattle: University of Washington Press. *(* pp. 12-44).

Levy, E. & Nelson, K. (1994). Words in discourse: a dialectical approach to the acquisition of meaning and use. *Journal of child language,* 21(2). (pp. 367-389).

Martin, J. R. (2002). A universe of meaning--how many practices? In: Johns, Ann M. (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. (pp. 269-278).

McCabe, A. & Peterson, C. (Eds.) (1991). *Developing narrative structure*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Martin, J. R. (1989). *Factual writing : exploring and challenging social reality*. Oxford, England : Oxford University Press.

Mayer, M. (1969). *Frog, Where are you?*. New York: Dial Books for Young Readers.

Menig-Peterson, C. L. (1975). The modification of communicative behavior in preschoolaged children as a function of the listener's perspective. *Child Development* 46, (pp. 1015-1018).

Menig-Peterson, C. L. & McCabe, A. (1978). Children's orientation of a listener to the context of their narratives. *Developmental Psychology* 14, (pp. 582-592).

Meyer, B. J. F. & Poon, L. W. (2001). Effects of structure strategy training and signaling on recall of text. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 93*, (pp. 141-159).

Miller, C. R. (1984). Genre as Social Action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 70*, (pp. 151-176).

Miller, C. R. (1994) Rhetorical Community: The Cultural Basis of Genre." *Genre and the New Rhetoric*. Ed. Aviva Freedman and Peter Medway. Taylor and Francis. (pp. 67–78).

Miller, C. R. & Shepherd, D. (2004). Blogging as Social Action: A Genre Analysis of the Weblog. In L.J. Gurak, S. Antonijevic, L. Johnson, C. Ratliff, & J. Reyman (Eds.), *Into the blogosphere: Rhetoric, community, and culture of weblogs.* http://blog.lib.umn.edu/blogosphere/women_and_children.html

Miller, P. J. & Sperry, L. L. (1988). Early talk about the past: The origins of conversational stories of personal experience. *Journal of Child Language* 15, (pp. 293-315).

Orsolini, M. (1990). Episodic structure in children's fantasy narratives: ``Breakthrough'' to decontextualised discourse. *Langauge and Cognitive Processes 5* (1), (pp. 53-79).

Papas, C. C., & Pettigrew, B. S. (1998). The role of genre in the psycholinguistic guessing game of reading. *Language Arts,* 75, (pp. 36-44).

Peterson, C. (1990). The who, when and where of early narratives. *Journal of Child Language* 17, (pp. 433-455).

Peterson, C. & Dodsworth, P. (1991). A longitudinal analysis of young children's cohesion and noun spedification in narratives. *Journal of Child Language, 18*, (pp. 397-415).

Peterson, C. & McCabe, A. (1983). *Developmental psycholinguistics: Three ways of looking at a child's narrative*. New York: Plenum.

Ragnarsdóttir, H., Aparici, M., Cahana-Amitay, D., van Hell, J., & Viguie´, A. (2002). Verbal structure and content in narrative and expository texts in five languages. *Written Language and Literacy* 5, (pp. 95–126).

Ravid, D., van Hell, J. G., Rosado, E., & Zamora, A. (2002). Subject NP patterning in the development of text production: speech and writing. *Written Language and Literacy* 5, (pp. 69–94).

Reilly, J. S., Baruch, E., Jisa, H., & Berman, R. (2002). Propositional attitudes in written and spoken language. *Written Language and Literacy* 5, (pp. 183–218).

Ruhi, Ş. (1993). İlköğretim 5. sınıf kompozisyon çalışmalarının içerik açısından bir değerlendirilmesi. In Kamile İmer - N.Engin Uzun (eds.) *VII. Dilbilim Kurultayı Bildirileri Ankara Üniversitesi 13-14 Mayıs 1993*. Ankara: AÜ DTCF Yayınları. (pp. 71-83).

Sansa-Tura, S., (1986). DIR in Modern Turkish. In E. Erguvanlı-Taylan and A. Aksu-Koç (eds.) *Türk Dilbilimi Konferansı Bildirileri Boğaziçi Üniversitesi 9-10 Ağustos 1984.* İstanbul: Boğaziçi Ü. Yayınevi (pp. 145-158).

Savaş, B. (2005). İlköğretim Okullarında Uygulanan Türkçe Eğitimi Programlarının Dilbilgisi Öğretimi Açısından Değerlendirilmesi. In XIX Ulusal Dilbilim Kurultayı Bildirileri 20-21 Mayıs 2005 Harran Üniversitesi. (pp. 66-86).

Shapiro, L. R., & Hudson, J. A. (1991). Tell me a make-believe story: Coherence and cohesion in young children's picture-elicited narratives. *Developmental Psychology*, 27, (pp. 960–974).

Shapiro, L. R., & Hudson, J. A. (1997) Coherence and cohesion in children's stories. In J. Costermans & M. Fayol (Eds.), *Processing interclausal relationships: Studies in the production and comprehension of text.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. (pp. 23–48).

Slobin, D. I. (1973). Cognitive prerequisites for the development of grammar. In C. A. Ferguson & D. I. Slobin, (Eds.), *Studies of child language development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. (pp. 175-208).

Stein, N. & Albro, E. (1997) Building complexity and coherence: children's use of goal-structured knowledge in telling stories. In M. Bamberg (Ed.), *Narrative development*. London; New Jersey: LEA. (pp. 5-44).

Strömqvist, S., Johnansson, V., Kriz, S., Ragnarsdóttir, H., Aisenman, R., & Ravid, D. (2002). Toward a crosslinguistic comparison of lexical quanta in speech and writing. *Written Language and Literacy* 5, (pp. 45–69).

Swales, J. (1990) *Genre analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tolchinsky, L., Johansson, V., & Zamora, A. (2002). Text openings and closings: textual autonomy and differentiation. *Written Language and Literacy* 5, (pp. 219–254).

Tolchinsky, L. & Rosado, E. (2005). The effect of literacy, text type, and modality on the use of grammatical means for agency alternation in Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics 37*. (pp. 209–237).

Tomlin, R. S., Forrest, L., & Pu, M. M. (1997). Discourse semantics. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as structure and process*. London: Sage. (pp. 63-111)

Topbaş, S. & Özcan, H. (1995). Anlatılarda Bağlaç Kullanımı: Normal ve Özel Eğitim Gereksinimli Öğrenciler Arasında Bir Karşılaştırma. *IX. Dilbilim Kurultayı.* Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Bolu.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Macro Structures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Verhoeven, L.,Aparici, M., Cahana-Amitay, D., van Hell, J. G., Kriz, S., & Viguié-Simon, A. (2002). Clause packaging in writing and speech: A cross-linguistic developmental analysis. In: Berman, Ruth A. and Ludo Verhoeven (eds.), *Cross-Linguistic Perspectives on the Development of Text-Production Abilities in Speech and Writing. Part 2: Special issue of Written Language & Literacy* 5:2. (pp. 135–161).

Widdowson, H. G. (1979). *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Witte, S., & Faigley, L. (1981). Coherence, cohesion, and writing quality. *College Composition and Communication, 32,* (pp. 189-204).