

**UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST**

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF COHESION IN ENGLISH AND EWE:  
A CASE STUDY OF SOME WRITTEN TEXTS**

**BY**

**COSMAS RAI AMENORVI**

Thesis submitted to the Department of English, Faculty of Arts, University of  
Cape Coast in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the award of Master of  
Philosophy in English.

**DECEMBER 2011**

## **DECLARATION**

### **Candidate's declaration**

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my own original work and that no part of it has been presented for another degree in this university or elsewhere.

Candidate's signature..... Date.....

Name.....

### **Supervisors' Declaration**

We hereby declare that the preparation and presentation of the thesis were supervised in accordance with the guidelines on supervision of thesis laid down by the university of Cape Coast.

Principal Supervisor's Signature..... Date.....

Name.....

Co-Supervisor's Signature..... Date.....

Name.....

## **ABSTRACT**

This study investigated how the Ewe language realizes cohesion in comparison with English. The study also sought to find out the extent to which either language in question interferes with the other in the use of cohesive devices among coordinate bilinguals, specifically Ghanaian undergraduate students reading Ewe as a major course of study. The findings revealed that both English and Ewe realize cohesion almost the same way, that is, by means of reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. There are, however, some differences when we focus on the individual cohesive devices, especially reference and ellipsis. The study further revealed that English, the second language of the respondents, had significant influence on Ewe, their first language, while Ewe had no significant influence on English as regards the realization of cohesion. These findings disprove the popular view in contact linguistics that only first languages have the capacity to interfere with second languages in the use of language among bilinguals. The findings indicate that the otherwise is also true and it is only that too much attention has been given to the former phenomenon to the neglect of the latter.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I am very grateful to the following persons who in no small way aided me in completing this work. First and foremost, I am heartily thankful to my principal supervisor, Prof. Lawrence Owusu-Ansah, whose encouragement, guidance, support and patience empowered me in conducting this study.

I have not forgotten the self-sacrificing spirit displayed towards me by my co-supervisor Dr.J.B.A. Afful in helping me to complete this work. I am grateful to them.

I would like to thank Dr.Dora Edu-Buandoh, Mrs. G.M.F. Akyea and Mr. Vincent Aziaku for their encouragement and advice before and during the preparation of this work.

I also offer my regards to all who supported me in any respect with this work, especially my dear and abiding friends Peter, Gershon, Jay, Jake, David, Silas, Frank and Daniel.

## **DEDICATION**

In memory of my twin brother Damian and to my parents, Gabriel and Bernice,  
my siblings and my dear heart Raina.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENT		PAGE
DEDICATION		ii
ABSTRACT		iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		iv
ABSTRACT		v
TABLE OF CONTENTS		vi
CHAPTER		
ONE	INTRODUCTION	
	Introduction	1
	Background to the study	1
	Types of bilinguals	3
	Types of language contact phenomenon	5
	Borrowing	5
	Pidgin and creoles	6
	Codeswitching and codemixing	7
	Interference	8
	Problem	10
	Research questions	10
	Hypothesis	11
	Significance of study	12
	Focus	13
	Chapter synopsis	14
	Summary	15

TWO	LITERATURE REVIEW	
	Introduction	16
	Theoretical framework	16
	Cohesion	16
	Grammatical cohesion	22
	Reference	22
	Substitution	25
	Ellipsis	27
	Conjunctions	29
	Lexical cohesion	30
	Bilingualism	38
	The contact between English and other languages	42
	Studies on cohesion and bilingualism	57
	Summary	60
THREE	METHODOLOGY	
	Introduction	62
	Research design	62
	Research sites	66
	University of Cape Coast	66
	University of Education, Winneba	67
	Population and sampling	68
	Data and data collection procedure	71
	Problems encountered	73

	Ethics	74
	Data analysis plan	76
	Views on findings	76
FOUR	DATA ANALYSIS	
	Introduction	78
	Cohesion in Ewe	79
	Reference	79
	Substitution	86
	Ellipsis	91
	Conjunctions	93
	Lexical cohesion	98
	Similarities and differences	108
	Differences in English and Ewe realization of reference	104
	Differences in English and Ewe realization of ellipsis	106
	English interference on Ewe	107
	Reference	109
	Ellipsis	113
	Ewe interference on English	120
	Summary	122
FIVE	CONCLUSION	
	Introduction	125
	Conclusions	125
	Views of respondents on findings	126
	Views of residents in Ewe-speaking communities	129



Views of students and scholars of Ewe	131
Implications of the study	134
Suggestions for further studies	135

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
Table 1: Respondents from UCC	69
Table 2: Respondents from UEW	70
Table 3: Ewe personal pronouns	83

# **CHAPTER ONE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Introduction**

This introductory chapter of the present study begins with the background to the study, which gives an overview of the outcomes of the contact between English and other languages. The section also discusses issues such as the research problem, the research questions, the hypotheses, the focus of the research and the significance of the study.

### **1.2 Background to the Study**

Language contact is a phenomenon that has been in existence for a long time. According to Thomason (2001), there is no evidence of any language that has developed in isolation. This means that every language has been in contact with another language or languages. In sub-Saharan countries like Ghana, many people use more than one language in their day-to-day activities. Through education, most Ghanaians have become bilinguals who acquire their second language, English, through study at school.

The school language policy in Ghana favours bilingualism. Owu-Ewie (2006) throws light on Ghana's language policy over the years. According to him, the Ghanaian languages taught in schools are Akan (Twi and Fante), Nzema, Ga, Ga-Adangbe, Ewe, Gonja, Kasem, Dagbani, and Dagaare out of about seventy.

Owu-Ewie (2006) gives an overview of the history of the language policy in Ghana. From 1925 to 1951, the Ghanaian language was used as the medium of instruction from primary one to three. From primary four, English took over as the medium of instruction and the Ghanaian language was taught as a subject. From 1952 to 1966, the medium of instruction from primary one throughout was English. From 1967 to 1969, the Ghanaian language served as the medium of instruction in primary one only, English taking over from there. The Ghanaian language was restored to its place in the first three years of primary education from 1970 to September 2002. From October 2002 to date, the English language has served as the medium of instruction at all levels of education in the country. The Ghanaian language is then taught as a subject, using the native tongue.

Since this study compares English and Ewe, it clearly fits into the field of study known as contact linguistics. Contact linguistics, as its name denotes, deals with the study of the contact between languages. Many studies in contact linguistics deal with bilingualism. An answer to the questions as to who a bilingual is and what bilingualism is, has been a matter of debate among linguists. There are different definitions and arguments among linguists on what bilingualism is. Definitions of bilingualism are, therefore, multifaceted. For example, for Bloomfield (1933:56), “native-like control of two languages” can be taken as a criterion for bilingualism. According to him, a bilingual must handle both languages as their native speakers do. Haugen (1953), however, talks about a bilingual as the speaker of one language producing complete meaningful utterances in the other language. Weinreich (1953:1), one of the pioneers of

contact linguistics, defines bilingualism as “the practice of alternatively using two languages”. Carl (1983:8) indicates that “bilingualism refers to the possessing of two languages by an individual or a society”. If an individual possesses two languages, we are talking about individual bilingualism. On the other hand, we talk about societal bilingualism when a linguistic community possesses and uses two languages concurrently.

Grosjean (1994) clarifies the misconception that bilinguals are and must be fluent and well-balanced in their two languages. By these simple and straightforward definitions, it is easy to say that a bilingual is “someone with the possession of two languages” (Li 2000:7). Weinreich (1953, 1968) classified three types of bilingualism according to the way bilinguals store language in their brains.

### **1.2.1 Types of Bilinguals**

The first he identified is coordinate bilingualism. A coordinate bilingual is one who has acquired two languages in two separate contexts and the words are stored separately. In this type of bilingualism, the person learns the languages in different environments. Halliday et al (1970) consider that this person is not necessarily an ambilingual (an individual with native competency in two languages). This bilingual possesses very high levels of proficiency in both languages in the written and oral modes. He is, however, not a native speaker of two languages. An instance of this type of bilingualism is seen in a Ghanaian child learning English at school with an already developed first language (L1).

The second type of bilingual Weinreich (1953, 1968) identified is the compound bilingual. This bilingual has acquired the two languages in the same context. The individual learns both languages from the same environment where they are used concurrently so that there is a fused representation of the two languages in the brain. In this case, a word has one concept but two different labels, one from each language.

The final type of bilingual identified by Weinreich (1953) is the subordinate bilingual. Here, the individual has acquired a first language and another language is interpreted through the stronger one. In other words, this bilingual exhibits interference in his or her language usage by reducing the patterns of the second language to those of the first. Ervin and Osgood (1954) show that this type of bilingual is subsumed under the coordinate type of bilingual.

Ghanaians who learn English as a second language at school can be classified as coordinate bilinguals. This is because their two languages are acquired in different environments, the first at home and the second at school. This is shown in Owu-Owie's (2006) overview of Ghana's language policy, where English is currently used as the medium of instruction at all levels of education in the country. According to Sey (1973), university students in Ghana are classified under coordinate bilinguals. Since this study is conducted among Ewe-English coordinate bilinguals, it is appropriate that it is conducted among university students who clearly meet this level of bilingualism.

### **1.3 Types of Language Contact Phenomenon**

An increasing body of works such as Brutt-Griffer (2002), Cook (1992, 2002), Grosjean (1989), Haugen (1953, 1956), Kecskes and Papp (2000) and Weinreich (1974) shows that the coexistence of two languages in an individual is a complex phenomenon. Bilinguals do not use language the way monolinguals do. The bilingual's use of language, as pointed out by Mackey (1962) and Wei (2002), involves such factors as degree (the proficiency level of the language that an individual has), function (for what an individual uses his languages, the roles his languages played in his total pattern of behavior), alternation (the extent to which one alternates between one's languages, how one changes from one language to another, and under what conditions) and interference (how well the bilingual keeps his languages apart, the extent to which he fuses them, how one of his languages influences the use of another).

#### **1.3.1 Borrowing**

Contact between languages can result in a variety of linguistic outcomes. One of the most researched areas in the field of languages in contact concerns the status of foreign lexical elements that appear in everyday discourse of bilinguals. This linguistic phenomenon is termed *borrowing*. Borrowing, according to Heath (1994:55), "involves mixing the systems themselves because an item is borrowed from one language to become part of the other language..." The borrowing of words happens because of the contact between languages and the 'source languages' of these words can be traced by people. Heath (1994), for instance,

provides some examples of borrowed words into English as *karaoke*, *paella*, *schnapps*, *sputnik* and *fait accompli* from Japanese, Spanish, German, Russian and French respectively. Pereira (1977) identified three hundred (300) English loan words in Brazilian Portuguese. Socanac (1996) pointed to more than one thousand five hundred (1500) English words in Italian. Paradis and Lancharite (1997) also identified about 545 French words in Fula. Poplack and Meechan (1998:127) assert that borrowing is a common language contact phenomenon and that “major-class content words such as nouns, verbs, and adjectives are the most likely to be borrowed”. Some examples of borrowed words into English are as follows: *courage*, *adventure*, *fruit*, *count*, *clergy*, *jury*, *state*, *question* and *pilgrimage* from French; *agile*, *abdomen*, *anatomy*, *area*, *capsule*, *compensate*, *insane*, *habitual* and *vindicate* from Latin and *anonymous*, *pneumonia*, *climax*, *skeleton*, *autograph*, *tragedy* and *atmosphere* from Greek. These are just a few examples of borrowed words we find in the English language. One way that languages, therefore, increase their vocabulary stock is by means of borrowing.

### **1.3.2 Pidgins and Creoles**

Pidgins and creoles may also result when languages meet. Bynon (1977:256) writes that “pidgins and creoles could be described as the contact languages par excellence, for it is to contact that they are presumed to have their very existence”. Pidgin is a simplified language that develops as a means of communication between two or more groups of speakers that do not have one common language. It is not a native language of any speaker of the speech



communities involved. However, it is possible for a pidgin to acquire native speakers. A pidgin that has acquired native speakers is called a creole language, and the process whereby a pidgin turns into a creole is called creolization (Hudson1980). Pidgins become creoles when generations whose parents speak pidgins to each other pass them on to their children as their first languages (L1s). Creoles can then replace the existing mix of languages to become the native language of a community. Examples of creole languages are Krio in Sierra Leone and Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea.

### **1.3.3 Codeswitching and Codemixing**

Another outcome of language contact is codeswitching. According to Hoffmann (1991), codeswitching is the most creative aspect of bilingual speech. Crystal (1987) submits that code, or language switching occurs when an individual who is bilingual alternates between two languages in his or her speech with another bilingual person. Codeswitching can take several forms: alteration of sentences, phrases, words and even sometimes morphemes. Codeswitching is prevalent among bilinguals. Cook (1991) puts the extent of codeswitching in normal conversation among bilinguals into the following percentages: codeswitching comprises 84% single word switches, 10% phrase switches and 6% clause switches. Codeswitching is one of the most researched fields of study as a language contact phenomenon and for its prevalence.

Some authorities use the terms *codeswitching* and *codemixing* interchangeably while others maintain that the two terms refer to two different

phenomena. Several scholars have attempted to differentiate between these terms. Among them are Bokamba (1976) and Muysken (2000). Bokamba (1989) asserts that while codeswitching concerns the alternate use of words, phrases and sentences from two distinct grammatical systems or languages, codemixing is the embedding of various linguistic units such as affixes (bound morphemes) and words (unbound morphemes) from different languages into the same structure. According to Muysken (2000), codemixing refers to all cases where lexical items and grammatical features from two languages appear in one sentence, and codeswitching refers to only code alternation. Simply put, while codeswitching refers solely to the alternation between two languages, codemixing combines the grammatical features of two or more languages in the same structure. Thus, codemixing, like codeswitching, is also one result of the contact between languages.

#### **1.3.4 Interference**

Interference is also one outcome of the contact between languages. Interference is the transference of elements of one language to another at various levels, namely phonological, grammatical, lexical and orthographical (Berthold, Mangubhai & Batorowicz, 1997). Berthold et al (1997) define phonological interference as items including accent such as stress, rhyme, intonation and speech sounds from the first language (L1) influencing those of the second language (L2). When the first language influences the second in terms of word order, use of pronouns and determiners, tense and mood and so on, we are talking

about grammatical interference. Interference at the lexical level provides for the borrowing of words from one language to another and modifying them to sound and function naturally in another language. Orthographic interference is the spelling of one language influencing that of another. While interference transforms elements of one language to behave like those of the other, switching simply involves the use of the elements of one language in another without the host language having any influence on these elements.

The present study focuses on how English interferes with Ewe and vice versa in the use of cohesion devices. Many studies have shown that the languages of the bilingual interfere with each other grammatically, phonologically and lexically. Many of these studies are reviewed in chapter two. Suffice it to say now that in bilingual research, these influences are termed ‘interference’, defined by Weinreich (1953:1) as “those instances of deviation from the norms of other language which occur in the speech of the bilingual as a result of the familiarity of more than one language”. Similarly, Grosjean (1982) indicates that interference is the involuntary influence of one language on another. Thus, interference is not an intentional influence. It happens involuntarily. For example, it is easy to tell from some people’s accent when they speak English that they are Nigerian, Ghanaian or Liberian. Their L1s influence their English and modify it, giving these speakers a foreign accent which they are usually not aware of. A Ghanaian is easily recognized in Nigeria by his accent just as it is easy to point out a Nigerian in Ghana when he speaks English.

#### **1.4 Problem**

Studies in contact linguistics have shown that when two languages come in contact, they interfere with each other phonologically, grammatically and lexically. However, the popular view in contact linguistics is that only first languages have the capacity to interfere with second languages of the bilingual (Akande and Akinwale 2006, Cook 1993, Crystal 1997 etc.). This study seeks to contest this popular view by ascertaining whether the otherwise is also possible, (making interference a mutual phenomenon between the languages of the bilingual). By focusing on the use of cohesion, which is both a grammatical and a lexical phenomenon, the present study aims to describe how cohesion is realized in Ewe and investigate the extent to which English interferes with Ewe and vice versa in the use of cohesive devices among Ewe-English coordinate (university undergraduate) bilinguals.

#### **1.5 Research Questions**

This comparative study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. How is cohesion realized in Ewe?
2. What are the similarities and differences, if any, between English and Ewe in the use of cohesion?
3. How do English and Ewe interfere with each other in the Ewe-English bilingual's use of cohesion?

## **1.6 Hypotheses**

Just as the first language of English learners interferes with English and makes it distinct in their speech communities, English may also interfere with these languages it coexists with and make these interferences mutual. This study is based on the following hypotheses.

First, the interference of Ewe on English in the use of cohesion among Ewe-English bilinguals will be greater than that of English on Ewe. Many studies like deHouwer (1995), Romaine (1995) and Naveed (2008), have shown that the influence of the first language on the second is greater than that of the second on the first. Moreover, it is possible for first languages to completely resist interference from second languages. Since Ewe is the first language of the respondents of this study, and English is their second language, it is only natural that the Ewe language will greatly influence the English language in this regard.

The second hypothesis is that there will be no significant difference between the way cohesion is realized in Ewe and English. This is because even though English and Ewe belong to two different language families, they share some features. One of those features is that the two languages follow the subject-verb-object (SVO) structure. Moreover, neither both Halliday and Hasan (1976) nor any other scholars argue that other languages do not realize cohesion. Inasmuch as a language can produce a text that is meaningful, that language employs cohesion. It is only left to us to find out how that language employs cohesion. All languages also universally have certain grammatical features in common no matter the family in which they are; all languages have a common

structural basis (Chomsky 2007). These same grammatical and lexical elements are used in the realization of cohesion. It is only that there are some differences in the way a particular language employs these elements in the realization of cohesion.

### **1.6 Significance of the Study**

The findings of this study will serve the following purposes. First, it is hoped that the literature of research on languages in contact will be enriched by this study. Most of the studies conducted in this field are based on other types of interferences such as phonological and grammatical interferences between the languages of the bilingual. This present study broadens the scope of studies on languages in contact by investigating another way interference can exhibit itself – through cohesion.

Secondly, while most studies concentrate only on how first languages influence second languages, this study, in addition to this, investigates how English, the second language (L2) of the respondents of this study, influences Ewe, their first language (L1). In this regard, this study seeks to challenge theories that give too much attention to the L1 interference on the L2 to the neglect of that of L2 on L1.

The study will also serve pedagogical purposes. Cohesion is one important part of language teaching. If students are taught how cohesion is realized in Ewe, this can help them improve upon their use of the Ewe language. It will also help teachers of the language to handle their teaching effectively. Since the realization

of cohesion differs from language to language, it is one bane to effective translation. This study will help make easy the task of the Ewe-English translator and can be used in Ewe-English translation classes.

Finally, this study will trigger investigation into how other Ghanaian or African languages employ cohesion in comparison with English and one another. This will contribute to already existing work in contact linguistics.

### **1.7 Focus**

The study's focal point is the cohesive devices identified by Halliday and Hasan (1976) namely reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. The study investigates all these devices in order to discover how cohesion is realized in Ewe. This objective cannot be realized fully if some of the cohesive devices are left out. In this study, the focus is on English and Ewe as the languages in contact. The researcher has advanced proficiency level in these languages, speaks and writes them well and can resolve complex cases concerning them and would not have to resort to experts entirely in conducting this study.

The present study is conducted among university undergraduate students reading Ghanaian Language (Ewe). First, since the type of bilingual under consideration in this study is the coordinate bilingual, it is better that the study be conducted among university students since according to Sey (1973) and others, this level of students and other professions (stage four) best explain coordinate bilinguals in Ghana. Secondly, the study focuses on students reading Ewe because the researcher seeks students who have advanced proficiency level in Ewe. In

addition, the study demands a high level of competence in both languages on the part of the respondent as this is one criterion of a coordinate bilingual.

Studies of this type can be conducted using oral or written data. This one is based on written data. Considering the size of the respondents and the fact that every respondent provided two sets of information, one in English and the other in Ewe, it is better to use written data for this study. Oral data will demand a great deal of time and money since all these data would have to be recorded and later codified for analysis. Besides, the study also aims at developing the writing skills of university students. For these reasons, the researcher decided to use written data instead of oral data for this study.

Finally, the research sites for the study are University of Cape Coast and University of Education, Winneba. There are other institutions of study in the country like University of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology and University of Developmental Studies. In these other institutions in the country, the researcher found out that the number of students reading Ghanaian Language (Ewe) as a course of study is very small unlike in UCC and UEW. UCC and UEW provide a sizable number of students reading Ewe and are therefore the best sites for the study.

## **1.8 Chapter Synopsis**

Chapter one, introduction, consists of the background to the study, the research problem, research questions, the hypotheses, significance of the study, the focus of the study and the chapter synopsis. Chapter two reviews the theoretical



framework as well as studies that are related to the present study. Some of these studies reviewed are from research conducted the world over while others are from studies conducted in universities in Ghana. Chapter three throws light on the research methodology used in data collection. Data collected are analyzed in chapter four. Chapter five serves as the conclusion for the study.

### **1.9 Summary**

This introductory part of this study placed the present study in contact linguistics since the study compares two languages, Ewe and English. The chapter discussed the history of Ghana's language policy over the years and revealed that English is presently used right from Primary One, making the Ghanaian a bilingual at the end. The various outcomes of linguistic contact such as borrowing, pidgins and creoles, codeswitching and interference were highlighted. The present study is based on interference on either language (English or Ewe) in the use of cohesive devices by Ewe-English bilinguals. The next chapter discusses related literature that serves as the theoretical and conceptual background to the present study.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

This chapter reviews the theoretical framework as well as relevant studies that serve as the conceptual basis for this study.

#### **2.2 Theoretical Framework**

The theories of cohesion and bilingualism as found in Halliday and Hasan's (1976) Cohesion in English as well as Weinreich's (1953, 1974) Languages in Contact serve as the main theoretical framework of this study. However, other authorities whose works share similar ideas with the above works are discussed in addition to these.

#### **2.3 Cohesion**

Many scholars like Bloor and Bloor (1995), Brown and Yule (1998), Fairclough (1995), Grundy (2000), Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), Levinson (1983), Osisanwo (2003), Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) and Verschueren (1999) have identified what sets a text apart from randomly selected sentences; that is, what

binds a text together. Of all these works, it is Halliday and Hasan's (1976) work which sets out the notion of cohesion in a clear, systematic and detailed manner.

Halliday and Hasan (1976:4) define the concept of cohesion as 'a semantic one; it refers to relations of meaning that exist within a text'. They further explain that:

Cohesion occurs when the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are thereby at least potentially integrated into a text.

The above quote implies that cohesion is the network of grammatical and lexical ties which link up various parts of a text. These ties organize and create a text by requiring the reader to interpret words and expressions in relation to the surrounding sentences and paragraphs. Cohesion is therefore a surface or physical relation as well as semantic relations that connect the actual words or expressions that we can see, hear or pinpoint from a text.

Verschueren (1999) seems to support Halliday and Hasan's definition of cohesion when he writes that "the label cohesion is generally used to designate this overt marking of relations within a discourse or text (which is then often called the context of discourse or text fragment under consideration)". Verschueren (1999) defines cohesion as 'overt marking of relations'. This follows that what marks relations and makes a text cohere are not hidden or abstract at all; they can be easily seen or identified. Cohesive elements are, therefore, recognizable in a text.

Cohesion may be realized physically; that is, grammatically or lexically, but it has semantic dimensions.

Cohesion does to a text what glue does to the shoes we wear and what a seam does to the clothes we wear. It can be defined as the links that hold a text together and give it meaning. In order to understand the importance of cohesion, we must first know and understand what a text actually is. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 293) define a text as

...not just a string of sentences. It is not simply a large grammatical unit, something of the same kind as a sentence, but deferring from it in size – a sort of a super sentence, a semantic unit. A text best is thought of as not a grammatical unit at all, but rather as a unit of a different kind: a semantic unit. The unity that it has is a unity of meaning in context, a texture that expresses the fact that it relates as a whole to the environments in which it is placed.

According to this definition, a text is ‘something of the same kind as a sentence’ or a ‘supersentence’. Halliday and Hasan (1976) call a text a ‘supersentence’, implying that although a text may comprise a number of sentences, these sentences can be understood and interpreted as though they were one sentence or one ‘semantic unit’.

As we have seen earlier, Halliday and Hasan (1976) identify what separates a collection of unrelated sentences and a text. This they identified as cohesion, which binds sentences into what is called ‘a text’ that must be understood as a semantic unit. Halliday and Hasan (1976) identify two different

kinds of cohesion in English: grammatical and lexical. Grammatically, cohesion is achieved through reference, ellipsis, substitution and conjunctions.

Fairclough (1995) and other scholars use the terms ‘cohesion’ and ‘coherence’ interchangeably. These terms overlap in meaning for they are both text-centered notions. Even though this study is specifically about cohesion, distinguishing ‘cohesion’ from ‘coherence’ would help the researcher focus on his point of interest – cohesion, and avoid the unnecessary blend of these notions.

De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) identify some textuality standards namely: cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality and intertextuality. Cohesion, as we can see, is the first of the seven textuality standards. Coherence is placed second to and separate from cohesion. Since coherence is listed differently as one major textuality standard separate from cohesion, there is no denying therefore that cohesion and coherence are distinct from each other. Moreover, a text can be cohesive but not coherent. That is, a text can employ cohesive devices but is not necessarily coherent (Halliday and Hasan (1976), Halliday and Matthiessen (2004). While de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) place coherence as number two of the text-centered standards, Carstens (1997) regards coherence as the last standard of textuality, for coherence, in his view, encompasses all the other six standards. Coherence is not a property inherent in texts; it is assigned to a text by its reader. The fact that de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), Carstens (1997) and many other authorities list cohesion and coherence separate from each other means they do not mean the same thing.

Indeed, Carrel (1982) in her often-quoted work asserts that cohesion is not coherence; the two terms do not mean the same thing. According to de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981:3-4), “cohesion relates to only the interconnectedness of the components and relations which underlie the surface text, are mutually accessible and relevant” while coherence is an abstract or mental phenomenon. Hoover (1997) and Sanders (1997) similarly distinguish between cohesion and coherence. Earlier, Thompson (1996:179) had differentiated between cohesion and coherence thus:

Cohesion refers to the linguistic devices by which the speaker can signal the experiential and interpersonal coherence of the text – and thus a textual phenomenon – we can point to features of the text, which serve a cohesive function. Coherence on the other hand is in the mind of the writer and the reader: it is a mental phenomenon and cannot be identified or quantified in the same way as cohesion.

It is clear that while cohesion refers to the physical links that can be pinpointed in a text, coherence is abstract and a ‘mental phenomenon’. Emphasizing the fact that coherence has to do with the mind, Osisanwo (2002:40) defines coherence thus:

It answers the question of what is it that accounts for the fact that a text makes sense to us as a discourse. It is different from cohesion, which accounts for how actual texts are held together lexically and grammatically.

Osisanwo (2002) further explains that the two text-centered notions, ‘cohesion’ and ‘coherence’, are distinct from each other inasmuch as they mean different

things: cohesion is the physical interconnections in a text, coherence is the meaning that these interconnections result in.

It must be however noted that even though cohesion and coherence are distinct notions, ‘the two are in most cases linked’, noted Thompson (1996: 74), ‘in that a text that exploits the cohesive resources of the language effectively, should normally be perceived as coherent.’ This is further emphasized by Kelly and Lawton (2006:54):

Writing is coherent when it features plenty of transition and an effective order of presentation. When you reassess for coherence you zero in on these aspects, making sure that the ideas flow smoothly and are arranged in a way that is most appropriate to communicate your point to your readers.

Thus, cohesive devices can provide clues to the coherence of a text. A text is coherent to the reader if the textual relations are clear to him or her, for as Senders et al (1992:1) put it, “coherence relations are ultimately cognitive relations”. It is possible to have a text full of cohesive devices but one that lacks coherence, for cohesion is just one of the ways to make a text coherent, meaningful, the other ways being the ones identified earlier de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981).

Halliday and Hasan (1976) identify five main cohesive devices in English namely, reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. Their work only explains with examples the tools for cohesion in English. As far as I know, no thorough studies have been conducted on cohesion in Ewe. This study seeks to reveal cohesive devices in Ewe, using Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) work

as a theoretical framework. The following sections look at the two major categories of cohesion namely, grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion.

## **2.4 Grammatical Cohesion**

### **2.4.1 Reference**

The first of the types of cohesive device identified by Halliday and Hasan (1976) is reference. The term 'reference' is traditionally used in semantics to mark the relationship that exists between a word and what it represents in the real world. Halliday and Hasan (1976), however, do not use this term as the semanticist does. In their model of cohesion, the term reference is used in a more restricted way to denote a direct relationship between pronouns and their antecedents. Reference is limited here to the relationship of identity that exists between two linguistic expressions. They further explain reference thus:

What characterizes this particular type of cohesion that which we are calling reference is the specific nature of the information that is signaled for retrieval. In the case of reference, the information to be retrieved is the referential meaning, the identity of the particular thing or class of things that is being referred to; and the cohesion lies in continuity of reference, whereby the thing enters into the discourse a second time (p31).

Reference simply has to do with bringing back or pointing to information that has gone before the text under scrutiny inasmuch as that information contributes to the understanding of the text as a unified whole.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) identify three areas in which reference is realized in English: personal pronouns, demonstratives and comparatives. Some personal references are *I, me, you, we, us, he, him, she, her, they, them, it* and



one. The words *this, these, that, those here, there* and *then* are some demonstrative references. For comparative reference, we have *same, identical, equal, additional, different, else*, comparative adjectives such as *similar, same, different* and so on.

Below are examples of each of the three types of references:

1. *Mrs. Thatcher has resigned. She announced her decision this morning.* -Halliday and Matthiessen (2004)
2. *Is it not marvelous to have a method of struggle where it is possible to stand up against the unjust system, fight it with all your might, never accept it and yet not stoop to violence and hatred in the process? This is what we have.* - Martin Luther King Jr.
3. *One of life's best philosophies is the golden rule. Another is to freely forgive others.*

In Example 1, the pronoun 'she', a personal reference, refers back to 'Mrs. Thatcher' within the textual world. We see that reference, as used here, exists in the textual rather than the semantic sense where the reader or listener has to retrieve the identity of what is discussed by referring to another expression in the immediate context. The resulting cohesion, therefore, lies in the transfer or continuity of reference since the point in question reenters into the discourse. The demonstrative pronoun 'this' in Example 2, refers back to the question that precedes it. In that case, *this* can only be interpreted as referring to the 'the method of struggle' mentioned earlier. The cohesion in Example 2 lies in the fact that the demonstrative *this* binds the two sentences together. In Example 3, the comparative *another* refers back to *philosophies* and as a consequence binds the text together.

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), reference is further divided into two: exophora (situational) and endophora (contextual). Exophora or exophoric reference is the type of reference that relates to something outside a text in

question. There are times when the meaning of a text is not explicit from the text itself, but is obvious to those in a particular situation. For example:

4. *Nobody believed his story. For everybody knows he is a liar.*

Readers outside this environment cannot refer to 'he' but the listeners involved are aware of 'him' and can find texture in these sentences.

The other type of reference in a text is endophora. Endophoric reference is textual in that what is discussed is retrievable from the text, not outside it. Halliday and Hasan (1976) give an example to explain endophora:

5. *Wash and core six cooking apples. Put them into a fireproof dish. -*

Halliday and Hasan (1976:2)

The cohesion of Example 5 lies in the pronoun 'them' in the second sentence for it refers back to 'apples' in the first sentence. This type of reference is an endophoric one inasmuch as what it points to is within the text. Everyone else will understand these sentences as far as what 'them' refers to is retrievable from the sentences, not anywhere else.

Further, there are two types of endophoric reference: anaphora and cataphora. Anaphoric reference is a type of reference that looks back to a preceding text. In Example 3, 'them' refers back to the preceding sentence to retrieve its meaning. It is easy for the reader to figure out that 'them' refers back to 'apples', not anything else; this reference is an anaphoric one. Unlike anaphoric reference, cataphoric reference points to a following text, not a preceding one. Quirk and Greenbaum (2000) provide examples of what a cataphoric reference looks like:

6. *It never should have happened. She went out and left the baby unattended.*

7. *Here is the news. A diplomat was kidnapped last night in London.*

In Example 6, what ‘it’ stands for is clarified in the following sentence. The referent of ‘it’ is retrieved from the following sentence. The cohesion here lies in the continuity of ideas between the first and second sentences. In Example 7, there is anticipation of what news there is. The second sentence provides the news – “A diplomat was kidnapped last night in London.” In this example too, the reference is cataphoric. Therefore, while both cataphoric and anaphoric references are endophoric, anaphoric refers to a preceding text and cataphoric to a following text.

#### **2.4.2 Substitution**

The second form of achieving grammatical cohesion is substitution. As its name denotes, substitution is the replacing of one grammatical unit (or units) with another. In the words of Quirk and Greenbaum (2000: 294), “substitution is a device for abbreviating and for avoiding repetition.” Substitution is therefore the replacement of one or more grammatical items by a substitute or a pro-form.

Nouns or noun phrases in English are substitutable with personal pronouns, possessive or reflexive pronouns and the indefinite pronouns ‘one’, ‘ones’, ‘that’ and ‘those’. The following examples demonstrate this fact.

8. *Doris bought the food but she did not eat it.*

9. *There is the student’s car and here are her keys.*

10. *This room is cooler than the one upstairs.*

11. *Cozy likes Shakespeare’s plays but Raina prefers those of Milton’s.*

In Example 8, the pronouns ‘she’ and ‘it’ replace ‘Doris’ and ‘the food’ respectively. These nouns are, therefore, substituted or replaced by these short and straightforward pronouns. This avoids the repetition of the nouns in question. The cohesion lies in the fact that ‘she’ as well as ‘it’ is anaphoric, they refer back to the nouns in question and bind the sentences as one. Moreover, what is replaced is retrievable from the textual world to facilitate understanding. In Example 9, ‘her’, a possessive pronoun, replaces ‘student’; in example 10, ‘one’ substitutes ‘room’ just as ‘those’ substitutes ‘plays’ in sentence 11. Substitution, as a cohesive device, avoids monotony, excessive repetition and at the same time, it holds a text together.

Verb phrases can also be replaced by the phrase ‘do so’ or its variants as regards tense and number. The following examples demonstrate this:

12. *Ewura Ama works hard and so does her husband*
13. *Roger promised to write to me and he did so*
14. *Do not open the next page until you are told to do so.*

In Example 12, ‘so does’ substitutes for the verb phrase ‘works hard’. ‘Did so’ in Example 13 replaces the verb phrase ‘promised to write’ while ‘do so’ replaces ‘open the next page’ in example 14.

In addition, whole clauses are also substitutable by proforms as a means of holding a text together. The following examples illustrate this point better.

15. *Is Lydia coming to the party? I hope so.*
16. *The results show that Gabby has won the election. If so he must be very happy.*
17. *Doris said she had won a scholarship, but it did not surprise me.*

The proform ‘so’ in Example 15 replaces a whole clause – ‘Lydia is coming to the party’. The cohesion lies in the fact that repetition is avoided but a shorter form,

a substitute, carries the idea across. The proform ‘so’ in Example 17 behaves much the same way as ‘so’ does in example 16. In Example 17, the pronoun ‘it’ replaces the preceding clause – *Doris said shehad won a scholarship*. The pronoun ‘it’ is anaphoric as well as a substitution of a longer form with a shorter one.

A close look at substitution and the examples above shows that reference and substitution sometimes overlap into each other as cohesive devices. Halliday and Hasan (1976:88) admit that “the classification of cohesive relations into different types should not be seen as implying a rigid division into watertight compartments”. They opine that there could be instances where cohesive relations lie on the “borderline between two types and could be interpreted as one or the other”. While reference marks a semantic relation, substitution marks a grammatical relation. Substitution is a relation in the wording while reference concerns meaning. The following example illustrates this point:

*18. Zidane is one of the best footballers of all time. He is of African descent.*

It is clear in Example 18 that the pronoun ‘he’ in the second sentence above refers back to as well as substitutes for ‘Zidane’ in the first. This example alone shows that it is possible for the same text to display a number of cohesive relations as in the case of reference and substitution.

### **2.4.3 Ellipsis**

The third cohesive devise identified by Halliday and Hasan (1976) is ellipsis. Like substitution, ellipsis is grammatical rather than lexical. While substitution deals

with replacing one word with another, ellipsis is the absence of that word, something left unsaid. Ellipsis involves the omission of an item. This is the case where something left unsaid is nevertheless understood by the reader or hearer. It refers to those cases where the grammatical structure itself points to an item or items that can rightly fill the spot in question. Halliday and Hasan (1976) provide an example:

19. *Joan brought some carnations and, Catherine some sweet peas.* – Halliday and Hasan (1976:143)

The above sentence warrants only one possible interpretation: Catherine bought some sweet peas. The verb ‘brought’ is therefore deleted in its second appearance. However, it is recoverable from the existing structure. It follows, therefore, that the cohesive device ellipsis is endophoric inasmuch as what is deleted is recoverable from within the text, not outside it. Let us look at other examples of ellipsis.

- 20. *The children must be advised what to do and what not to do.*
- 21. *Rai submitted an essay on Saussure and another on Chomsky.*
- 22. *Offenders are always punished but law abiders never rewarded.*

In Example 20, the clause ‘the children must be advised’ is deleted in its second appearance. However, it is retrievable from the structure for full meaning to be derived from the sentence. In Example 21, the verb ‘submitted’ is deleted in its second appearance. In Example 22, the verb ‘are’ is not repeated. The cohesion lies in the fact that what is left unsaid is retrievable from context and the text is therefore held together.

#### 2.4.4 Conjunctions

Conjunctions also function as a cohesive device in a text. Unlike reference, substitution and ellipsis, conjunctions do not inform the reader or listener to supply missing information by looking for it elsewhere in the text or by filling structural slots. Conjunctions instead signal the way the writer or speaker wants the reader or hearer to relate what is about to be written or said to what has been said or written before. Halliday and Hasan (1976:226) posit:

Conjunction is rather different in nature from the other cohesive relations, from both reference... and substitution and ellipsis... Conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meaning; they are not devices for reaching out into the preceding (or the following) text, but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse.

The quote above follows that the conjunction is quite different from other cohesive devices for they “are cohesive not in themselves.” Their presence in a text means that some information is taken for granted; something is presupposed.

Conjunction creates cohesion by relating sentences and paragraphs to each other by using words from the class of conjunction, or numerals. This can be causal, adversative, additive, continuatives or discourse markers. Examples of additive conjunctive elements are ‘and’ or ‘also’, ‘in addition’, ‘furthermore’, ‘besides’, ‘similarly’, ‘for instance’, ‘by contrast’ and so on. Some adversative conjunctions are ‘but’, ‘yet’, ‘however’, ‘instead’, ‘on the other hand’, ‘nevertheless’, ‘as matter of fact’. The conjunctive elements like ‘so’, ‘consequently’, ‘it follows’, ‘for’, ‘because’, ‘under the circumstances’ and

suchlike are normally causal conjunctions. Some continuatives are ‘now’, ‘of course’, ‘well’, ‘anyway’, ‘surely’ and ‘after all’. The following examples, one for each type of conjunctive element, illustrate the use of conjunction to bind a text together.

23. *He was beaten and stripped naked. Besides, he was jailed.*

24. *Do not tell them the story now. Instead, discuss with them what happened.*

25. *Larry stepped on Cozy’s toes. Consequently, a fight ensued between them.*

26. *Festus could not answer that question. After all, he is but a boy.*

In Example 23 above, ‘besides’, an addition conjunction, binds the two sentences.

There is therefore a link connecting the first sentence with the second. The cohesion lies in this connective. The conjunctions ‘instead’, ‘consequently’ and ‘after all’ which are adversative, causal and continuative conjunctions in Examples 24, 25 and 26 respectively, also play the same role of binding as does the additive conjunction ‘besides’.

## **2.5 Lexical Cohesion**

The final type of cohesive element identified by Halliday and Hasan (1976) is lexical cohesion. Halliday (2004:570) in his book Introduction to Functional Grammar differentiates between the other types of cohesion discussed above and lexical cohesion. He writes:

However, cohesion also operates within the lexical zone of lexicogrammar. Here a speaker or writer creates cohesion in discourse through the choice of lexical items. Cohesion takes advantage of the patterns inherent in the organization of lexis. Lexis is organized into a network of lexical relations such as the ‘kind of’ relations obtaining between ‘fish’ and ‘salmon’.



Lexical cohesion as we can deduce from Halliday's words, depends on the choice of lexical items. Lexical cohesion is basically created by repetition (reiteration) of the same lexeme, or superordinates (general nouns), or other lexemes sharing the majority of semantic features, also called hyponyms. Lexical cohesion can also form relational patterns in text in a way that links sentences to create coherence thereby, sometimes overlapping with other cohesion features.

Halliday (2004) further illustrates lexical cohesion by the relationship between 'fish' and 'salmon'. We see that 'fish' is a superordinate term that encompasses a subordinate one – 'salmon'. This example, clearly, is a lexical not a grammatical one. Like reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunctions, there are different types of lexical cohesion.

Bloor and Bloor (1995), Fairclough (1995) and Halliday (1985) identify the repetition of an item as the most direct form of lexical cohesion. Bloor & Bloor (1995:99) say that:

Lexical cohesion refers to the cohesive effect of the use of lexical items in discourse where the choice of an item relates to the choices that have gone before. One important type of lexical cohesion, probably the one with the strongest cohesive force, is repetition (or reiteration) of the same item.

Repetition, as we can see above, is the reiteration of the same lexical item in a discourse or a text. Repetition, as a lexical cohesive device, is broad and has many branches. The succeeding paragraphs discuss these types of repetition.

Before we discuss the various kinds of repetition, here is an example given by Halliday (2004) to illustrate repetition.

27. *Algy met a bear. The bear was bulky.*

Example 27 illustrates what lexical repetition is. It is clear that the lexical item ‘bear’ is repeated. This simple repetition binds the two sentences and ideas together into one unified text. It must be noted that ‘bear’ could be replaced with the pronoun ‘it’. This, however, will be a different type of cohesion – reference or substitution.

Another form of repetition is synonymy. That is, lexical cohesion can result from the choice of a lexical item that is in some sense synonymous with a preceding one. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) provide an example:

28. *He was startled by a noise from behind him. It was the sound of trotting horses.*  
*The sound of the cavalry grew rapidly nearer.*

We can see that in the example above, *sound* replaces *noise* in the second sentence. This does not only avoid the repetition of noise, it performs a grammatical function of cohesion. *Calvary* also replaces *horses* and serves the same grammatical purpose of cohesion.

It is, however, important for us to know that complete synonymy in this regard is very rare, even if it exists. Cann (1993:21) notes the following:

The relation of synonymy is defined where two lexemes have the same sense and extensions and so may to defined as mutually hyponymous. Total synonymy is rare but partial synonymy occurs relatively frequently where two lexemes have almost the same sense and almost the same extension.

We can deduce from the above that synonyms do not have exactly the same meaning but have the same sense and extension. Moreover, Cann (1993) asserts

that total synonymy is rare. Other authorities like Cruse (1986), Kearns (2000), Kempson (1977), Lyons (1995, 97) and Sekyi-Baidoo (2002) all agree that absolute synonymy is a rarity.

Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:572) reveal a very important point with regard to the repetition of lexical items in lexical cohesion. They submit that “in order for a lexical item to be recognized as repeated, it need not be in the same morphological shape.” Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) suggest that we do not necessarily look forward to seeing what is repeated to look exactly as what comes before. They gave examples as *dine*, *dining*, *diner* and *dinner* as referring to one item. Thus, repeated lexical items can have various morphological shapes but still share the property of repetition and a cohesive device.

Synonymy, according to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), comes with reference synonyms of the same or some higher level of generality, synonyms in the narrower sense and superordinates. The other type of synonymy identified by Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) is the one without necessary identity of reference. The following examples clarify these points:

29. *Two hundred soldiers joined the peace-keeping force. The battalion is one of the best the country has ever produced.*

30. *Children are said to be strange, but Emil is the strangest of all.*

In Example 29, we see that the second appearance of ‘soldiers’ assumes a new form – ‘battalion’. *Battalion* and *soldiers* have a general-specific relationship; while *soldiers* is the general or superordinate term, *battalion* is the subordinate or specific term. *Battalion* as a synonym has a reference point – *soldiers*. This reference to a preceding item binds the text together. In Example 30, we see the

link between ‘children’ and ‘Emil’. ‘Emil’ does not necessarily refer to children. However, as far as this statement is about children, Emil must be the child of reference in this regard.

Verschueren (1999) also identified another way lexical cohesion is realized: the juxtaposition of linguistic items. This placement of linguistic items side by side is the separation of related items by commas, parenthesis or dashes. Below are some examples:

- 31. *Mr. Kufuor, the President, is known by many as a gentleman.*
- 32. *Football – the game of passion – is the most celebrated sport in the world.*
- 33. *Pollination (the transfer of pollen from one plant to another) is a common term in botany.*

In Example 31, the noun phrase ‘the President’ is in apposition to, ‘Kufuor’ and is separated from ‘Kufuor’ by two commas. ‘The president’, placed side by side ‘Kufuor’, is an example of what Verschueren (1999) terms ‘juxtaposition’. The cohesion lies in the fact that ‘the president’ is the same as ‘Kufuor’ and as a result binds the text together. In Example 32, ‘the game of passion’ is separated from ‘football’ by two dashes. However, since that noun phrase adds more information or explains what football is, these two pieces of information are joined together as one. In Example 33, ‘the transfer of pollen...’ explains what pollination is. This explanation binds the text together.

Verschueren (1999) also uncovers exemplification as one way of achieving lexical cohesion. He identifies some expressions like ‘for example’ and ‘for instance’ as some of the expressions that show exemplification and bind a text together. The following are examples:

- 34. *Many freedom fighters die early. An example is Martin Luther King.*

35. *You may have questions which you wish to raise. For instance, who will oversee your work and how will feedback be given?*

In Example 34, ‘an example’ gives Martin Luther King as one of the freedom fighters who died young. This example connects with ‘freedom fighters’ and binds the two pieces of information together. The same link of cohesion appears in Example 35. The term of exemplification ‘for instance’ provides the question that the reader or listener anticipates.

An important work worth mentioning relating to lexical reiteration is Hoey’s (1991) Lexical Patterns in Text. Hoey (1991) proposed that different forms of lexical repetition combine to organize a text. His study has provided evidence that instances of lexical cohesion mark points of links between sentences. The first link he considered is lexical repetition, classified under simple and complex. A simple repetition involves items that Hoey (1991:55) defined as “formally identical”. These are items sharing the exact same form or the same morpheme with minimum alterations, such as those marking the third person singular and past. Complex repetition occurs “either when two lexical items share a lexical morpheme”, but have a different grammatical class or function. The following exemplify simple and complex repetitions:

36. *Drugs have powerful effects on people. Drugs must therefore be used with caution.*

37. *Communication builds up the bond between families. It is important to communicate our feelings to our close relations.*

Example 36 illustrates simple repetition. The word ‘drugs’ does not change its form or function in its second appearance. However, in Example 37, ‘communication’, a noun, becomes a verb in its second appearance. The same

idea of communication is repeated but in a different form. That is an example of what Hoey (1991) calls a complex repetition.

According to Hoey (1991), the second category of repetition is synonymy. This involves the repetition of the idea represented by a lexical item, rather than its form. Instances of synonymy may be either simple or complex. A simple synonymy occurs when a lexical item may substitute for another in context without loss or gain in specificity and with no discernible change in meaning, while complex synonymy involves synonyms, which are not part of the same word class. Below are examples:

38. *Malcolm's child is very intelligent. Who wouldn't want to have a boy as clever as that?*

39. *Malcolm X was killed while delivering a speech. Such assassinations were common in the sixties.*

In example 38, 'intelligent' and 'clever' appear in the first and second sentences respectively. These words are both adjectives and both refer to 'child'. Moreover, 'child' and 'boy' are also synonyms and both belong to the same word class – nouns. These adjectives and nouns in question achieve cohesion and are examples of simple synonyms. In Example 39, 'killed' is a verb while 'assassinations' is a noun. The same idea of killing is carried across in the word 'assassinations'. However, the words belong to different word classes. This is an example of complex synonymy.

Another type of links identified by Hoey (1991) is that of superordinate and hyponymic repetition. These links occur when items are connected by a lexical relation of class membership. Superordinate repetition involves a general term which designates a class of which the earlier item is a member. Conversely,

hyponymic repetition involves a specific item which is a member of, or included in, the class designated by the earlier item. These are examples:

40. *She gave Etsey a pen and a pencil. Those gifts meant nothing to him for he had a lot of stationery.*

41. *Many animals have gone extinct. Notable among them is the mammoth.*

In Example 40, ‘a pen and a pencil’ points to the superordinate term ‘stationery’. The term ‘stationery’ encompasses ‘a pen and a pencil’ and this serves the purpose of cohesion. In 41, ‘mammoth’ is included in the hyponymic term ‘animals’. In other words, a mammoth is a type of animal. This idea of inclusion also serves a cohesive purpose.

We must remember that all these scholars discussed herein look at factors responsible for cohesion in the English language. That follows, therefore, that factors responsible for cohesion in English are not things yet to be discovered. Since this study compares English and Ewe, it concerns itself with seeing how the Ewe language resembles or differs from the English language in the use of cohesion. Callow (1974:30) posits that “each language has its own patterns to convey the interrelationships of persons and events and in no language may these patterns be ignored.” Since languages considerably differ in various ways from one another, each language definitely has its own ‘pattern of interrelationships’. Cohesion is one of these ‘patterns of interrelationships’ inherent in languages. English and Ewe are two different languages as they belong to two distinct families of languages: the Ewe language is a member of the Kwa family of languages that include Akan, Yoruba, Ga and Igbo while English is from the Indo-European family of languages that include German, Dutch and Swedish.

Since these languages are distinct from each other and operate with different grammatical systems, it is likely that the way cohesion is realized in each will differ from the other. This study seeks to find out how cohesion is realized in Ewe as well as how different or similar, in comparison with English, does the Ewe language convey cohesion and how these two languages interfere with each other in the use of cohesion.

## **2.6 Bilingualism**

Investigating the way two languages influence each other when they come in contact calls for a thorough overview of the issue of bilingualism. A central issue in bilingual research concerns the extent to which linguistic representations in two languages are processed independently of each other.

In Languages in Contact, Weinreich (1953) discussed how two language systems relate to each other in the mind of the same individual. The key concept he discussed is interference, defined as “those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language” (p1). Gold (1986:133) maintains that interference is a pejorative word, which may have the sense of ‘contaminate’. He suggests instead using the term ‘influence’, which is a neutral and objective word. These two terms, ‘interference’ and ‘influence’, however, refer to the same phenomenon and are used interchangeably in this present study. Other scholars like Alternberg and Cains (1983), Cook (1992, 2002), Grosjean (1989), Kecskes and Papp (2000), Mack (1986), Preston and Lambert (1969) and Robins (1989)



agree with Weinreich (1953,68) that bilinguals refuse to hold their two languages as distinct, disconnected systems and that languages in the bilingual's mind interfere with each other in different ways. There is therefore no denying that as far as an individual handles more than one language, there must be interference between these languages.

Weinreich (1953) goes on to identify two dimensions on which interference can occur. These are the bilingual's actual speech and the bilingual's knowledge of language. Robins (1989: 404) expresses the same view of bilingualism as Weinreich (1953) when he says:

Contacts between languages...have several effects. In particular, when ready communication in a restricted set of contexts is required, a simplified version of one of the languages involved often arises, modified phonetically, grammatically and lexically in the direction of the other language.

Robins (1989) is essentially referring to interference between the languages of the bilingual without referring to the term 'interference' or 'influence'. Interference therefore can manifest itself phonetically, grammatically and lexically. As we have seen earlier, cohesion is a lexico-grammatical relationship between linguistic items and this relationship binds a text together. Moreover, since interference between the languages of the bilingual can manifest grammatically and lexically, it is likely that there will be interferences between English and Ewe in the use of cohesion between the two languages. The researcher has observed phonological interference of Ewe on English and vice versa among Ewe-English bilinguals and believes that interference can manifest itself in the use of cohesive devices among

Ewe-English bilinguals. This conclusion is reasonable because cohesion is realized both grammatically and lexically. Since interference occurs in these systems, it would not be a surprise if it occurs in the Ewe-English bilingual's use of cohesive devices.

Interference can affect a person's pronunciation, grammar and other aspects of language use. Cook (1993) supports Weinreich (1953) and Robins (1989)'s claim by providing some examples that interference can affect a speaker's speech as well as his or her knowledge of language. In Cook's (1993) Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition, she writes that "interference can happen in all the systems of language. Speakers may carry over the L1 phonological systems by ignoring distinctions made in the L2 but not in the L1" (p8).

Just like Weinreich (1953), Cook (1993) and Robins (1989) point to the phonological system as one of the systems of language in which interference can occur. Cook (1993:8) provides an example to support this claim:

For example, some French fail to distinguish between the two English phonemes /i:/ and /i/ as in 'keen' /ki:n/ and 'kin' /kin/ because they are not distinct in their L1.

In French, unlike in English, the vowel /i/ is neither described long nor short. Rather, it is realized as one vowel where length is not important. The L1 French speaker does not recognize this difference in English and therefore realizes these two vowels as though they were one. Cook's example seems to suggest that interference is normally carried from the L1 to the L2, not otherwise. That argument suggests that since the L1 is the first language to be acquired by the

bilingual as well as the more used language, its influence on the L2, the second and the less used language, will be tremendous. This deduction is logical. However, it does not altogether rule out the likelihood of the L2 also interfering with the L1.

Cook (1993:8) goes on to give more examples as to how interference is possible in the grammatical level of the bilingual. She writes:

At the grammatical level, speakers impose inappropriate L1 orders on the L2; German learners of English produce “Yesterday came he” modeled on the equivalent German sentence “Gestern kam er”.

From the above, it is clear that word order in German is completely different from modern English word order. ‘Yesterday came he’ is a word-for-word translation into English of the German sentence ‘Gestern kam er’ according to the word order in German. This is, however, not accepted in English because it violates English word order. The example “Gestern kam er” reveals that interference can affect the syntactic structure of either language of the bilingual. Since interference affects either language of the bilingual at all levels including grammar, as pointed out by Weinreich (1953), Robins (1989) and Cook (1993) and others, there is the likelihood of interference in the use of cohesion in the Ewe-English bilingual. In fact, Halliday and Hasan (1976:5) posit that “cohesion is part of the system of a language. The potential for cohesion lies in the systematic resources of reference, ellipsis and so on that are built into the language itself”.

Since cohesion is part of the system of language and bilingualism exhibits interferences in language systems of the bilingual, it is possible that there will be interference in the expression of cohesive devices in Ewe-English bilingual’s use

of cohesion. There are studies around the globe on the contact between English and other languages and what results from this contact. Some of these studies are discussed below as they contribute to and shape the present study.

## **2.7 The Contact between English and Other languages**

Many studies have been conducted on how English coexists with other languages it comes in contact with. Most of these studies have shown that there is always a struggle for dominance between English and the host language, since English is a second language to most speakers in the world (Crystal 1997, Philipson 1992). Since the present study compares English and Ewe, it is worth reviewing some of these studies in order to know what is already happening between English and other languages that it comes in contact with. This section reviews some studies on two major aspects of contact linguistics namely, bilingualism and codeswitching.

Akande and Akinwale (2006) conducted a case study on the pronunciation of /θ/ and /ð/ sounds among some Yoruba speakers of English. In the study the majority of the respondents more often than not replaced the English dental fricatives /θ/ and /ð/ with Yoruba alveolar stops /t/ and /d/ respectively. This is one of their conclusions drawn from the study:

The interference of the mother tongue (MT) of second language speakers of English is very crucial in their language performance. The study found out that the MT of Yoruba speakers of English usually influenced their pronunciations in English (p30).

Akande (2005) also conducted a similar study among Yoruba-speaking undergraduate students in the Obafemi Awolowo University and had similar conclusions. The mother tongue interference in the pronunciation of the English dental fricatives /θ/ and /ð/ among the Yoruba speakers of Nigeria is another proof that the first language of the bilingual interferes with the second one phonologically. In view of this, we have many new Englishes such as Ghanaian English and Nigerian English that show some level of uniqueness, no matter how subtle when placed side by side native English. Jowitt (1991) emphasizes this fact:

An obviously attractive parameter for determining varieties within Nigerian English is the ethnic one, i.e. distinguishing the various kinds of English that result from the interference of MTs (mother tongues). We could then talk of Hausa English, Igbo English, Yoruba English etc.

Jowitt (1991) clearly points to the fact that all that is referred to as Nigerian English, Hausa English, Igbo English and Yoruba English – and by extension Ghanaian English and its many variants – are, in fact, the mother tongue interferences on English. These interferences are so strong that they give the English language a new look and make it unique in comparison with native English. Akande (2005), Akande and Akinwale (2006) and Jowitt (1991) seem to confirm the observation made by Sey (1973) about Ghanaian English. Sey (1973:6) asserts that “the peculiar features of the English of educated Ghanaians may be more profitably described in terms of tendencies rather than specific Ghanaian usage, traceable directly to vernacular usage”. It is clear that the mother tongue (MT) has a strong influence on English as these studies have shown.

There is, however, one important thing to note about the conclusion drawn by Akande and Akinwale (2006) and Akande (2005) in their respective studies. They maintained that it is the interference of the mother tongue that made their respondents replace the English fricatives /θ/ and /ð/ with Yoruba dentals /t/ and /d/ respectively. We must note that the dentals /t/ and /d/ are not unique to the Yoruba language. These two sounds are also native to the English language as is evidenced, for example, in the words *take* /teik/ and *dark* /da: k/. What this, therefore, shows is that these respondents are simply not pronouncing these dental fricatives wrongly, replacing them with perhaps what they find easy to pronounce, the alveolar stops /t/ and /d/. While Yoruba and English both share the alveolar stops /t/ and /d/, the dental fricatives /θ/ and /ð/ are unique to the English language. Perhaps, it is simply the fact that these respondents' choice of the alveolar stops /t/ and /d/ for the fricatives /θ/ and /ð/ is shared by the two languages in contact.

Besides Akande and Akinwale (2006) and Akande (2005), an earlier study by Bada (2001) lends proof that the influence of the native language on English is essential. His study describes the phonological analysis of the English phonemic production of some Japanese-English bilinguals. His conclusion is that some sounds were found to pose difficulties of production that are attributable to the L1, whereas others were produced with no difficulty because they were already present in the L1 phonological system. These Japanese-English bilinguals also tend to use the voiceless alveolar stops /t/ to replace the voiceless dental fricative /θ/ and substitute the voiced dental fricative /ð/ with the voiced alveolar stop /d/. Just like Yoruba and other languages, Japanese also has the alveolar stops /t/ and /d/. We see that the Yoruba-

English and Japanese-English bilingual fall back on these alveolar stops to replace the English dental fricatives since these alveolar stops can be found in their mother tongues. It is only a matter of coincidence that the English language also has the alveolar stops in question.

The researcher is of the view that too much attention is given to how much the mother tongue interferes with English to the neglect of the effect of English on the mother tongue. A number of studies have shown that the mother tongue greatly interferes with English. That does not altogether mean that English as a second language does not interfere with the mother tongue. It does and this is one of the assumptions the present study seeks to make, paying attention to the use of cohesive devices. We must also note that the respondents of Akande (2005), Akande and Akinwale (2006) were undergraduate students, revealing that interference of the mother tongue on English and perhaps vice versa can occur no matter one's level of education.

Akande (2005), Akande and Akinwale (2006), Akinjobi (2004), Jibril (1982) and Jowitt (1991, 2000) assert that interference from the mother tongue is the cause of the uniqueness of the various Englishes spoken in Nigeria. Cook (1993), Robin (1989) and Weinreich (1953, 68) all pointed out that interference is, and can come, from either language of the bilingual. The present study does not only seek to discover how Ewe interferes with English in the use of cohesion. It also seeks to discover whether the second language, English, has any influence on the mother tongue, Ewe, in this regard.

Among the language contact phenomena, codeswitching, the alternate use of different languages by bilinguals in the same conversation, has attracted linguists' attention and has been studied from various perspectives. Most of these

studies dealt with intersentential and intrasentential codeswitching. Some of them are discussed in the following paragraphs. Intersentential codeswitching is the type of codeswitching done across sentences while intrasentential codeswitching is that type that takes place within sentences. Some decades ago, Weinreich (1953:788) argued:

The ideal bilingual switches from one language to another according to appropriate changes in the speech situation (interlocutors, topics etc.), but not in an unchanged situation and certainly not within a single sentence.

Many studies have proved that codeswitching (CS) can be both intersentential and intrasentential; codeswitching can take place within a sentence and between sentences. These studies render Weinreich's assertion invalid and also reveal that studies of the structure of CS constructions are relatively new since Weinreich (1968) made this statement four decades ago. Garretts (1975), Myers-Scotton (1993), Nishimura (1997), Ochola (2006) and Romaine (1995) studied the structure of Swahili-English, Marathi-English, Japanese-English, Panjabi-English and Dholuo-English CS constructions. Most of these studies specifically touch on the grammatical as well as the lexical structure of CS constructions. Since cohesion is a grammatical as well as a lexical phenomenon and this current study deals with the issue of bilingualism, it is therefore important to analyze some of these studies that deal with grammatical and lexical interferences in bilinguals as these inform the present study.

Myers-Scotton (1993, 1997, 2002) examined Swahili-English CS corpus comprising conversations recorded in Nairobi and proposed the matrix language



frame model (MLF). This model was proposed initially in 1993 and modified in 1997 and 2002. Currently, it is the most influential model used to account for intrasentential CS. This model maintains that it is one of the languages, the mother tongue in particular, of the bilingual that controls the grammar of intrasentential CS constructions. The language which provides the abstract morphosyntactic frame and the frame itself is called the matrix language (ML) and the other participating language is called the embedded language (EL).

Myers-Scotton (2002) distinguishes two types of CS: classic codeswitching and composite codeswitching. In the former, only one of the two languages in contact accounts for the morphosyntactic structure of the bilingual clause whereas in the latter, the morphosyntactic structure is made up of the two languages in contact. The MFL model applies to classic CS and Myers-Scotton (1993, 1997, 2002) proposed the following principles to guide it. First, it is independent or dependent clauses rather than sentences that should be the unit of analysis. Second, a bilingual CS construction may consist of three types of constituents: mixed constituents include morphemes from both matrix language and embedded language. ML islands are made of ML morphemes only and are under the control of ML grammar. They do not have any influence from the EL. EL islands are also well-formed by EL grammar but they are inserted into an ML frame. Therefore, EL islands are under the constraint of ML grammar (2002). Finally, regarding the mixed constituent, two hierarchies are proposed: first, participating languages do not have the same status. Second, the language which provides the abstract morphosyntactic frame and the frame itself is called the

matrix language (ML) and the other participating language is called the embedded language (EL).

Many studies have attempted to prove or disprove Myers-Scotton's matrix language frame model (MLF). One of such studies is that of Ochola (2006). Ochola (2006) admits:

A fascinating aspect of language contact is to consider what happens to the grammatical structure of languages when their speakers are bilingual and their speech brings two (or more) languages into contact. The goal of this article is to test the hypotheses about grammatical structure of codeswitching (CS) that are explicit or inherent in the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model of Myers-Scotton (1993, 1997; 2002).p208

Ochola's (2006) paper was a repetition of Myers-Scotton (1993, 1997, 2002). She conducted a study in the United States of America among undergraduate students who are Dholuo L1 speakers in which she analyzed the morphosyntactic structures in Dholuo-English CS utterances. Dholuo is a western Niletic language spoken around the shore of Lake Victoria in Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. One of the findings of Ochola (2006) is that single occurring verbs in Dholuo-English are governed by the morphosyntactic frame of the Dholuo language. For example:

42. Ne- wa- talk gi professor moro  
PST 1PL talk with professor ADJ. another  
(We talked with another professor)

In the CS Dholuo-English construction above, the English verb 'talk' is not inflected as it is in the monolingual translation in English. Rather, 'take' is preceded by the past tense marker in Dholuo 'ne'. Based on phenomena like these, Ochola (2006) argues that it is the Dholuo language that controls the grammatical patterning of Dholuo-

English CS constructions. She provides other examples to support her claim. Two are as follows:

43. Kusa è n big town.  
Kusa 3S-NONPAST BE big town  
(Kusa is a big town)

44. calculus ma – ngeny onge  
calculus that a lot that not there is  
(There is not a lot of calculus)

In Example 43, ‘big town’ is an English noun phrase consisting of the adjective ‘big’ and the head noun ‘town’. English grammar demands that ‘big town’ be preceded by the article ‘a’ inasmuch as the head word of the noun phrase ‘town’ is singular. The fact that this article is missing and this structure is still accepted as correct means that it is Dholuo that frames the utterance, not English. In Example 44, the English noun ‘calculus’ is followed by the Dholuo quantifying adjective ‘ngeny’ (a lot) introduced by ‘ma’ (that). In English, quantifiers precede the nouns they modify, as the translated version of Example 37 shows. The quantifier ‘a lot of’ precedes ‘calculus’. However, the Dholuo quantifier ‘ngeny’ (a lot) comes after ‘calculus’ in the CS construction. This is because in Dholuo, quantifiers come after the nouns they modify. Clearly, it is the Dholuo language that provides the grammatical structure of the Dholuo-English CS constructions. In fact, every other aspect about the Dholuo-English CS grammar tested by Ochola (2006) reveals that the Dholuo language absolutely controls the grammar of every intrasentential Dholuo-English CS constructions. These findings have validated Myers-Scotton’s MFL theory and seem to confirm an observation made by Weinreich (1953:88) that “it is the conclusion of common experience, if not yet a finding of psycholinguistic research that the language which has been learned first, or the mother

tongue, is in a privileged position to resist interference”. The above statement, although made more than half a century ago is still true today. Many modern studies have proved so. It is this observation that triggered Myers-Scotton’s MFL model in analyzing CS constructions.

There have been some studies on the contact between English and some Ghanaian languages. Amuzu’s (2006) unearthed three constraints the Ewe language places on English when the two are used in intrasentential CS constructions. Amuzu (2006:38) observed, “codeswitchers are deploying certain mother tongue language maintenance mechanisms which they have built into the principles that guide them in codeswitching”. He talks about ‘mother tongue language maintenance mechanisms’ which control the grammar of Ewe-English codeswitching constructions. The first of the constraints identified by Amuzu (2006:38) is that “the mother tongue shall contribute all grammatically active system morphemes in a bilingual construction”. Amuzu (2006) gives examples to support this claim:

45. Wo    le        boy    a2e        si - fi    phone  
       3PL   catch   boy   a certain   REL- fi    phone  
       (They caught a boy who stole a phone)

In the bilingual construction above, ‘boy’ and ‘phone’ are two English singular countable nouns. Singular nouns in English are normally preceded by the indefinite marker ‘a’. In example 45 however, we see that the English indefinite ‘a’ is blocked from preceding ‘boy’ and ‘phone’. Rather, ‘boy’ is postmodified by the Ewe indefinite marker ‘a2e’ (a certain). Since ‘a2e’ is a system morpheme in Ewe and the first constraint demands that the mother tongue contribute all grammatically active system morphemes in bilingual constructions, the English

indefinite marker is, therefore, blocked from preceding the noun ‘boy’. Below is another example:

46. Line -a      n4    busy    elabe    me-n4    internet    browse-m  
 DEF.was            because    I    was  
 ( The line was busy because I was browsing the internet.)

In Example 46, it is affirmed that it is the mother tongue (MT) that controls the grammar of this bilingual construction. The noun ‘line’ is postmodified by the Ewe definite marker -a instead of being premodified, as it were, by the English definite article ‘the’. Moreover, the verb ‘browse’ takes the Ewe morpheme -m, an equivalent of the English -ing. It is clear that it is the MT that has contributed all the active grammatical systems in the CS constructions above. This first constraint which points out that the MT contribute all active morphemes in Ewe-English CS constructions, is thus proved true.

The second constraint that Amuzu (2006:39) identified is that “the mother tongue shall set the order in which morphemes, constituents from both languages co-occur in a bilingual construction”. When we refer to Example 45, *a2e* (a certain) post-modifies ‘boy’ instead of premodifying it. In English, determiners and demonstratives are premodifiers. In Ewe, they are postmodifiers. Amegashie (2004), Atakpa (1993) and Obianim (1990) identify some of these demonstratives in Ewe as *a2e(certain)*, *sia(this)*, *siawo(these)*, *ma(that)* and so on and assert that they always come after the nouns they modify. Here are some examples:

47. ~utsu      *a2e*  
       **Man**      **a certain (a certain man)**  
  
 @evi      sia  
       **Child**      **this (this child)**

Awu	ma	<b>Shirt</b>	<b>that (that shirt)</b>
		Sukuvi	siawo
		<b>Student</b>	<b>these (these students)</b>

We can see that the indefinite marker *a2eas* as well as the demonstratives *sia*, *ma* and *siawo* postmodifies the nouns *`utsu*, *2evi*, *awu* and *sukuvi* respectively. This is the grammatical constraint that the Ewe grammar imposes on English in the Ewe-English CS constructions. Moreover, Ewe-English bilinguals make specific choices that uphold the integrity of the mother tongue by refusing to let English adjectives premodify Ewe nouns in CS constructions. That will be against constraint two. In English, most adjectives are attributive; they come before the nouns they modify. A few come after the nouns they modify. Examples are *galore* and *old* as in the phrases *money galore* and *four years old* respectively. In contrast, Ewe adjectives are all in postmodification; they come after the nouns they modify. Below are some examples:

48.

suku	yeye	<b>school</b>	<b>new ( new school)</b>
2evi	nyui	<b>child</b>	<b>good (good child)</b>
ame	tsitsi	<b>person</b>	<b>old (old person)</b>

Since adjectives postmodify nouns in Ewe, even when they are used with English nouns in CS constructions, they postmodify them rather than premodify them according to English norm. Here are examples from Amuzu (1998:79):

49.

(a) Gake fifia, **hadziha best one** a woawo si wo le.  
 But now, choir the 3PL hand 3sg be PRE

(But now, they have the best choir)

- (b) Ts4 aka2i**bright one** si le **corner** kema dzi va na-m  
Take lantern REL be over there come to- 1sg.  
(Bring the bright lantern that is in the corner over there to me.)  
(Amuzu 1998:80)

In Example 49, ‘hadziha’ (choir) and ‘aka2i’ (lantern) are the Ewe nouns used in the above CS constructions. These are both postmodified by English adjectives ‘best’ and ‘bright’ respectively. These adjectives have occurred outside their normal position in English and have behaved as though they were native to Ewe.

The following Ewe-English CS construction will, therefore, be unacceptable:

50. \*Woa n4 big a2aka ma me.  
3PL POT-be box that inside.  
(They will be inside that big box)

The foregoing construction has the English adjective ‘big’ premodifying the Ewe noun a2aka (box). We have however seen that constraint two demands that “the mother tongue shall set the order in which morphemes, constituents from both languages co-occur in a bilingual construction”. We also learn in Ewe, adjectives postmodify nouns. Taking these points into consideration helps us to see the unacceptability of the CS construction above; that is, the extent to which Ewe interferes with English in CS.

The third constraint Amuzu (2006) identified is that some English lexemes are accepted in CS forms, others are not. Some English verbs are accepted in singly-occurring forms in mixed verb phrases. Some of these verbs he identified are *go, come, know, see, look, eat, want, say, tell, give* and *buy*. The following CS constructions are therefore unacceptable:

51. \*Ama me le suku **go-ge** o a?  
 Ama NEG. be-PRE school go ING  
 ( Won't Ama go to school?)

\*Kofi **come-ge** ets4  
 Kofi come -ING tomorrow  
 (Kofi is coming tomorrow)

Amuzu's findings about the third constraint are not altogether new for, almost three decades ago, Forson (1979:183-184) also had similar findings. He also named the above verbs as the English verbs that may not occur in Akan-based mixed verb phrases. Examples from Forson (1979) are as follows:

52. \*\$-re-go fie.  
 3sg-PROG-go home  
 (He is going home.)

Nyarko Ansah (2006) gave further examples to confirm Forson's findings.

53. \*M'a-see more clearly now.  
 1sg-perf.  
 ( I see more clearly now.)

54. \*M'a know me left and right  
 1sg-perf.  
 (I know my left from right.)

Forson (1979) explained that these English verbs refuse to enter Akan-English CS construction because their Akan counterparts are frequently used in monolingual Akan constructions. Amuzu (2006) agrees with Forson (1979) partially, for according to him some Ewe verbs like '2u' which can mean *eat*, *chew*, *deplete*, *spend* and *squander* defy Forson's argument. Of all the English verbs that translate the Ewe verb '2u', only *eat* will not occur in a mixed verb phrase. The same applies to the Ewe verb 'kp4' which can be translated *see*, *look*, *watch*, *notice*, *observe*, *find out*, *discover* and *consult*, depending on the



circumstance. Of these verbs too, only *see* and *look* are blocked from occurring in mixed verb phrases. Amuzu (2006) argues that these verbs that do not enter mixed construction are generic or superordinate terms. For example, the verb *eat* encompasses a wide range of meaning which can involve *chew*, *swallow* and *lick*. These specific forms are accepted in mixed constructions rather than their generic counterparts. I agree with Amuzu that it is not enough to say that the verbs that do not enter mixed constructions are simply frequently used in their respective monolingual constructions. This is because the frequency of the use of a verb depends on one's choice of words or a circumstance may demand the use of a particular verb. Moreover, no empirical study shows that these verbs are used more frequently than those that enter Ghanaian language-English CS constructions. Amuzu's (2006) explanation as regards why some Akan or Ewe verbs cannot enter into Ghanaian language-English CS constructions is, therefore, more convincing, easier to explain and prove than that of Forson (1979).

Forson (1979) also acknowledges that codeswitching is common in Ghana and that some speakers switch between English and other Ghanaian languages – a product of bilingualism. He further states that although Akan-English bilinguals switch between Akan and English, it is Akan, which is mixed with various items of English not the other way round. Amuzu's (2006) work only seems to confirm Forson (1968), but this time, in the case of Ewe-English bilinguals.

Torto (2000) also carried out a study among University of Cape Coast students as regards their choice of code in communication. The study looked at Akan-English, Ewe-English, Ga-English, Dagbani-English and Dagaare-English

bilinguals. He observed that all these bilinguals switch code between their MT and English at various times. Just like Amuzu (2006) and Forson (1968, 79), Torto (2000) observed that it was the Ghanaian languages that were mixed with words and expression of English, not vice versa. The Ghanaian languages, therefore, served as the matrix languages, while English was the embedded one.

From the studies of Akande (2005), Akande and Akinwale (2006), Amuzu (2005), Forson (1968, 1979), Nyarko Ansah (2005) and Torto (2000), it is clear that the mother tongue (MT) maintains the upper hand over English and still holds onto its characteristic features and contributes these features when it comes in contact with English, especially in codeswitching.

Akande (2005), Akande and Akinwale's (2006) and Torto's (2000) studies were conducted among undergraduate students in West Africa. These respondents have studied English to a very high level. Notwithstanding that, their mother tongue still maintains strong interference with English. The present study is also conducted among undergraduate students in Ghana. The researcher thinks that the findings of this study may go contrary to those mentioned above. English may strongly interfere with Ewe in the use of cohesion, given the following reasons. First, the studies discussed herein were conducted based on spoken data. Since the respondents of these studies usually communicate using their L1, it is not surprising that their L1 greatly interferes with their L2. The present study, however, focuses on students' written data in both English and Ewe. Since almost all of students' essays, quizzes, assignments and examinations are written in English rather than in the Ghanaian language, the researcher believes that there is

the likelihood that the English language will dominate the Ewe language by interfering with it greatly. Moreover, the studies discussed touched on phonological and grammatical interference between English and the other languages, and not cohesion.

## **2.8 Studies on Cohesion and Bilingualism**

Some studies in contact linguistics reveal that the use of cohesive devices is one bane of translation. One of such studies is that of Shi (2004). Shi's study reveals the importance of teaching cohesion in translation classes. Shi (2004) compared the test scores of Chinese-English bilinguals before and after teaching them the realization of cohesion in English based on Halliday and Hasan's concept of cohesion and how this concept poses a challenge to the Chinese-English translator. This challenge exists because Chinese and English belong to two different language families and it is only natural that the way each language employs interrelationship of persons and events is different from the other (Callow 1974). Moreover, Newmark (1987:295) asserts that "the topic of cohesion...has always appeared to be the most useful constituent of ...text linguistics applicable to translation." Newmark's words reveal that one of the ways to a good translation of one language into another is to master the unique ways each of these languages employ cohesive devices. Shi (2004) found that the test scores of his translation students improved tremendously after teaching them the concept of cohesion in English and how this concept can be handled in Chinese.

Querol (2005) also presents a description of how English literature makes use of substitution as a device of grammatical cohesion and the mechanisms employed in its translation into Spanish. The results suggest that the Spanish solution to this device is that other mechanisms different from substitution are used. Two literary corpuses were used for the study: corpus A composed of the original texts written in English and was made up of 113445 words, corpus B included the translation into Spanish of those same texts and it consisted of 114164 words. In the English corpus, substitution appeared 125 times. When selecting a device in the Spanish translation, substitution had not always been the case. Only 24 cases of substitution were identified. For the rest of the 101 cases, another solution was adopted. Other grammatical, lexical cohesive devices and some translation techniques were employed to solve this problem.

This study reveals that even though all languages have cohesive devices, these are employed following the internal rules of the language in question. One remarkable thing about the study in question is that out of 125 times substitution appeared in the English corpus, the translation of the same text into Spanish gathered only 24 occurrences, about 20 percent of the appearances of substitution in the original English text. The study further reveals that cohesion is one major system that the translator must grapple with in order to effectively carry out his task. Baker (1992: 190) asserts, “Every language has its own links for establishing cohesive links”. This study of the English-Spanish translation confirms Baker’s words and shows that there can be shifts in the realization of cohesion in one language when it is translated into another (see Blum-Kulka 2000).

The present study will serve the same purpose to the Ewe-English translator the purpose the studies of Shi (2004) and Querol (2005) serve to the Chinese-English and Spanish-English translators respectively. The present study identifies the similarities and differences in the way English and Ewe realize cohesion. This will help the Ewe-English translator to develop mechanisms to deal with the problem of cohesion when translating English into Ewe and vice versa.

Other studies reveal that cohesion also plays a major role in multilingual conversations. One of such studies is that of Angermeyer (2002). He studied the conversations of a trilingual family in 1997 in Canada. The family was made up of a mother, a native speaker of German. The father spoke both English and French at home. The couple communicated in English since that was the language both share. After the birth of their children, the father spoke English to them while the mother spoke German to them. The father later learned German while the mother learned French to some degree.

Analysis of their conversations showed that there were many cases when lexical items of their other languages are inserted into their matrix language. When the father spoke German, he inserted English and French lexical items. The same thing happened to the mother when she spoke English or French. These insertions, however, formed cohesive ties with the lexical items of their matrix language and made their utterances as though they were completely using one language.

Angermeyer (2002) argues that insertions of one language into another of a bilingual are a consequence of the bilingual's attempt to create coherence between utterances in different languages. As we saw earlier, one of the ways to achieve coherence is by means of cohesion. He goes to argue that if a bilingual repeats a lexical item from a previous utterance even if the language of interaction has changed, lexical cohesion is established. The only difference is that the utterances belong to two different languages. Even though the lexical items may belong to different languages, they form a cohesive tie nevertheless. Hoey (1991:9-10) noted that lexical cohesion is "the single most important form of cohesive tie." Angermeyer (2002) reveals that Hoey's assertion is true even in the case of multilingual conversations.

## **2.9 Summary**

This chapter gives an overview of Halliday and Hasan's (1976) Cohesion in English and Weinreich (1953, 1968) Languages in Contact as a theoretical framework on which to discover how cohesion is realized in Ewe and how bilingualism affects the Ewe-English bilingual's use of cohesion respectively. The chapter also reveals and clearly defines what interference is in relation to the reactions between the two languages in the bilingual's mind. Interference, as Weinreich (1953; 1968) and others assert, can happen grammatically, phonologically and lexically. At the phonological level, this is liable to occur when the phonemic inventory of the target language differs from that of the mother tongue. At the grammatical level, interference may occur if a grammatical category exists in the target language but not in the mother tongue or if the two

languages employ different structures to convey a particular grammatical relationship. I argue that since cohesion is a grammatical as well as a lexical phenomenon, there is the possibility that interference can exhibit itself in the Ewe-English bilingual's use of cohesion.

Moreover, all the empirical studies discussed in this chapter with regard to the contact between French-English, German- English, Japanese-English, Yoruba-English, Dholuo-English, Akan-English, Ewe-English, Ga-English and so on reveal that interference between the languages of the bilingual does really happen. The researcher observes that the mother tongue (MT) seems to have the upper hand over the English language in all these studies reviewed. This could be as the result of too much attention focused on how the English language is transformed when it comes in contact with other languages other than vice versa. The mother tongue (MT) also undergoes some transformation as it comes in contact with English. This is one of the discoveries this present study seeks to make, with focus on cohesion.

In the present study, the mother tongue (MT) or the L1 of the respondents is the Ewe language. The lexical structure and the grammar of Ewe differ from those of English. Since cohesion is both a grammatical and lexical phenomenon, Ewe's realization of cohesion will be at least slightly different from how it is realized in English.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

This chapter outlines the research methodology employed in the present study. It, in particular, describes the research sites and population, sample and its selection, the research design, the data collection procedure, ethics and the data analysis plan.

#### **3.2 Research Design**

The nature of the present study puts it into the domain of qualitative research. Shank (2002:5) defines qualitative research as “a form of systematic empirical inquiry into meaning”. By ‘systematic’ he means that the study should be planned and well organized. By ‘empirical’, he means that this type of inquiry is grounded in the world of experience. Denzin and Lincoln (2000:3) claim that qualitative research involves an “interpretive and naturalistic” approach. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. Fraenkel and Norman (2002:505) emphasize the point that in qualitative study, “there is greater emphasis on holistic description – that is, on describing in detail all what goes on in a particular activity or situation”.

The main qualitative research design employed in this study was the case study design. Case studies richly describe, explain or access and evaluate a



phenomenon under study (Gall, Borg & Gall 1996). The study, as we shall see in chapter four, deals predominantly with description and narration. This is because the outcomes of the study are not reduced to numerical scores as it is normally done in quantitative researches. Fraenkel and Norman (2002) and Reinard (1998) point to some major characteristics of qualitative researches. Some of these are that they have qualitative data, flexible design, naturalistic enquiry, personal contact and insight, inductive analysis and holistic perspective.

Even though this study is predominantly qualitative, it has some quantitative aspects. Figures such as the number of respondents, the number of essays received from respondents as well as tables showing these figures appeared in the study and helped in data analysis.

It is clear that this study had qualitative data – written texts of students. Moreover, the study was a natural enquiry for it investigated a natural phenomenon – the use of language. The research involved a personal contact between the researcher and respondents. The analytical form of this study was also inductive in that it was not reduced to tables or numerical scores, but it discussed phenomena as they happened. Suffice it now to say that this study was largely qualitative.

Measures were taken to ensure that data collection would be without blemish. One of such measures was a pilot study conducted. “A pilot study”, according to Frankel and Norman (2002:12), “is a small scale of the proposed procedures. Its purpose is to detect any problems so that they can be remedied before the study is carried out. Based on the foregoing knowledge, 16

undergraduate Ghanaian Language (Ewe) students of the University of Cape Coast were randomly picked: four students from each level (two males, two females from each level). After explaining to them what the present study was about, the researcher gave them some topics to write on. Since the present study investigates cohesion in English and Ewe, each of the 16 were asked to write two essays, one in English and one in Ewe. This comparison in cohesion in the two languages in student essays would be impossible if respondents provided essays in only one language. In all, 32 essays – 16 in English and 16 in Ewe – were expected from the 16 students in the pilot study. The researcher gave them a period of one week within which to submit their essays. This time was given by the researcher as an experimental one on which to decide which time to give to respondents to submit their essays in the main study.

Out of the 16 students, 9 submitted their texts; 7 did not show up. The researcher contacted all the students used in this pilot. From those who did not provide essays for the pilot study, he wanted to know what prevented them from submitting their essays. Some had wanted to use their own topics since they did not have time for further research. Others complained about the limited time given them to submit the assignment. Some said they had quizzes and assignments and that they could not have time for the present study. These problems helped the researcher to take measures to ensure the smooth collection of data in the main study. These measures are discussed under data and data collection procedure.

The data gathered from the pilot study was analyzed and this gave the researcher some insight about the realization of cohesion in Ewe. He found from the data that cohesion as a textual phenomenon realizable grammatically and lexically was almost the same in Ewe as it was in English. Moreover, he found that there were some differences as regards the individual cohesive devices, especially in reference and ellipsis. There were traces of English influence on Ewe with specific regard to reference and ellipsis. These differences came about because of the different ways English and Ewe employ personal pronouns in the realization of reference and ellipsis. Ewe has a broad range of personal pronouns to pick from in realizing reference and ellipsis while English, comparatively, has a limited set to choose from. These similarities, differences and interferences as they appeared even in the data of the main study are discussed in detail in chapter four. However, the researcher did not find any trace of Ewe influence in the data of the pilot study.

The pilot study confirmed the researcher's hypotheses that both languages would realize cohesion almost the same way and that English would interfere with Ewe in this regard. This pilot study prepared the researcher for the main study as to whether or not the researcher's hypotheses in the pilot study would be confirmed by the findings of the main study.

### **3.3 Research Sites**

As indicated in chapter one, the research sites for the present study were University of Cape Coast (UCC) and University of Education, Winneba (UEW). These institutions also had the largest number of Ghanaian Language (Ewe) students. Since this study was directed towards students reading, Ghanaian language (Ewe), it was appropriate these institutions served as the research sites for the present study. Background information about the research sites follows.

### **3.3.1 University of Cape Coast**

The University of Cape Coast was one of the research sites of the present study. Since the study was conducted among Ghanaian Language (Ewe) students in the University, it was important to give an overview of the Department of Ghanaian Languages and Linguistics of the University.

The Department of Ghanaian Languages and Linguistics in the University of Cape Coast is one of the departments in the Faculty of Arts which consists of other departments such as Departments of English, French, History, Classics and Philosophy, Religion and Humans Values, Music and African Studies. The Department of Ghanaian Languages runs undergraduate and postgraduate courses in Akan (Twi and Fante), Ewe and Ga. Besides, the department also runs the General Linguistics course at the undergraduate level.

Students reading any of the Ghanaian languages above read it as one of their major courses comprising three or four subject areas. According to the University's First Degree and Diploma Programmers Admission Brochure for 2009/2010 Academic Year, students reading the following courses can read a

Ghanaian language as one of its major subject areas in the following programmes: B.A (Arts), B.A. (African Studies), B.A. (Theatre Studies), B.A. (Music), B.Ed. (Basic Education) and B.Ed. (Arts). Most students reading any of these programmes eventually take one or two of their courses as their major courses. Because of this trend, the number of students reading Ewe and other Ghanaian languages reduces over the years. This is clearly spelt in the total number of students reading Ewe in UCC in comparison with UEW.

### **3.3.2 University of Education, Winneba**

The second research site for this study was the University of Education, Winneba (UEW). Like UCC, UEW also runs undergraduate and postgraduate courses in Ghanaian languages. However, the UEW's structure is different from that of UCC.

In UEW, there is a department solely for Ewe, namely the Department of Ewe Education. This department is found in the Faculty of Languages Education, the largest faculty in the University. This faculty consists of other departments like Departments of Akan-Nzema Education, Applied Linguistics, English Education, French Education, GaDangme Education and Gur-Gonja Education. In UEW, unlike UCC, each student is entitled to one major subject area as a course of study. Students reading Ewe Education, for example, read this course throughout their levels. This is so with all other courses. This explains why UEW has more students reading Ghanaian Language (Ewe) than UCC, as we shall see in the succeeding paragraphs.

### **3.4 Population and Sampling**

The population of the present study was all the undergraduate students who are Ewe-English coordinate bilinguals in UCC and UEW. Undergraduate classes in these institutions cover levels 100 to 400. There was a problem with this population regarding the present study. The problem was that an undergraduate Ewe-English bilingual might not necessarily be a coordinate bilingual. The study, however, was to be conducted among coordinate bilinguals – bilinguals who have very high proficiency levels in both languages. That means that not any undergraduate speaking and writing Ewe and English in UCC and UEW was necessarily a coordinate bilingual.

Since the population of the study was a vast one and not everyone in the population could be a coordinate bilingual, the researcher used the purposive sampling method to select his respondents for the present study. Only students in UCC and UEW who read Ghanaian language (Ewe) as one of their major courses were used for this study. A student reading Ewe as a major course of study in UCC and UEW must have a good proficiency level in Ewe, in both speaking and writing modes of the language. Moreover, most of the students' other courses, assignments and academic works are written in English other than the Ghanaian language (Ewe). A student who read English as a major course without Ewe was not as qualified as a coordinate bilingual as the student that read Ewe as a major course. This is because students reading Ewe take assignments and tests in English. The medium of teaching in most of their courses outside Ewe is English.

However, students who read only English do not take assignments in Ewe, neither are they taught using Ewe. The student reading Ewe, therefore, has higher proficiency levels in both Ewe and English than the student reading only English.

Purposive sampling was the best method of sampling for the present study. Purposive sampling is “based on a specific purpose rather than randomly” (Tashakkori and Teddlie 2003a, p. 713). This target group from the population was suitable for the present study because the target group possessed the characteristics needed for the study. The students who read Ewe as one of their major courses would have a better proficiency level in both English and Ewe. As noted by Maxwell (1997:87), in purposive sampling, “particular persons...are deliberately selected for the important information they can provide that cannot be gotten...from others.” This particular group of students reading Ewe in UCC and UEW is the best sample for the present study since their levels of proficiency in English and Ewe were high and they qualified as coordinate bilinguals. The tables below show the distributions of this target groups from UCC and UEW.

**Table 1: Number of Respondents from UCC**

SEX	LEVEL 100	LEVEL 200	LEVEL 300	LEVEL 400	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE
MALE	12	13	6	4	35	68.63%
FEMALE	7	6	2	1	16	31.37%
TOTAL	19	19	8	5	51	100%

Table 1 presents the distribution of the respondents from the University of Cape Coast. The total number of the respondents was fifty-one (51), consisting of thirty-five (35) males and sixteen (16) females. Male respondents made up 68.63% of the UCC sample while females comprised 31.37%. Level hundred consisted of twelve males (12) and seven (7) females. Level two hundred was made up of thirteen (13) males and six (6) females. While level three hundred had six (6) males and two (2) females, level four hundred comprised four (4) males and one (1) female. Table 2 shows the distribution of respondents from the University of Winneba (UEW).

**Table 2: Number of Respondents from UEW**

SEX	LEVEL 100	LEVEL 200	LEVEL 300	LEVEL 400	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE
MALE	51	43	24	36	154	70.32%
FEMALE	10	16	19	20	65	29.68%
TOTAL	61	59	43	56	219	100%

The respondents from UEW total two hundred and nineteen (219), consisting of 154 (70.32%) and 65 females (29.68%). The total of respondents from UCC and UEW is 270: 189 males and 81 females. The former represents 70% of the sample while the latter stands at 30%. Moreover, out of this total sample of 270, the respondents from UCC (51) stand at 18.9% while that of UEW (219) represents 81.1%. The total 270 was therefore the sample for the present study.

### **3.5 Data and Data Collection Procedure**



Data for the current study were based on written texts of undergraduate students reading Ghanaian Language (Ewe) in UCC and UEW. Since this study investigates English and Ewe, each respondent provided two texts for the study – one in English and the other in Ewe. In order to make the essay writing easy for the respondents, the respondents were given various essay topics on which to write. Some of these topics are as follows:

*Road accidents in Ghana*

*Unemployment among the youth in Ghana*

*The role of women in Ghana's development*

*The importance of university education to Ghana*

Of the 270 respondents, 15 wrote on the topic *Road accidents in Ghana*, 18 wrote on *Unemployment among the youth in Ghana*, 7 wrote on *The role of women in Ghana's development* and 12 wrote on *The importance of university education to Ghana*. Only 52 respondents wrote on any of the topics the researcher provided. The rest of the respondents, just as it happened in the pilot study, wrote on a variety of topics other than the ones given them. They were willing to write on topics they were conversant with. The respondents that were willing to choose their own topics were allowed to do so since the aim of the study in question was not about which topic to write on but the creation of a text. Halliday and Hasan's (1976) definition of a text, as we saw in chapter two, clearly leaves topic out of the question. It follows that no matter the topic written on, the product is a text. The majority of respondents wrote on the same topic in both languages while others wrote on different topics.

In order to make the collection of data less stressful and well-organized, the researcher collected the teaching time table of Ewe in both research sites –

UCC and UEW. Since the researcher is a Senior Research Assistant in the Department of Ghanaian Languages in UCC, meeting the various lecturers who teach Ewe in the department to arrange to accompany them to their lectures in order to collect data posed no problem. This is because all these lecturers in the department know the researcher. In March 2009, the researcher accompanied these lecturers in UCC to their lectures. He was introduced to the classes after which he was given the chance to tell the students his mission. The researcher then told each class the topic of his study as well as what the study sought to achieve. He further explained to the respondents the kind of data he sought for the study.

Thereafter, the researcher provided every respondent two foolscap sheets and a ballpoint pen. These sheets and pens reduced any effort the respondents might make to provide paper for the essays in question. Reasons for this as well as others in carrying out the study are given under the title, *Ethics*. Since the respondents had other important academic assignments to do, the researcher gave the students a three-week period within which to submit the essays. This was to allow the respondents time to be able to write the essays in spite of other academic works they might be doing.

In the first week of May 2009, the same research procedure was carried out in UEW. There were, however, some slight differences between what happened in UCC and UEW. It was quite difficult to arrange with the lecturers in UEW to help collect data. Through the help of some lecturers who are based in UEW but are part-time lecturers in the Department of Ghanaian Languages in

UCC, the researcher was able to arrange and accompany these lecturers to their lectures and followed the same procedures he used in UCC.

The number of students reading Ewe in UEW far outweighed that of UCC. Because of this, the researcher spent more time with each class in UEW than he did in UCC. Every other procedure carried out in UCC was maintained in UEW. The researcher took the phone number of each class representative in UEW and informed the class that anybody who finished writing the essays earlier than the three-week period given could submit them to their class representatives. He communicated regularly with these class leaders to know whether the respondents submitted the essays.

### **3.6 Problems Encountered**

There were some problems encountered in the data collection process. These, however, did not affect the study negatively in any way. Some respondents refused to write the essays for the study since according to them, “writing two essays was too much a task for them”. In addition, even though the researcher gave the respondents a three-week period within which to write the essays, it took almost eight weeks before he had the essays. Because of these problems, although the researcher expected to receive a total 540 essays (270 in English and 270 in Ewe), he received 426 (221 in English and 205 in Ewe). The essays received are approximately 79 percent of the number envisaged from the sample, 540, needed for the study. This problem does not affect the findings of the study since these

findings are not reduced to numerical bases. The findings of the present study are rather descriptive as the next chapter shows.

### **3.7 Ethics**

The researcher maintained high ethics during his data collection. Reinard (1998:12) said that “conducting research is bound up in the ethical standards our society has accepted”. Thus, just as procedures and results matter in judging a study, the ethics of the researcher during a study are equally important. In order to lend validity to the present study, it is important to discuss the researcher’s ethics in conducting the study.

Ary et al (2000) and Sarantakos (1993) provide some ethical standards on the researcher-respondent relation. Some of the ethics they identified are proper identification of the researcher, free and informed consent of the respondents, the right to privacy, anonymity and confidentiality on the part of respondents, respondents’ questions as regards the study must be answered and the eventual benefit of the study must be stated.

Bearing these points in mind, the researcher was careful not to be unethical in his data collection process. Concerning proper identification of the researcher, every class he went, the researcher formally introduced himself by telling the class his name, his address, the title of his study and what type of data he sought. This helped the researcher to familiarize himself with respondents and helped create a friendly atmosphere in order to promote a smooth interchange between researcher and respondents for problem-free data collection.

At both research sites, a few respondents were not willing to provide data for this study. They complained about being too busy to burden themselves with writing essays that do not form part of their semester assessments. Since ethics demands that respondents are not forced to help carry out a study as noted by Reinard (1998) and Sarantakos (1993), these respondents were not forced to provide essays for the present study. In UCC, six respondents refused to provide any data for the study. In UEW, the number was 21. It is not ethical to force respondents to help in a study. The quality of data could be affected if respondents grudgingly participate in a study.

The researcher assured the respondents that the study was purely for academic purposes and that every respondent would remain anonymous. He then advised respondents not to write their names on the essays they wrote. They were however to write their levels and sex on the top left corner of their essays. This information would help data analysis. Sarandakos (1993) also insists that if respondents ask questions about the study, they should be answered. As noted earlier, the researcher answered all questions raised by the respondents.

As noted under the section 'Data and Data Collection Procedure', the researcher provided the respondents with two foolscap sheets and a pen each. This was to motivate the respondents to respond favorably to the assignment given them.

### **3.8 Data Analysis Plan**

Since data for this study was in two corpuses – one in English and the other Ewe – the researcher sorted out the English corpus separately from the Ewe corpus. Since the present study investigated cohesion in English, data was analyzed based on Halliday and Hasan's (1976) cohesion coding scheme found in Chapter 8 of their Cohesion in English. In that coding scheme, each cohesive device is separated and broken down into its various parts for easy identification. Here, every sentence was numbered. This helped the researcher to easily pinpoint a cohesive device, tie, as well as the very word or group of words that spells cohesion. Gall et al. (1996) outlined three approaches to case data analysis – interpretational analysis, where the researcher looks for patterns within data to explain the phenomenon; structural analysis, which discusses patterns as they appear in a text or the like and finally, reflective analysis, where the evaluation of the studied phenomenon is done by a qualified expert. All these three approaches were employed in analyzing data of the present study. Chapter four discusses the analysis of data.

### **3.9 Views on Findings**

For the sake of validity and basing the conclusions of this study on a broader point of view rather than on the researcher's views only, the findings of this study were tested on a number of people. The first persons contacted were some of the respondents of this study. The views of residents in some Ewe-speaking communities such as Duakoro in Cape Coast, Aflao and Denu, both in the Ketu District of the Volta Region, were also solicited. Moreover, the views of teachers

and lecturers of Ewe were also incorporated in this study. These views and responses towards the findings of this study are thoroughly discussed in the final chapter of the study.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **DATA ANALYSIS**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter discusses data collected for this study. Data was analyzed by considering each research question at a time. The first is: How is cohesion realized in Ewe? To answer this question, only the texts in Ewe were considered. Every sentence of the texts was numbered for easy reference. The various cohesive devices namely reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion were then taken one at a time and cohesive ties were looked for to match or mismatch them. The researcher followed the models presented by Halliday and Hasan (1976).

The second research question has to do with the differences and similarities between English and Ewe in the use of cohesion. After answering the first question, the researcher could now tell these differences and similarities since the realization of cohesion in English already serves as the theoretical framework for the present work.

The third research question is, How do English and Ewe interfere with each other in the Ewe-English bilingual's use of cohesion? To answer this question, both the Ewe and English texts were considered. The researcher



analyzed the English texts as he did the Ewe ones earlier. The following section answers the first research question regarding how cohesion is realized in Ewe.

## 4.2 Cohesion in Ewe

This section discusses how the Ewe language realizes cohesion. Cohesion in Ewe is described by focusing on a cohesive device one at a time and discussing it exhaustively.

### 4.2.1 Reference

Analysis of data reveals that one of the ways in which cohesion is realized in Ewe is by means of reference. The following examples authenticate this conclusion. As we have seen earlier, one of the ways in which reference is realized is by the use of personal pronouns. There are some peculiarities in Ewe personal pronouns that are discussed in this chapter as they are used in the realization of reference. Here is an example to aid in the discussion of data.

55a. Enye nyate5e be ny4nuwo s4gb4 wu `utsuwo le Ghana.  
 3SG-COP truth that woman-PL more than man-PL LOC  
 (It is true that women outnumber men in Ghana)

b. Togb4 be wòle nenema h7 la, wometea `u w4a d4 ses8 a2eke o.  
 though PREP 3SG-COP same 3PL-NEG-HAB can do work hard neg.  
 (Though this is true, they do not do any hard work.)

In Example 55b, the Ewe third person singular *wò* (*it, she* or *he* depending on the context) *inwòle...* refers back to sentence *a*. In that case, sentence *a* re-enters the discussion. The only change we see of it is that it has been reduced to a single pronoun *wò*. This is clearly shown in the English translation as *that* just as *it* in

translation *b* refers to the whole of sentence *a*, so does *wò* in sentence *b* refer to the whole of sentence *a*.

Another referential link that serves a cohesive purpose in the foregoing examples is the Ewe third person plural pronoun *wo*(they) in the clause *wometea`u...* (they can't...). The *e* (it) and *wo* (they) bind the two sentences together and serve the cohesive purpose of reference.

Reference, as a cohesive device, can either be anaphoric or cataphoric. It is anaphoric when the reference points to a preceding item and cataphoric when the reference points to a succeeding item. These are some examples from data showing both types of references.

56(a) *Dunyahehe menye 2evi 5e nya kura o.*  
 politics NEG.COP child POSS word NEG.NEG  
 (Politics is not a child's play)

*Tsitsiawo kple ak4tan4amesit4wo 5e nyae wònye.*  
 elderly.PL CONJ chest.owner.PL POSS word.FOC 3sg COP  
 (It is the elderly and the courageous who indulge in politics.)

(b) *Dzilawo kpea fu ge2e 2e wo viwo ta le 2evyawo 5e sukudenyawo,*  
 parent-PL suffer-HAB many PREP POSS-child-PL PREP PREP child-DEF- PL  
 POSS school-go- words,

*nu2unyawo kple k4dzidenyawo me.*  
 thing-eat-words CONJ hospital-go-words POST.  
 (Parents suffer for their children's education, nutrition and health)

*Nu siawo w4w4 menye fefenya kura o.*  
 thing DEM-PL do-do NEG-COP play-word NEG NEG  
 (Fulfilling these roles is not easy at all)

In Example 56a, the sentence *Dunyahehe menye 2evi 5e nya kura o*(Politics is not a child's play), clearly points to the succeeding sentence to provide the answer as to who should indulge in politics. The answer comes swiftly in the following sentence

– *Tsitsiawo kple ak4tan4amesit4wo 5e nyae wònye*(It is the elderly and the courageous who indulge in it).

The first sentence in Example 56a clearly points to the following one for a meaningful cohesive tie. This type of reference is anaphoric.

A reference can also be cataphoric when a cohesive tie links with a linguistic item or items in a preceding sentence. The preceding items of reference do not need to come immediately before a succeeding sentence to be accepted as cataphoric. As long as a link is made, a cohesive tie is established however near or far off the linguistic items that mark the tie are, the reference is still cataphoric. Example 56b illustrates how a cataphoric reference looks like in Ewe. The example has two sentences. The first part reads: *Dzilawo kpea fu ge2e 2e woviwo ta le 2evyawo 5e sukudenyawo, nu2unyawo kple k4dzidenyawo me* (Parents suffer for their children's education, nutrition and health). The second sentence goes, *Nu siawo w4w4 menyefefenya kura o*(Fulfilling these roles is not easy at all). The first sentence lists some of the roles parents play – *sukudenyawo* (education), *nu2unyawo* (nutrition), and *k4dzidenyawo*(health). The second sentence restates these roles in the pro-form *nu siawo* (these things). In this case, *nu siawo* refers back to the different roles parents perform in the lives of their children. This is a cataphoric reference.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) identify three ways in which reference can be realized in English: through the use of demonstratives, personal pronouns and comparatives. Data revealed that reference is realized in like manner in Ewe. The following examples explain this conclusion:

57. Af4kuwo dz4na le mia5e m4wo dzi zi ge2e.  
 Accidents happen-HAB. PREP. We-POSS road-PL POST time several  
 (Accidents happen on our roads many times.)

<b>First</b>	<b>Person</b>	<b>Second</b>	<b>Person</b>	<b>Third</b>	<b>Person</b>
--------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------

58. Esiawo menyey 3ukulawo5e vodada 6e siaa 6i o.  
 These NEG-COP-HAB driver-PL POSS. Fault always NEG.  
 (Drivers are not always to blame for these accidents.)

In Example 58, a demonstrative pronoun *esiawo* (these) has a direct link with *af4kuwo* (accidents) in the preceding sentence (Example 57). In addition to serving as a cohesive device, *esiawo* also helps in avoiding monotony. Here is another example:

59. Sukudede h=a `ut4 le ame 5e agbe me. Ema nye nyate5e matr4matr4.  
 School+ing need adv prep person POS life PREP. DEM COP truth NEG return  
 NEG return

(Education is very important in a person's life. That is an undeniable truth.)

In Example 59, the Ewe demonstrative pronoun *ema* (that) refers back to the statement before it – *sukudede hia `ut4 le ame 5e agbe me* (education is very important in a person's life). These examples show that Ewe also realizes cohesion by means of demonstratives just as English does.

Reference exhibits itself by the use of personal pronouns too in Ewe. The table below shows Ewe personal pronouns and this will aid in the comprehension of how reference is realized by personal pronouns in Ewe.

**Table 3: Ewe personal pronouns**

singular	Plural	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
me	m	nà à-	mi	wò	wo
m-	m a	nè è-	mia	e- ne	
-m	m awo		miawo	ya	
	m e		mie	eya	
				a- na	woawo
				ye	
				-i	
nye		wò		yè	yewo
				l	
				è	

Below are examples of the realization of reference by personal pronouns from the data:

60a. Sukudelawo kple d4w4lawo kat7 lé n45e vevi a2e na duk4 sia.student-PL  
CONJ worker-PL all work-HAB place important PREP nation DEM  
(Workers and students have an important place in the country.)

b. Wo5e veviedodo nu w4e be dzidzedzekp4kp4 le duk4a me.  
3PL-POSS hard work thing do+PRO comfort seeing PREP nation-DEF POST  
(Their hard work brings comfort to the people in the country.)

In Example 60a, *sukudelawo* (students) and *d4w4lawo* (workers) are replaced by the personal pronoun *wo*(they) in 60b. The personal pronoun *wo*, therefore, refers back to these two groups of people. Here is another example of the use of personals in Ewe:

61. Nye kple n4vinye ye wodzi 2e Keta.  
1SG CONJ brother-mine FOC 3PL-bear PREP Keta  
(My brother and I were born at Keta.)

Afimaemítsi hede suku le.  
There+FOC2PL-grow VERBID+attend school POST LOC.  
(That was where we grew up and attended school.)

In Example 61, the personal pronoun *mí* refers back to *nye* (I) and *n4vinye* (my brother). It is clear by these examples that just as personals perform cohesive ties in English, they do the same in Ewe. These are some common Ewe personals derived from the data: *nye* / *me* (I), *wò* (you singular), *mi* or *miawo* (you plural), *mí* or *míawo* (we), *wo* (they), *e* or *eya* (he, she, it).

The Ewe language, just as English does, also realizes cohesion by means of demonstrative references. Here are some examples:

62a. Nkronful nye du sue le Ghana 5e ^edze5e Nutoa me  
 cop town small prep poss east region prep  
 (Nkronful is a small town in the Eastern Region of Ghana)

Afimae wodzi Nkrumah le.  
 there-foc 3pl-bear POST LOC.  
 (That is where Nkrumah was born)

b. Edze be ametsitsi 2e siaa 2e nabu e2okui, aw4 nu si dze.  
 3sg-right person-old all respect 3sg-self FUT-do thing dem right  
 (It is good for all elderly ones to respect respect themselves and do what is right)

Kp42e`u nyuiwoe emawo nye na 2eviwo.  
 example good-pl-foc dem cop prep child-pl  
 (Those are good examples for children)

The second sentence of Example 62a uses the demonstrative *afimae* (there) to refer back to *Nkronful* in the first sentence. In Example b, sentence one mentions self-respect as well as doing what is right as qualities elderly ones must portray. The second sentence refers to these qualities by the use of the demonstrative *emawo* (those). *Emawo*, therefore, refers back to the earlier information and serves as a cohesive tie between the two pieces of information.

Other examples of demonstratives in Ewe derived from data are *esia* (this), *esiawo* (these), *ema* (that), *ekeme* (that one), *afisia* (here), *fifia* (now), *6e ma 6i*(then) and *6e a2ewo 6i*(sometimes).

Besides demonstratives, comparatives also serve as cohesive ties in Ewe just as they do in English. Below are some examples.

63a. Ghana<sup>5</sup>e koko x<sup>4</sup> asi wu esiwo le xexea kat<sup>7</sup> me.  
 Ghana POSS cocoa get market ADV DEM PREP world+DEF all POST  
 (Ghana's cocoa is the most expensive in the world)

Gake, mes<sup>4</sup>gb<sup>4</sup> abe Cote D'Ivoire t<sup>4</sup> ene o.  
 CONJ NEG-plenty ADV POSS ADV NEG  
 (But it is not as much as that of Cote D'Ivoire.)

b. Ghana x<sup>4</sup> 2okuisin<sup>4n4</sup> do `g<sup>4</sup> na Afrika duk<sup>4</sup>wo kata.  
 G. get independence ahead ADV country-PL all  
 (Ghana had independence ahead of all African countries)

Afrika duk<sup>4</sup> bubuawo ya dze 2okuisin<sup>4n4</sup> x<sup>4</sup>x<sup>4</sup> g<sup>4</sup>me le 1960wo me.  
 A. country other-PL start independence gain+ing prep PREP -PL POST  
 (Other African countries started having their independence in the 1960s.)

In Example 63a, the sentence *Ghana 5e koko ...* says that Ghana's cocoa is the most expensive in the world. In the following sentence, the comparative *abe ... ene* (like or same) places Ghana's cocoa side by side that of Cote D'Ivoire in terms of quantity. The use of the comparative *abe... ene* refers to an earlier information without which the comparison here will be void. This is a comparative reference in that a comparison is used as a cohesive tie that refers back to preceding information. Example 63b shows another type of comparative reference in Ewe. The sentence *Ghana x<sup>4</sup> 2okuisin<sup>4n4</sup>...* tells Ghana's having independence ahead of other African countries. The following sentence *Afrika duk<sup>4</sup> bubuawo...* says that other African nations had their independence in the

1960s. The Ewe comparative *bubuawo* (others) refers to the African countries that had their independence after Ghana. Moreover, it is a comparative tie between the two sentences. It is impossible and unacceptable to use the comparative *bubuawo* in Ewe so as it is when we use *others* in English without any prior information. The comparative *bubuawo* therefore refers back to the first sentence *Ghana x4 2okuisin4n4...*

It is clear that the Ewe language realizes cohesion by means of reference just as English does. There are some differences though, and these differences are discussed as we look at the similarities and differences between English and Ewe in their use of cohesion. Suffice it now to say that one of the ways Ewe also realizes cohesion is by means of reference.

#### **4.2.2 Substitution**

Halliday and Hasan (1976) identify substitution as one of the ways cohesion is realized in English. They further explain that substitution and reference overlap with each other; while substitution concerns the grammatical items that serve the cohesive tie, reference concerns itself with meaning, which is the meaning these grammatical items carry with them. In this regard, many of the examples that qualify as references are equally acceptable as substitution. As we have already seen in chapter two, “substitution is a device for abbreviating and avoiding repetition” Quirk and Greenbaun (2000:297). In English, noun phrases are replaced by personal pronouns, possessive or reflexive pronouns and the indefinite pronouns *one*, *ones*, *that*, and *those*. Below illustrates how Ewe demonstrates substitution.



64a. Nyemeke nu hafi wò5o tome nam zi eve o.  
 1PL-neg-open mouth before 3pl-beat chic prep-me time two neg  
 (Hardly had I opened my mouth when he slapped me twice.)

Gake ema mew4 naneke o.  
 butdem neg-do nothing neg  
 (But that is nothing.)

b. Nyemesii kp4 be `utsu a2eke 2e n4via `utsu kp4 le Ghana o.  
 1PL-neg-hear before Dem man any marry brother+DEF man before prep G. neg  
 (I had never heard that a man married a man in Ghana)

Gake nenemae wòle le yevuwo de.  
 CONJ. same+FOC 1pl-to be prep white-PL country  
 (But that's the way it is in the western world.)

c. D4 wua ame ge2e le xexeme duk4 gbl4ewo me.  
 Hunger kill-HAB man many-PREP world country poor PREP  
 (Many people go hungry in the world's poor nations)

Nusia meb4 2e ablotsi duk4wo me o.  
 Thing-DEM NEG-common prep abroad country-pl prep neg  
 (This is not common abroad.)

d. Nufiafia, d4w4w4 le gadzra2o5e kple x4tutu wonye d4w4na vovovowo.  
 Teach+ing work+ing LOC bank conj. Masonry 3pl-COP work different  
 (Teaching, working in the bank and masonry are different kinds of work.)

Nufiafae nye d4 si ses8 wu esiawo kat7 gake ga mele eme o.  
 Teaching+TOP cop work DEM hard adv dem all onj. Money neg-LOC prep neg  
 (Teaching is the hardest of these all but is not lucrative.)

In Example 64a, *ema* (that) in the second sentence substitutes for *wo5o tome nam zi eve* (they slapped me twice) without which those same words may be repeated and then we will be talking about another type of cohesion, lexical cohesion, which will be discussed under that title. One thing we have realized about substitution as a cohesive tie is that long linguistic constructions can be replaced by very short ones as in the example in question.

In Example 64b, the first sentence reads, *Nyemesii kp4 be `utsu a2eke 2e n4via `utsu kp4 le Ghana o* (I had never heard that a man married a man in Ghana.). The following sentence goes *Gake nenemae wòle le yevuwo de* (But that's the way it is abroad). The expression *nenemae* (that is the way it is) replaces the idea of the speaker's never hearing of a man getting married to another man in Ghana. Moreover, the second person singular pronoun *wò* as in *wòle* (*it is*) also substitutes for the same happening carried in the preceding sentence. In this case, too, the words *nenemae* and *wòle* replace a whole sentence.

In Example 64c, the demonstrative pronoun *sia*, or *esia* (*this*) substitutes for *d4 wua ame ge2e le xexeme duk4 gbl4ewo me* (Many people go hungry in the world's poor nations). This cohesive tie substitutes for as well as avoids the repetition of the same words as used in the preceding sentence.

In Example 64d, the first sentence mentions different types of work – *nufiafia* (teaching), *d4w4w4 le gadzra2o5e* (working in the bank) and *x4tutu* (masonry). The second sentence asserts that *nufiafia* (teaching) is more difficult than *all of these* (*esiawo kata*). We see clearly from this example that *esiawo* (these) replaces the other types of work mentioned alongside *nufiafia* (teaching), which are *d4w4w4 le gadzra2o5e* (working in the bank) and *x4tutu* (masonry). The word *kat7* (all) in addition to replacing these two other types of work in question also serve as emphasis on the difficulty of the teaching job. There is another substitution we find in the second sentence – *gake ga mele eme o* (but it is not lucrative). The Ewe third person singular pronoun *e*, as in *eme* (in),

stands in place of *nufiafia*. Therefore, another way to render this is simply to repeat *nufiafia* (teaching) in this context – thus, *gake ga mele nufiafia me o*.

In Ewe, whole sentences or clauses are substitutable by the pro forms *alea* (lit. this is how) and *nenema* (lit. that is how) when they reappear in succeeding sentences and these in the context carry the same meaning of the sentence they replace. These are some examples to illustrate the above.

- 65a. @evi ge2e tsina va zua ametsitsi hafi nyana be  
 Child many grow-HAB. come become-HAB elder before know-HAB that  
 yewo dzilawo nye ame veviwo le yewo 5e agbeme.  
 3pl parent-PL COP person important-plLOC2PL POSS life  
 (Many children grow only to learn the importance of their parents in their life)
- b. Nenema wòle le xexea 5e akpa siaa akpa.  
 Same 1sg-COP COP world DEF POSS side all side  
 (That is how it is all over the world.)

In Example 65 above, the first sentence – *2evi ge2e tsina va zua ametsitsi...* – is repeated in the second sentence. This time, however, it is reduced to the word *nenema*. From this type of cohesive tie where a whole clause is reduced to fewer words or a single word, economy of words is a common feature. This helps avoid repetition, which in itself is another type of cohesive tie. This is discussed under lexical cohesion. Another common linguistic item that is used like *nenema* in Ewe is the word *ale* or *alea*. The following are examples of how these form cohesive ties.

- 66a. Ga mele agba18 s4sr- me abe alesi wòle b415o5o me ene o.  
 money neg-cop book learn+ing prep comp adv 2sg football prep adv neg  
 (Scholarly work is not as lucrative as playing football.)
- b. Menye alea nuwo n4 ts7 o.

neg-cop            thing-pl cop past neg  
(That is not the way things were in the past)

67a. Le egbe `kekewo me la,  
prep today day-pl prep det

amewo 5e agbe le bubum to l4rif4kuwo me.  
man-pl poss life prep lose prog.prep vehicular-accidents prep  
(These days, people lose their lives from road accidents)

b. Ale nyadz4dz4gbl4lawo gbl4e nye esi.  
howjournalist-pl say+3sg cop. Dem  
(That is how journalists said it.)

In Example 66b, *alea* carries the idea in 66a and is repeated in the second sentence. The resulting cohesive tie is obvious. Formerly, scholarly work was more lucrative than playing football and that things have changed. The whole idea in sentence 66a is recaptured in 66b; 66b, therefore, re-enters the discussion and forms a tie with 66a.

In 67a, it is clear that many people lose their lives by road accidents. The word *alea* in Example 67b assumes the idea expressed in 67a and forms a cohesive tie with 67a. It therefore substitutes for the whole sentence before it.

It is evident from the above illustrations that Ewe realizes cohesion by means of substitution just as English does. Let us now turn our attention to another way cohesion is realized in Ewe – ellipsis.

#### 4.2.3 Ellipsis

Unlike reference and substitution that form cohesive ties by referring back to preceding information or replacing one linguistic item with another, ellipsis forms a

cohesive tie by deleting some information or linguistic items that are recoverable from the context in question. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), this is one of the ways cohesion is realized in English. In reference, a tie can be directed to information that is not overt or present in a text available. That type of reference is exophoric. In ellipsis, however, everything that is deleted is recoverable from the text. Ellipsis is therefore an endophoric phenomenon. Below are some examples from Ewe.

68. ~utsuvi sue la 2u 6e, tikpo, 5u du, va se 2e esime wòdze anyi.  
 Boy-small adj. def.dance, jump, run until 3sg-fall down  
 (The little boy danced, jumped and ran until he fell down.)

69. @e wònyo be kpovit4wo nan4 ga x4m le  
 3sg-good dem. police-pl money receive-prog.prep

l4rikulawo si le mía5e m4wo dzia? Ao.  
 driver-pl hand prep road-pl prep no  
 (Is it good for the police to be taking money from drivers on our roads? No)

In Example 68 the noun phrase *`utsuvi sue la* (the little boy) is deleted before the verbs *5u du* (run) and *tikpo* (jump). It is clear that it is *`utsuvi sue la* that is the subject of these verbs. One thing that shows that *`utsuvi sue la* is the subject of these verbs is the use of the pronoun *wò* in 68. This pronoun refers back to *`utsuvi sue la* and in that context no other subject is mentioned in the sentence besides *`utsuvi sue la*.

The sentence can be further broken down and the deleted noun phrase reinserted to show this point clearly. When that is done the derived sentences read:

~utsuvi sue la 2u 6e.  
 ~utsuvi sue la tikpo.  
 ~utsuvi sue la 5u du.

Breaking the sentence down this way shows that the deleted portion is *`utsuvi sue la*. However, were the original sentence to read as it is above, it would have been employing another type of cohesion – lexical cohesion by means of simple repetition. This type is discussed later in this chapter.

In Example 69, the Ewe negative response *ao* (no) in response to the preceding question is enough for a meaningful communication to take place. The positive form *I* (yes) can equally serve the same purpose. In the example, the whole clause is deleted in its second appearance. The cohesion here lies in the fact the reader or listener can fall back on the previous information and retrieve the necessary ideas for easy understanding which, in this case, is found in the question that precedes *ao*. Here is another example showing the use of ellipsis in Ewe.

70. Gat4 sia tu a5e ene s4` 2e Keta eye wògale bubu tum 2e G1.  
 Money-owner dem. build house 4 prep. Keta conj. 3sg again other build-prog  
 prep Accra  
 (This wealthy man built four houses at Keta and he is still building another in Accra)

We see from Example 70 that the noun *a5e* is not repeated just as its English counterpart *house* is deleted in its second appearance in the English rendering of the Ewe construction under discussion. We conclude therefore that English and Ewe both realize cohesion by ellipsis. There are, however, some differences in the way these languages realize their ellipsis. These differences are thoroughly discussed later in this chapter. Suffice it now to say that Ewe also realizes cohesion by ellipsis just as English does.

#### 4.2.4 Conjunction

Conjunctions also serve as cohesive ties as in Ewe as they do in English. Halliday and Hasan (1976) identify four types of conjunctions in English: causal, additive, adversative and continuatives or discourse markers. Examples of these types of conjunctions are given in chapter two of this work. Data revealed that Ewe also realizes cohesion by means of all these types of conjunctions. The difference noted in data is that most of these conjunctions in Ewe are phrasal rather than single linguistic items as in the case of English. Let us look at some examples to illustrate conjunctions in Ewe.

71a. Mekp4 wolé fiafi a2e nyits4 le G1.  
 1sg-see 3pl-catch thief some previous day prep Accra.  
 (I saw a thief caught the previous day in Accra)

Wo5ui, wow4 funyafunyae eye wòyi 2i me.  
 3pl-beat-pro 3pl-do torture+3sg conj. 3sg-go faint prep  
 (He was beaten and tortured until he collapsed)

b. Kpe2e esiawo `u la, wotso e5e asibid1wo 2a.  
 CONJ dem-pl LOC det 3pl-cut 3sg-poss finger-pl  
 (Besides, they cut off his fingers)

In example 71b, the Ewe phrase *kpe2e esiawo `u la* which translates into English as *besides, in addition, apart from these* and *in addition to these ones*, serves an additive conjunction. Its appearance in the text presupposes that some other information apart from the one that follows the conjunction is present. This presupposed information we retrieve from the previous sentence: the thief was beaten and tortured. However, there were more to these, *kpe2e esiawo `u la* (besides), *wotso e5e asibid1wo 2a* (they cut his fingers off). Extra information is added to the previous information and this is done by the help of the additive conjunction in question.

We have noticed from the discussion that it is possible in the case of Example 71a to translate the Ewe additive conjunction used there with a single English word ‘besides’ although phrases that express the same idea of addition can be used. In Ewe, it is impossible to use a single linguistic item as a conjunction in this case. In the Ewe construction, the word that carries the idea of addition in the phrase *kpe2e esiawo `u la iskpe2e*. The expression *esiawo `u la* which follows *kpe2e* refers back to the ideas expressed in the previous sentence. *Kpe2e* or sometimes *hekpe2e* although in themselves expressed the idea of addition, they can never stand alone as *besides* can in English. *Kpe2e* has to combine with expressions that have reference to previous information in order to be full as an additive conjunction. What we deduce here is that Ewe can combine more than one cohesive types where one overshadows the other as in the case of Example 71a.

An example of adversative conjunction in Ewe from the data set is as follows:

72a. Past4wo w4 2e siaa 2e le nu fiam amewo 3uu 2e2i koe te wo `u.  
 pastor-pl do everything thing teach-prog person-pl tire only 3pl body  
 (Pastors had done all they could in teaching people.)

b. Gake nugbegbl8w4w4 2eko wògale dzi yim.  
 Conj thing bad-do+do just 2sg-again up go-prog  
 ( However, badness continues to go high.)

In the Example 72b above, *gake* (however) is an adversative conjunction. It follows a statement that has a positive idea expressed in it. The presence of this conjunction *gake* (but or however) automatically shows that the information that follows *gake* is and must be in contrast with the one that precedes it. The contrast provided here in *gake* is what serves as the cohesive tie between the two conflicting ideas expressed in the text. In this example



unlike the one before it, *gake* as a conjunction can be used to introduce other information unlike *kpe2e*. However, it is acceptable to use a longer phrase, which can substitute for and be used interchangeably with ‘*gake*’ but never in the case of ‘*kpe2e*’. Here is an example to illustrate this argument.

- 73a. Past4wo w4 2e siaa 2e fia nu amewo 3uu 2e2i koe te wo `u.  
 pastor-pl do everything thing teach person-pl tire only 3pl body  
 (Pastors have done all they can in teaching people.)
- b. Togb4 be wòle nenema h7 la, nugbegbl8w4w4 2eko wògale dzi yim.  
 Conj DEM 2sg-loc same bad-do do just 2sg-again up go-prog  
 (However, badness continues to go high.)

We refer to the same example in which *gake* is used. In this case, *gake* is replaced by the clause *togb4 be wòle nenema ha la...*(even though it is that way...). The same idea of contrast is expressed in this clause as it is in the single conjunction *gake* and these two can be used interchangeably with each other. So while the additive conjunction *kpe2e* cannot be used alone except with other words that refer back to previous information, the adversative *gake* can be used alone as well as can be replaced by other expressions which carry the same idea of contrast.

Just like English, Ewe demonstrates causal conjunctions. The example below illustrates this.

- 74a. Egbe sukuvi ge2e mesr-a nu kura o.  
 Today student many neg-learn-HAB thing neg neg.  
 (Nowadays, students do not study at all.)
- b. Gbevu ko won4a w4w4m le sukukpowo dzi.  
 Bush-dog only 3pl- do-HAB prep school-compound prep  
 (They only indulge in unprofitable things.)
- c. Ema tae wo domet4 ge2e mekp4a dzidzedze le wo5e dodokp4wo meo.  
 3sg-dem head-foc many neg-see-HAB comfort prep 3pl-poss exam-pl prep  
 neg  
 (That is why most of them do not do well in their exams.)

In the foregoing Example 74, *ema tae* and also *eya tae* serve as causal conjunctions. The thoughts expressed in the previous sentences are that students do not study; they only spend their time on frivolous things. The conjunction *ema tae* (consequently or as a result) tells us, therefore, that the failure of these students is as the result of their inability to study towards examinations. The cohesion does not lie in the conjunctions *ema tae* but in the fact that its presence presupposes the presence of some other information. Thus, we cannot use any of these conjunctions alone or in isolation no more than we can tie a knot for nothing.

Ewe also realizes cohesion by continuatives or discourse markers. The following are examples from data.

75a. Dzilawo megale 2eke ts4m le wo viwo 5e agben4n4 me o.  
 Parent-pl neg-again none take-prog. 3pl-poss child-pl life prep neg  
 (Parents do not care about the lives of their children anymore.)

b. Le nyate5e me la, nenema wòle le xexea 5e akpa siaa akpa fifia.  
 Prep. Truth prep def. that 3sg prep world-DEF poss side all side now  
 (Truly, that is how it is in every part of the world now.)

76a. Gb7la, edze be dzi2u2ua nada ga 2e ga dzi na d4w4lawo.  
 firstdet. 3sg-right government-DEF put money prep money prep worker-pl  
 (First, the government must increase the salaries of workers.)

b. Le go bubu me la, edze be d4w4lawo h7 naw4 d4 sesi8.  
 prep way other-prep def 3sg-important that worker-pl also work hard  
 (On the other hand, it is important that workers must also work hard.)

In Example 75a, the idea of the irresponsibility of parents towards their children is raised. The succeeding sentence – 75b – confirms that idea in the continuative *le nyate5e me la*(truly). There is therefore a cohesive tie between the previous

information before and after the continuative in question. The discourse marker *le nyate5e me la* confirms the previous information by providing a newer one that goes along with the one before it, forming a cohesive tie.

Moreover, in Example 76a, the continuative *gb7la* (first or firstly) is used. This no doubt introduces the first information. The use of *gb7 la* alone indicates that more information lies ahead. The reader is in expectation of information ahead as it is expressed in the discourse marker used in 76a. Example 76b employs *le go bubume la* (on the other hand). The appearance of this continuative alone points to the previous one in 76a – *gb7la*. It is clear that the link between these discourse markers as well as the information they carry binds the constructions together as though one sentence.

We have discussed how conjunctions are employed in Ewe with examples from our data set. However, the examples made use of only a few of these conjunctions. The following are some more examples of the four types of conjunctions in Ewe. Some additive conjunctions in Ewe are *hekpe2e or kpe2e* (in addition), *abe ...ene* (like or same), *hã* (also), *ts4 kpe2e e`u* (to add to this), *le kp42e`u me* (for example). The following are some of the adversatives in Ewe: *gake* (but), *dz4gbenyuit4e la* (fortunately), *dz4gbev48t4e la* (unfortunately), *le go bubume la or lem4 bubu `u la* (on the other hand). Some Ewe causals are *eya ta*, *ema tae* or *susu ma tae* (because of that), *elabe* or *elabena* (because), *ml4eba* (finally). These words *fifia* (now), *le nyate5e me* (truly), *ts4 yi edzi* (in continuation), *le go sia me* (in this regard) and *abe ale si wòle ene* (as it is) are some Ewe continuatives or discourse markers.

It is clear then that just like English, Ewe also realizes cohesion by continuatives. There is another way that the Ewe language realizes cohesion. That is by lexical cohesion. The next section discusses this type of cohesion.

#### 4.2.5 Lexical Cohesion

Cohesion is also realized in Ewe lexically. As we have already seen, lexical cohesion assumes different forms such as repetition, which further subsumes hyponymy, complex and simple synonymy. Below is an example of lexical cohesion from Ewe.

77. Enye nyate5e be ny4nuwo s4gb4 wu `utsuwo le Ghana.  
 3SG-be truth that woman-PL outnumber adv man-PL loc  
 (It is true that women outnumber men in Ghana)

Gake ny4nuwo mew4a d4 de`g4wo abe `utsuwo ene o.  
 But woman-PL NEG-do-HAB work high like man-PL same NEG  
 (But women do not do advanced works as men do)

In the example above, the nouns *ny4nuwo* (women) and *`utsuwo* (men) are repeated. This cohesive tie is a simple repetition of the linguistic items demonstrating that cohesion is realized in Ewe, just as in English, by simple repetition.

Another way cohesion is realized lexically in Ewe is by means of synonymy. Words with similar meanings serve as cohesive ties and avoid monotony. The examples below illustrate this conclusion.

78a. Ts7 la, yevud4wo me4 2e Ghana o.  
 past Def white collar job-PL NEG-common prep neg  
 (In the past, whites were not common in Ghana)

b. Gake egbe `ue ke eye blemanyawo nu va yi.  
 CONJ today day-foc open CONJ former-things come go

(But a new day has come and the things of the past are gone)

- c. Fifia la, yevud4wo le duk4a 5e afi siaa afi.  
now DEF white-work-PL PREP nation-DEF everywhere  
(Now, there are whites everywhere in the country)

In Examples 78*a* to *c* above, we see the use of synonyms for the purpose of cohesion. In Example 78*a*, *ts7*(past) reappears as *blemanyawo* (literally past words) in *b*. The same idea of pastness is carried in these words and in this respect, they form a cohesive tie.

Halliday and Hasan (1975) and Hoey (1991) point out that synonymy as a way of achieving cohesion assumes two different forms: simple synonymy and complex synonymy. In simple synonymy, linguistic items that serve cohesive ties are similar in meaning and at the same time belong to the same word class. They differ from the simple repetition where the same item that serves a cohesive tie is repeated without any modification. Below are some examples from the data.

- 79*a*. Ame ge2e bu wo5e agbe le af4ku sia me.  
man many lost 3PL-POSS life PREP accident DEM POST  
(Many people lost their lives in this accident)
- b. Ameyinugbeawo domet4 adewo metsi kura o.  
Dead-body.DEF-pl some NEG-grow NEG NEG  
(Some of the dead were very young)
- c. Dz4gbev-e sia te5e menyakp4 kura o.  
Misfortune DEM place NEG-see NEG NEG  
(This misfortune was a bloody one.)

Example 79*a* explains what simple synonymy is. In 79*a*, *ame* (man), a noun reappears in 79*b* as *ameyinugbe* (dead body), another noun. It is clear that the latter of these synonyms has a tie with the former as the latter has almost the same meaning as the former. However, the two items in question have different forms

but belong to the same word class. They are both nouns. In the same example, *af4ku*(accident) and *dz4gbev-e*(misfortune) serve a cohesive tie in the similarity of the meanings they share. Both items are nouns but of different forms.

Ewe also realizes cohesion by complex synonymy. This is where the linguistic items that serve a cohesive tie are similar in meaning but belong to different word classes. These are some examples.

80a. *Ny4nuwo dea agble hew4a d4 ge2e hena duk4a 5e `g4yiyi.*  
 Woman-PL farm-HAB farm do-HAB work many nation-DEF PREP progress  
 (Women farm in addition to many other works for the nation's development)

b. *Le agbledenyawo me la ny4nuwoe nye ame siwo w4a d4 wu.*  
 prep farming-word-PL PREP DEF woman-PL-FOC COP DEM do-HAB ADV  
 (In matters regarding farming, women are the harder workers)

c. *Ne `utsuwo kpe 2e ny4nuwo `u la, duk4a atsi 2e edzi.*  
 if man-PL help PREP woman-PLloc dem country-DEF grow prep prep  
 (If men help women, the nation will continue to develop.)

Example 80a makes use of the verb phrase *dea agble*(v. farm) which comprises the transitive verb *dea* and its object *agble*. In Ewe, the verb *de* (farm) is transitive, always demanding an object. The idea expressed by the verb phrase *dea agble* in 80a is carried on into 80b and this time it assumes a different word class, a noun. As we can see, this idea is expressed in the Ewe noun *agbledede* (farming). Even though two different word classes are used in this example, a cohesive tie still exists between the word classes epitomizing the complexity displayed in lexical cohesion.

The examples show another complex cohesion. In sentence 80a, the noun *`g4yiyi*(lit. going forward – growth, development) is used. This noun is used in reference to the country signifying the growth of that country. In sentence 80c,

however, the verb phrase *atsi 2e edzi* (will grow) is used in relation to the growth of that same country. The idea expressed in *g4yiyiis* is the same expressed in the phrase *atsi 2e edzi* forming a cohesive tie between these words as well as the clauses in which they are found.

The Ewe language also realizes cohesion lexically by means of hyponymy. Hyponymy, as we have seen in chapter two, employs the relation of inclusion where the meaning of one linguistic item is embedded in the other. The relationship between *flowers* and *tulip*, for example, is that of hyponymy, for a tulip is a type of flower. The following constructions from the data reveal that Ewe also uses hyponymy as a means of realizing cohesion.

81a. Mango metsena le ku2i6i o.

M. neg-bear prep dry season neg  
(Mangoes do not bear fruit during dry season)

Atikutsetse ge2ewo tsena le tsidza6i.

fruit many-pl appear prep rainy season  
(Many fruits appear during rainy season.)

b. Egbe ny4nuviwo va zu tivi kp4lawo. Womegale ampe tum o.

today girl-pl come become TV viewers 3pl-neg-prep ampe play neg (Today's girls have become TV viewers. They do not play anymore.)

Míade fefewo kat7 nu vayi

1pl-home play-pl all end come go  
(Our traditional plays are all gone.)

c. Egbl4 be ta n4 ye2um sesi8. D4léame 5e nyawo h7va glo.

3sg-say head 3sg-eat-pro hard sickness poss word-pl become too much  
(He said his head ached seriously. We have become tired of illness.)

d. Tsilele kple nume k4kl4 nye nu siwo míew4na gbe siaa gbe.

bathing conj. mouth washingcop thing dem. 2pl-do-HAB day all day  
(Bathing and washing our mouths are things we do every day.)

Ame2okuidzadzra2o m4nu a2ewoe nye ma.

person-self-care way some-FOC cop. DEM

(These are some personal hygiene ways.)

In Example 81a, there is a hyponymous tie between the words *mango* and *atikutsetsewo* (fruits). The meaning of the former is encompassed in that of the latter. *Mango* is a type of *atikutsetse*. This link or relationship forms a cohesive tie that binds the two constructions as well as the ideas they express together. Moreover, Example 81b employs another hyponymous tie. *Ampe* has the same relationship with *fefewo* (plays) as *mango* has with *atikutsetsewo*. *Ampe* is one type of *fefewo* enjoyed by girls. Just as *mango* links with *atikutsetsewo* for a cohesive tie, so do *ampe* and *fefewo* in Example 81b.

In Example 81c, the words *tsilele* (bathing) and *a2uk4kl4* (cleaning one's teeth) are both included in the meaning of the word *ame2okuidzadzra2o* (self-care). The cleaning of one's teeth and bathing are, of course, both self-care measures. There is therefore a hyponymous cohesive tie among these three linguistic items; *ame2okuidzadzra2o* includes both *tsilele* and *a2uk4kl4*. In Example 81d, *d4leame* (sickness) refers back to the expression *ta... ye 2um* (had headache). There is no denying that *ta2uame* (headache) is one type *d4léame*. The meaning of *ta2uame* is included in that of *d4léame*, forming a cohesive tie. These examples from data show that Ewe also employs hyponymy as a way of realizing cohesion just as English does.

From all the above discussions, we observed that the Ewe languages does not realize cohesion by reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunctions and lexical cohesion almost any differently from English. Indeed, the two languages have many similarities and few differences in the realization of cohesion. The next



section focuses on the similarities and differences regarding the realization of cohesion in the two languages.

### **4.3 Similarities and Differences**

Broadly, Ewe and English realize cohesion in almost the same way. Both languages realize cohesion by reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunctions and lexical cohesion. With regard to reference, Ewe also realizes cohesion by the use of personals, demonstratives, and comparatives. Both languages realize reference anaphorically and cataphorically.

Just like English, Ewe realizes substitution by personal pronouns replacing noun phrases, pro-forms substituting verb phrases and pro-forms replacing whole clauses. Ellipsis is realized by deleting whole clauses, noun phrases, and verb phrases. Ewe also uses conjunctions that are causal, adversative, additive, continuatives or discourse markers. Finally, lexically, Ewe also realizes cohesion by repetition, synonymy and hyponymy.

On the surface, as we have seen, both English and Ewe are similar as regards cohesion. Each language demonstrates the five cohesive devices identified by Halliday and Hasan (1975). There are, however, some differences in the way these two languages realize cohesion when we consider the individual cohesive devices, especially reference and ellipsis. The next section discusses these differences, looking at reference and ellipsis.

#### **4.3.1 Differences in English and Ewe Realization of Reference**

We have already seen that both English and Ewe realize cohesion by reference. There are, however, some differences in the way the two languages realize cohesion by reference. An area where Ewe differs from English in the use of reference is in the use of personal pronouns. Let us look at some examples from Ewe to clarify this point.

82a. Egbl4 be yeva ets4 `di  
       3sg-say that 3sg-come yesterday morning  
       (He said he came yesterday in the morning.)

b. Wobe yewoen4 te5ea hafi atia mu.  
       3pl-say 3pl-top place-def. prep tree-def fall  
       (They said they were present before the tree fell.)

In Example 82a, we see two personals – *e-* in *egbl4* and *ye* in *yeva*. When this sentence translates into English, we read:

*He said he came yesterday morning.*

In the English translation, we see that the personal *he* appears twice, the second referring to the first and the two forming a cohesive tie. In Ewe, however, the case is different; the personals differ, *yere* refers back to *e*. In example 81b, two personals appear – *wo* in *wobe...* and *yewoe* in *yewoen4*. The personal *yewoe* refers back to *wo* and forms a tie. The English translation of the same sentence reads:

*They said they were there when the tree fell.*

The foregoing English sentence uses the personal pronoun *they* twice, the latter referring back to the former. As we have seen so far, Ewe demonstrates the use of two different personals but at the same time these different personals still form the cohesive tie that that English forms by simply repeating the personals involved.

This difference in the realization of cohesion by the use of personals in Ewe is because, unlike English, the Ewe language has quite a complex use of personals. This is thoroughly discussed with examples from data under section 4.4 *English interference on Ewe*.

#### 4.3.2 Differences in English and Ewe Realization of Ellipsis

A major difference observed between English and Ewe concerning the realization of cohesion is by means of ellipsis in the deletion of the verbal element in some contexts. Let us look at some examples from data to clarify this point.

Evans swept the guest room and David the compound.

We can tell from the above sentence that the verb *swept* is deleted in its second appearance. This is a common way English realizes cohesion – by the deletion of the verbal element in its second appearance and falling back on that verb for full meaning. This phenomenon is almost impossible in Ewe. Throughout data, there is no occurrence of ellipsis by this means. The foregoing English sentence could translate thus:

83. Evans kpl4 amedzrox4ame eye David kpl4 kpataadzi.  
 sweep stranger-room-DEF conj. sweep compound  
 (Evans swept the guest room and David the compound.)

In the sentence above, the verb *kpl4*(sweep) appears more than once, while in the English construction, the verb swept appears only once and the construction is

still correct and acceptable. If the Ewe sentence drops the verb *kpl4* in its second appearance, the sentence reads:

84. Evans *kpl4 amedzrox4me eye Ama kpatadzi*.  
Sweep stranger-room conj. corridor  
(Evans swept the guest room and Ama the compound.)

This is not acceptable in Ewe. The verb in question must appear again for the construction to be accepted as correct. The only way ellipsis was employed in the data with regard to the deletion of the verbal element in its second appearance was when a statement served as an answer to a question and presupposed the idea as well as the linguistic elements including the verbs in the question.

Here is an example:

85. Enyo be *kpovit4wo nan4 ga x4m le l4rikulawo si le m4wo dzia?* Ao.  
3sg. good dem police money receive-prog prep.Driver-pl prep.road-pl prep  
(Is it good for the police to be taking money from drivers on roads? No.)

Just as *no* in the English translation of this Ewe construction is enough for a meaningful conversation to take place even as the whole clause including the verbal element is deleted, so is *ao* in Ewe. Ellipsis is realizable in English by means of the deletion of the verbal element in its second latter appearances. In Ewe, however, this is not acceptable. This is one major way Ewe and English differ from each other in the realization of cohesion by means of ellipsis.

#### **4.4 English interference on Ewe**

This study finally seeks to find out how English and Ewe interfere with each other in the use of cohesion. As we have seen from the beginning of the study, a major interest in contact linguistics is to find out how two languages in contact interfere

with or influence each other. Since the focus of this study is cohesion, we only discuss how either language influences the other in this regard.

We have seen the similarities and differences in the way English and Ewe realize cohesion. Were the two languages entirely similar in the realization of cohesion, there definitely would have been no interferences in this regard. The differences of the two languages in their realization of cohesion are the grounds for these interferences. Differences in the phonological and grammatical systems of languages in contact are the bases for interference. This section discusses those interferences, starting with that of English on Ewe and then that of Ewe on English.

Many studies have shown the great influence first languages have over second languages of bilinguals. In chapters one and two of this study, we looked at some of these studies: Akande (2005), Akande and Akinwale (2006), Cook (1993), Robins (1989) and others. Some scholars like Weinreich (1953) even insisted that it is impossible for a second language to interfere with the first language of a bilingual; it is always the other way round. In the present study, however, findings have revealed that not only can a second language interfere with the first one of a bilingual, but also that this interference can occur in the use of language by coordinate bilinguals – university students who read their first language as a course of study and who served as the respondents of this study.

The researcher argued that the many studies that have shown the L1 interfering with the L2 were geared towards uncovering the influence that the L1 has over the L2 to the neglect of that of the influence the latter has on the former.

The discussions below, taking a cohesive device one at a time, prove that the researcher's argument is true; L2's can also influence L1's.

#### 4.4.1 Reference

One way data revealed the influence of English on Ewe was in the use of reference. The influence of English happened particularly in the use of Ewe personals. We have already discussed the differences that exist between English personals and Ewe personals. Let us look at some examples from the data.

86a. Kpovit4 la gbl4 be yen4 te5e si wowu adzodala la le.  
 policedef. say dem. 3sg place. dem. 3pl-kill robber def. post.  
 (The police said he was at the place where the robber had been killed.)

b. Nu sia do dziku na K4bla eye e2oe be yemayi aza2u5e o  
 thing dem. cause anger prep. Conj. 3sg-decide dem. 3sg-neg-go festival neg  
 (This angered K4bla and he decided not to go to the festival.)

87a. Wo2u nu eye wokp4 gb4 be wow4 nu sia nu nyuie.  
 3pl-eat thing conj. 3pl-see dem 3pl thing all thing adv.  
 (They ate and made sure they did everything well.)

b. Mil- be mi koe ayi ahakpe ameawo  
 1pl-agree 1pl only go meet person-pl  
 (We agreed that only we would go to meet the people.)

In Example 86a, the personal pronoun *ye* as in *yen4* ... refers back to *kpovit4* (police). This is acceptable in Ewe. Still, when we substitute *kpovit4* with the personal *e*, the sentence will still be acceptable and the personal *ye* will therefore

refer to *e* in that case. We learnt earlier on that in English the subjective form of personals do not change inasmuch as they refer to the same thing.

The data revealed that some students have ignored the Ewe deferential personal pronouns and resorted to using the first deferential ones. The researcher believes that this must be due to interference from English since English has only one type of personals that function as subjects. The respondents because of the influence from English are therefore simply dropping what English does not have and making Ewe look like English in the use of personals. Example 86b explains this point better.

In Example b, the personal *e* as in *e2oe* refers to the subject of the construction K4bla. The personal *e* is wrongly used in this construction making the sentence in which it appears very strange. The sentence rightly reads thus:

*Nu sia do dziku na K4bla eye wò2oe be yemayi aza2u5e o.*

In this acceptable version of the sentence, the right personal *wò* is used and it refers to *K4bla*. The personal *wò* is also a third person singular personal just as *e* is. Both are subjective personals; the latter appears at the initial part of a sentence while the former does not. The personal *wò* also normally appears after the *be* clause (that clause) in Ewe. Examples are as follows:

*Kofi be yea2u nu.*

*Kuma mel-be yeayi kuate5e o.*

It is clear from the examples that while Ewe employs the singular third personals *e*, *wò* and *ye* in the subjective form, English only employs *he*, *she* or *it*, depending on the context. While Ewe uses *wo*, *woawo* and *yewo* as plurals, English employs only *they* for the same purpose.

From the foregoing, we can deduce that the difference in the use of personals in English and Ewe is the cause of this Ewe sentence employing Ewe personals as though the sentence were an English one. When we translate this sentence into English, it reads:

*This angered K4bla and he decided he would not go to the festival.*

In the foregoing English sentence, the personal *he* appears twice, both referring to K4bla. It is clear that the reason why Example 86b from our data set is rendered thus is that the respondent was unconsciously making Ewe personals behave and look like English ones. The obvious reason why the respondent chose the Ewe personal *e* throughout is that in English, only *he* fits that position and is used throughout without changing its form unlike in Ewe. The personals *ye* and *wo* cannot be used at the initial position in Ewe (Atakpa 1993, Amegashie 2004). In English, however, the personals *he*, *she*, *it* and their plural forms can occur at any part of the sentence. Because of this difference in English and Ewe use of personals, respondents fell victim to the interference from English and used Ewe personals as though they were those of English. Since the personal *e* comes handy and is without much restriction as *ye* and *wo*, it becomes the obvious choice and is used throughout just as *he* is used in English.

In Example 87a, the Ewe third person plural personal *wo* appears twice. In its second appearance, *wo* should have been *yewo* inasmuch as it comes after the Ewe *be clause* (that clause). After the Ewe *be clauses*, most Ewe personals change their forms to, what I would call from hence, Ewe secondary personals. Let us look at the following sentences to illustrate this point before we proceed.



88a. Egbe be yemele tsi le ge o.  
 3sg-refuse dem 3sg-neg- water bathe neg  
 (He refused to take his bath.)

b. Wol- be yewoakpe 2e 2evia `u.  
           3pl-agree dem-help      child-foc body  
 (They agreed to help the child.)

The Ewe *be clause* (*that clause*), as we have argued, carries secondary personals other than the initial even though the latter refers to the former and both form a cohesive tie. In English, however, this is not so. We see from the first sentence above that in the *that clause* is another *he* besides the initial one, both forming a cohesive tie. In the Ewe sentence, however, we see two different personals – *e* as in *egbe* and *ye* as in *yemele* – both referring to the same thing and forming a tie. It is unacceptable to repeat the *e* in its second appearance just as it is unacceptable to bring *ye* to the position of *e* and vice versa. Either way is unacceptable.

In Example 88b, we see two different personals, *wo* as in *wol* and *yewo* as in *yewoakpe*, both forming a tie, the second referring to the first. The English translation, however, maintains the plural English personal *they*. Just as *ye* cannot replace *e* and vice versa in the first sentence, so can *wo* not replace *yewo* and vice versa in sentence two. This is how some personals work in Ewe.

Now back to the sentence before the above illustrations. In Example 87, the third person Ewe personal *wo* appears twice, which must not be so. In its second appearance, *wo* should have been *yewo* for it comes after the Ewe *be clause*. Why has this respondent chosen *wo* again instead of *yewo*? The answer comes readily in the fact that English would employ the same personal were this sentence in English. This sentence can be rendered thus in English:

*They ate and (they) made sure that everything went on smoothly.*

In the above English translation, the personal pronoun *they* appears twice. The latter, however, can be deleted and the sentence will still be acceptable though. Since English employs the same personal in many positions, the respondents employ Ewe personals as though they were those of English, a clear interference from English.

Finally, Example 87b employs the first person plural personal *mí* two times. The latter should have been *míawo*. However, this sentence also falls victim to interference from English. There is one thing that is common from the influence of English on Ewe in this data analysis; all these influences so far result in unacceptable constructions in Ewe. These unacceptable Ewe sentences are modified in the way English employs personals. Indeed, scholars like Cook (1993), Robins (1989) and Weinreich (1953) assert that contact between languages have several effects, one of which is that the second language of the bilingual begins to be modified phonetically, grammatically and lexically in the direction of the first. This phenomenon under discussion confirms their stand. The only significant difference here is that this time, it is the second language interfering with the first one, a proof that their stand is true and the opposite is equally true.

#### **4.4.2 Ellipsis**

We already saw that English and Ewe both realize cohesion by ellipsis. We also saw that though this is so, there are some differences and these differences are

seen in the way Ewe handles the deletion of verbs or verbal elements and the deletion of personals. We focus now on how the English language interferes with Ewe in these two ways.

Before we continue, let us take one example of ellipsis from Halliday and Hasan (1976) to illustrate a point:

*Joan bought some carnations and, Catherine some sweet peas.*

We saw from chapter two of this study that the sentence above warrants only one interpretation – Catherine also bought sweet peas. Although the verb bought is deleted in its second appearance, it is still retrievable from the clause for effective communication to take place. The English part of the data also revealed many sentences of the type above. Below are some examples:

- 89a. The president announced his intention to run again and the vice president his decision to step down.*  
*b. The accused persons were arraigned before court and those found guilty imprisoned.*

It is evident from the sentences 89a and 89b that the verbs *announced* and *were* are deleted in their second appearance. However, these sentences are meaningful and acceptable in English.

Unlike English, it is not acceptable to have sentences of this type in Ewe. In Ewe, verbal elements cannot be deleted in their second appearance as we have seen in the case of English. However, the Ewe data revealed constructions of these English types. Let us look at some these constructions.

- 90a. Ax4lu 5le awu yeye eye K4dzo af4kpa kple kuku.  
A. Buy shirt new conj. footwear conj. hat  
(Ax4lu bought a new shirt and K4dzo footwear and a hat.)  
b. Dzilawo 2u akpl8 eye 2evyawo ya b4b4 kple gali.

Parent-pl eat conj. child-pl conj.  
(The parents ate akple and the children gari and beans.)

- c. Abla va te5ea eye K4dzo h7.  
A.come place-foc conj.conj.  
(Abla came to the place and K4dzo also)

In Example 90a above, the main verb in the sentence is *5le* (buy) and it appears only once in the sentence. When this sentence is translated into English, it reads:

*Ax4lu bought a new shirt, and K4dzo footwear and a hat.*

In this English sentence, the main verb *bought* appears once, yet the sentence is acceptable. Even if the verb *bought* appears twice, it will still be acceptable. In Ewe, however, only the latter phenomenon is possible and acceptable; the former is not. The deletion of the verbal element in its second appearance is alien to Ewe. The acceptable form of sentence 90 will read:

Ax4lu 5le awu yeye eye K4dzo (h7) 5le af4kpa kple kuku.

In this corrected form of sentence a, the main verb *5le* appears twice, with the first subject *Ax4lu* and the second *K4dzo*. Since these constructions are possible and are acceptable in one of the languages (that is, English) of these bilinguals in question, we can point to English as the source of this influence. English is, therefore, interfering with Ewe in this regard, bending Ewe to realize ellipsis like English.

We must also be aware that interference from one language to another in a bilingual can cause the receiving language to flout its own grammatical, phonological and syntactic rules (Akanke 2005, Akanke and Akinwale 2006, Bhela 1999, Cook 1993). Cook (1993) points out how German-English bilinguals construct sentences in English modeled on German syntax. In Cook's (1993)

example, German, the first language of the German-English bilinguals influences the second language, English. The sentences produced from these interferences are thus not acceptable in English. This means that interference of one language on another can produce unacceptable constructions in the receiving language.

In the present case, nevertheless, it is the second language that is interfering with the first. English, the second language of the Ewe-English bilingual is, therefore, interfering with Ewe, their second language by influencing Ewe to realize ellipsis by deleting the verbal element in its second appearance, a phenomenon that is not natural to Ewe.

Let us continue our discussion with Example 90b. In Example 89b, the main verb is *kp4*(see). Evidently, it appears only once in the sentence, something that is all right with English. Once again, this Ewe construction has fallen victim to English interference. This conclusion becomes clearer when we translate the sentence into English. The English translation thus reads:

*The parents ate akple and the children gari and beans.*

From the translation, the verb *ate* appears only once. It is dropped after the second subject of the construction *children*. There is enough evidence that English is the source of the influence here.

The last example 90c can translate into English thus:

*Abla came to the place and K4dzo also.*

In the English sentence above, the verb *came* is deleted after *also*. Let us go back to Example 90c. In that example, the main verb is *va*. In Ewe, the deletion of the verb after *ha* (also) is unacceptable. It is, therefore, worth arguing that English is

bending Ewe towards itself as regards cohesion in the deletion of the verbal elements in Ewe constructions just as English does.

We must note that we are not concluding that the verbal element in constructions cannot be deleted in Ewe inasmuch as they are retrievable from the constructions. That phenomenon is not acceptable in constructions such as the ones we have discussed. There are other instances where verbal elements can be deleted in Ewe and they will be no problem. Here are some examples:

- 91a. ~utsu la kple via yi agble `di sia.  
man det. conj. Child.det go farm morning dem.  
(The man and his child have gone to farm this morning.)
- b. Nufiala la alo sukudzikp4la koe aw4 d4 sia alea.  
teacher det. Conj. School-overseer only do work dem dem.  
(Only the teacher or the school overseer can do this work like this.)

In the foregoing two sentences, each verb *yi* and *aw4*, respectively, appears once. However, these sentences are acceptable in Ewe. In each case, the subjects are joined by a conjunction and both subjects share a verb. This type of ellipsis is acceptable in Ewe, not the form we discussed earlier on.

Another key area in data where the researcher observed interference from English on Ewe regarding ellipsis is in the deletion of personals in Ewe constructions. Let us look at some examples from the data to clarify the point in question.

- 92a. Mekp4 `utsu a2e wòn4 bebem 2e x4a xa ets4.  
1sg-see man some 3sg hide-prog. Prep. Room-def. adv. yesterday  
(I saw a man and he was hiding behind the room yesterday.)
- b. Nufiala la kp4 2evi a2ewo won4 fefem le sukux4awo me.  
teacher def. see+past child some 3pl play-prog prep classroom-pl prep  
(The teacher saw some children playing in the classrooms.)

In sentence 92a above, the Ewe personal *wò* refers back to *`utsu*(man). As we can see from the English translation under 92a, the personal that should refer to man is deleted. The sentence reads:

*I saw a man eating.*

That sentence can also be rendered in these ways:

*I saw a man and he was eating.*

*I saw a man. He was eating.*

All three ways of rendering sentence a are possible and acceptable in English. From the second and third examples, the personal *he* and other items are deleted. The dropping of the personal, as we have seen above, is not acceptable in Ewe. Examples 92a and b are correct and are acceptable in Ewe since they have the personals *wò* and *wo* referring back to their respective subjects.

Data has shown some instances where the personals are deleted in Ewe constructions, just as they happen in those of English. This phenomenon, as we have already noted, is unacceptable in Ewe. Let us discuss some of these instances of such usage in the data.

93a. Miekp4 2evi a2e n4 nu xlem le atia te.

2pl-see+past child some past.thing read-prog prep tree-def prep.

(We saw a child reading under the tree.)

b. Kuma be yekp4 ny4nuvi eve kpl4 `utsuawo 2o.

say 3sg-see+past woman-small two follow man-pl prep

(Kuma said that he saw two girls following the men.)

c. Wohe to na ame ba2a siawo hafi 2e asi le wo `u dzo.

3pl-pull ear prep person bad dem. prep leave hand prep. 3pl body go

(They punished the bad men before allowing them to go.)

In Example 93a above, *2evi a2e* (a child) is the object of the verb *kp4*(saw). This object in turn is the subject of the verb *xl8m* and needs a personal to refer back to

it in that context. That personal *wò* is missing. If we look at the English translation of the construction in question, no personal *wò* refers back to *child* in that construction. Of course, it is possible to insert the personal *he* in that construction to refer back to *child*. Either way is possible and acceptable in English. In Ewe, however, that personal that bears reference to *2evi a2e* must be present for a grammatically accepted construction. The correct form of the Sentence 93a reads thus:

*Miekp4 2evi a2e wòn4 nu xl8m le atia te.*

As noted earlier, the personal *wò* is necessary in this construction.

Example 93 b shows that there is a personal *wo(they)* missing. The noun phrase *ny4nuvi eve* (two girls) needs a personal *wo* to refer to it. The personal missing is *wo (they)*. The right construction reads:

*Kuma be yekp4 ny4nuvi eve wokpl4 `utsuawo 2o.*

The personal *wo* as in *wokpl4* (the followed) refers to *ny4nuvi eve*. As we have said, this reference in Ewe is a compulsory one. In English, however, it is a matter of style. One could choose to drop the personal in one instance and decide to use it in another. In Ewe, however, there is no choice as to whether or not to use the personal in such constructions. Their use is necessary in Ewe.

The correct rendering of Example 93c is as follows:

*Wohe to na ame ba2a siawo hafi 2e asi le wo `u wodzo.*

There is a *wo(they)* missing before the final verb *dzo* (go). In addition, this refers back to the noun phrase *ame ba2a siawo* (these bad people). The *wo* is necessary in this construction in order to be accepted as grammatically correct.



It can be concluded earlier on that the construction of these unacceptable sentences by coordinate Ewe-English bilinguals used in this study is as a result of interference from English. One thing, the researcher observed, that made respondents produce this English-influenced constructions is that the English influence does not affect meaning in these constructions. Those who speak Ewe and who are not necessarily scholars of the language can understand them. The researcher tested this conclusion by approaching some speakers of Ewe, literate and illiterate, to find out their reactions to these English influenced constructions in order to discuss this interference issue from a broad point of view, especially those of the native speakers of Ewe. Their reactions are discussed in the final chapter of the present study. In the next section, we focus our attention on Ewe interference on English with regard to cohesion.

#### **4.5 Ewe Interference on English**

The previous sections revealed that the interference of English on Ewe happens in reference and ellipsis. In the former, this happens specifically in the use of personals; where the interference takes place in the deletion of the verbal element and personals. This section discusses Ewe influence on English in the use of cohesion.

In English, verbal elements and personals can be deleted in their second appearance inasmuch as these items are overt and recoverable in the constructions in which they appear. These linguistic items can also be repeated and such

construction in which they appear can still be acceptable. Either way is acceptable in English. In Ewe, however, the repetition of these items is compulsory.

What is being referred to as Ewe interference on English is that in the English texts of respondents, there was repetitive use of verbal elements and personals. The other way was very rare. Let us look at some examples from the data.

94a. *He told me I should speak to the chairperson.*

b. *They asked the secretary to tell us that we should come home.*

c. *The authorities punished them and warned them that they should not play there again.*

In Example 94a, the personals *me* and *I* refer to the same person. It is possible to drop the personal *I* and still have an acceptable English construction. That sentence can re-read:

*He told me to speak to the chairperson.*

The researcher observed from the data that many constructions follow the pattern of the original example 94a, not the re-written type. His observation was clarified after translating these sentences into Ewe. When we translate Example 94a into Ewe, we have the following:

*Egbl4 nam be ma5o nu na nun4la la.*

In the above translation, the personal *-m* as in *nam*, and *m-* as in *ma5o* refer to the same person. It is not acceptable to drop any of these personals in Ewe as it is in English. It is logical to point toward Ewe as the influence here. Both ways of handling personals are acceptable in English. Why would the Ewe-English bilingual stick to one more than the other as though that one way is the only

acceptable way of handling personal pronouns in the other one language? This other language must be responsible for this influence, and in this case, it is Ewe.

Examples 94b and 94c can be re-written thus:

*He asked the secretary to tell us to come home  
The authorities punished and warned them never to play there again.*

When we translate these into Ewe, we read:

*Egbl4 na sekertia be woagbl4 na m be m a va a5e.  
Amegawo he to na wo eye woka mo nawo be womega fe fefe le afima az4 o.*

In the translated version above, the personal *m* appears twice and refers to the same person. In the second translation, *wo* appears three times referring to the same person. None of these can be dropped for acceptable constructions in Ewe as they can in English. All these clearly show that they overuse of this style in English constructions, a style which is the solely used in Ewe points to Ewe influence on English.

#### **4.7 Summary**

Chapter four discussed the data with examples in answering the research questions raised in chapter one. The first is to discover how cohesion is realized in Ewe. Data revealed that just as in English, Ewe realizes cohesion by means of reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunctions and lexical cohesion.

The second question sought to find out the similarities and differences between the way English and Ewe realize cohesion. Data showed that the two languages realize cohesion the same way as we have seen in the analysis of data. The only differences noted in data analysis are those that occur in the way Ewe

realizes cohesion by means of ellipsis and reference. The difference in ellipsis is that in Ewe, verbal elements are almost compulsory and cannot be deleted as they are in English constructions. There are also some instances where the personals cannot be dropped even as their referent is overt in Ewe constructions. With regard to reference, different personals can refer to the same, referent; some cannot appear at initial positions while others can. These restrictions are not in English.

The third research question had to do with the extent to which either language interferes with the other in the Ewe-English bilingual's use of language. Data shows clearly that the interference of English and on Ewe is a significant one. This interference is a consequence of unacceptable Ewe constructions, showing that English's influence on Ewe is a great one. When we fall back on Sey's (1973) bilingual cline, he placed university students under coordinate bilinguals – those who handle two languages almost equally. If this is the case, then it follows therefore that these ones will be able to successfully, at least to an extent, resist interference from either language. However, the present study has proved otherwise. For coordinate bilinguals as well as those who read their L1 as a major course of study to fall to such interferences from an L2 means that the popular notion held that L1s have the upper hand on L2s in terms of interference is not always true.

Finally, when it comes to the influence Ewe had on English, that is minimal or can be considered as no influence at all. We saw that the use of personals is almost compulsory in Ewe. In English, they can be either deleted sometimes or maintained, it is a matter of style. Data revealed that personals were

used more often in English constructions even if their absence would not cause any ungrammatical constructions. The researcher points to Ewe as the source of influence here. However, there is a problem. How can we call a phenomenon as an influence if it is also natural to a particular language as in the case of English? The recurrence of these constructions throughout data with little variations gives Ewe the stronger point and the source of influence though. Since this is the way Ewe predominantly realizes cohesion, by means of repeating personals in almost all circumstances, unlike English, that can vary this trend, the use of just that style in the English data must be the result of Ewe influence.

All in all, cohesion is realized in both languages largely the same way. The interference of English on Ewe in the use of cohesion among coordinate bilinguals supersedes that of Ewe on English, proving that just first languages influence second languages in a bilinguals use of language, the otherwise is not only possible but actually happens. Now that all the research questions are answered in this chapter of the present study, conclusions as well as suggestions for further studies based on the questions the findings of the present study raised is imperative. The final chapter of the present study draws the curtain down on these issues.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **CONCLUSION**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

This chapter concludes the present study. It summarizes the entire study and draws conclusions from the analysis and discussions. It recounts the reactions from various people towards the findings of the present study. It finally provides suggestions for further studies based on the questions raised on the present study.

#### **5.2 Conclusions**

The objective of this study as stated in Chapter One was to discover how cohesion is realized in Ewe, discuss the similarities and differences between English and Ewe in their use of cohesion and finally unearth how English interferes with Ewe in this regard and vice versa.

From the analysis of the data in Chapter Four, we concluded that Ewe realizes cohesion the same way English does: by means of reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and by lexical cohesion as submitted by Halliday and Hasan (1976) in their work on cohesion in English. In chapter one, the researcher hypothesized that both languages in question would realize cohesion almost the same way. This was because Halliday and Hasan (1976), Hoey (1991) and other scholars regarding cohesion never argued as to whether or not other languages realize cohesion or that other languages realize cohesion by means of other

cohesive devices other than the ones they identified. The hypothesis that both English and Ewe would realize cohesion almost the same way is thus confirmed by the findings of this study.

Even though English and Ewe realize cohesion the same way, broadly speaking, there exist differences. We have seen from the data analysis in chapter four that these differences exist in the languages' use of reference and ellipsis.

### **5.3 Views of Respondents on Findings**

After the analysis of data and the findings of this study, the researcher wanted to find out the reactions of the respondents of the study towards the findings. This was done to ascertain whether or not these respondents would agree that they had been influenced by English in the use of cohesive devices in their essays they wrote for the study.

We have already discussed how the influence of English on Ewe resulted in unacceptable Ewe constructions. The researcher gathered all these constructions, some of which were discussed in chapter four. The researcher then mixed these constructions with other constructions that were acceptable and showed them to some randomly chosen respondents, undergraduate university students from UCC and UEW reading Ghanaian Language (Ewe). Since the researcher resided in UCC, he could have access to almost all the respondents from UCC. He then gave out this paper to the randomly selected respondents to tick against constructions that they thought were questionable and say why they thought so.

Out of the fifty-one (51) respondents in UCC, thirty-nine (39) were contacted to find out their reactions to the findings of the study. Out of the 219 at UEW, the researcher had access to forty-six (46). Of the 39 respondents from UCC, thirty-six (36) were surprised that those constructions came from them. Some of them realized that the constructions were from the essays they had written for this study. Some admitted that they were not under any tension as they had a lot of time to write the essays. When these respondents were asked what caused the problem, some of the respondents mentioned English. A Level Four Hundred student in UCC said:

Some of us think in English even when we are writing in Ewe. I think this is so because even though we read Ewe as one of our major courses, we only use it when we are in Ewe classes. Every other time, it is English all way. Why wouldn't we write Ewe as though we were writing English?

We can see from the outcome of the reactions of respondents as well as the comment above that English truly is the source of the interference on Ewe. The Level Four Hundred student submitted that the interference might be because students use Ewe scarcely in comparison with English in their academic assignments. It is true that students always use English in their assignments and examinations. They only use Ewe or other Ghanaian languages when that is one of their major courses and they write assignments and examinations on them. It is reasonable to conclude that since English is used as the major medium of communication in teaching and learning, it must have a strong influence on the scarcely used Ewe or other Ghanaian languages. The quote above points to English as cause of the problems in the essays in Ewe.



Of the 39 respondents from UCC that were examined, three were indifferent towards the findings. They argued against the view of their companions that language is dynamic and hence it changes. These respondents argued that language changes but did not say what could cause the change. They failed to see that interference of one language on another could cause a change in that language. These students agreed that there is a change but failed to identify the cause of this change. The cause of that change is what the other respondents identified – English. Since these ‘changes’ in the Ewe language are natural to English but unnatural to Ewe, and that English and Ewe are in contact, it is easy, therefore, to say that English is the cause of these ‘changes’ in the Ewe language.

Moreover, more than forty respondents from UEW were surprised to see some of their own constructions, and expressed the same views as those of their UCC counterparts. They pointed at English as being responsible for such construction. One Level Three Hundred female student said, “I am very surprised we wrote these things. Is it because we were writing? I don’t believe we could say these things were we speaking.”

It is clear that the majority of respondents showed that something was responsible for such constructions from university students who read Ewe. The researcher has repeatedly argued that English is responsible for such influence. In order not to have a parochial view of the findings of the present study particularly with regard to the interference from English, the researcher sought the opinions of some other people who are native speakers of Ewe and who are not

undergraduates or graduates. The outcomes of this are discussed under the subheading *Views of Residents in Ewe-Speaking Communities*.

### **5.3 Views of Residents in Ewe-Speaking Communities**

Since the researcher was interested in finding out the reactions of a number of native speakers of Ewe towards the constructions he believed suffered from English interference and basing his argument and conclusions on a broader point of view rather than his alone, he tested his findings on some Ewe speakers here in Cape Coast at Duakoro, and at Aflao and Denu of the Ketu District in the Volta Region.

Duakoro is an Ewe community in Cape Coast which lies by the sea from the East Gate of the University of Cape Coast to Abakam near Elmina. Aflao and Denu are towns that share a border at the south-eastern part of the Volta Region of Ghana. People were contacted from these Ewe speaking communities, focusing on market women, fishermen and others who use only the Ewe language in their day-to-day activities. Most of the ones contacted and interviewed could not read or write Ewe. A few could read and write.

The researcher read the constructions to those who could not read and those who could read he handed the script to them. Most of the times, the readings drew laughter and surprise from the interviewees just as they did in the second meeting with respondents of this study.

Some comments were noted some from the people, as they are very important to the study even as they came from non-scholars but who are native

speakers of the language. One woman from Duakoro asked after listening to the reading, “Efo, me2e kuku E3eawoe `l4 nusiawo loo alo amedzroviwoea?” She wanted to know whether Ewe natives wrote these constructions or learners of the Ewe language. She was surprised that such constructions came from Ewe speakers. One man from Denu said that “sukuviwo do yevugbe 3uu womegate `u le a5e gbea dom nyuie kura o” (students have spent all their times speaking and reading English and now cannot speak their mother tongue well).

The reactions of the people and comments towards the constructions in question, as we have seen above, points to the fact that there is a problem somewhere. The woman from Duakoro was surprised that not only native speakers but also university students could write such constructions. She asked whether these writers were learners of the language. That alone points to the fact that there is influence coming from another language. The man from Aflao was right when he said that perhaps the excessive use of English among students affects the way they handle their own mother tongue. These native speakers saw that all the constructions had problems. They corrected them in their own ways, just as the researcher did in the analysis of data (see Chapter Four). They could not, however, tell the reasons behind their corrections.

Other comments heard from the people are as follow: some of the people simply said, “womede o” – they are not correct; wo2i kokui (they sound funny) and “gake mese wo kata g4me” (but I have understood everything). None of the interviewees had a problem with the meaning of these constructions as we have seen from the comments above. This problem concerned the structure of the

constructions and many readily provided the correct forms of these constructions. Collecting the reactions of the respondents of the present study and those of native speakers of Ewe and placing them side by side those of scholars of the Ewe language would help have a broader view of the conclusions of this study. So far, the reaction of both respondents and other native speakers of Ewe reveal that English is the cause for the wrong use of grammatical elements in marking cohesion in Ewe. The next section looks at the reactions of scholars towards the findings in question.

#### **5.4 Views of Students and Scholars of Ewe**

This section looks at the reactions from students and scholars of Ewe towards the findings of the study. The researcher sought some views from scholars of the Ewe language. Among the people interviewed were teachers of Ewe of various levels ranging from junior high school to university and graduate students who read Ewe. Among the basic and secondary level teachers of Ewe, the researcher went to some basic schools such as Aflao Border Junior High, Preventive Junior High and Duakoro Junior High Schools.

Among all these teachers of Ewe, the researcher gathered reactions similar to those gathered from residents in Ewe-speaking communities. Everybody that read the constructions showed some surprise. After explaining to them that the study was conducted among university students who read Ewe as a major course, some of the teachers teaching Ewe in Junior High Schools in the Ketu District of the Volta Region were surprised, commenting “*Who will teach our young people*

*our mother tongue?*” They made statements such as this because they thought such *errors* were unpardonable among university students who were studying the Ewe language as a major course of study. They were unaware of the surprise respondents themselves showed when they saw their own *errors* let alone aware that these *errors* came about because of the influence of English.

The researcher also gathered from some secondary school teachers in the Ketu District that respondents who wrote these sentences must be thinking in English and transferring their ideas from English into Ewe composition. They submitted that many of the writers of these constructions would be surprised that these came from them. As we have seen earlier on, when some of these respondents were met, they were surprised to have written those constructions and confirmed the words of those teachers that they were thinking in English, and that the use of English dominates all their academic work. They only use Ewe in Ewe lectures and other scholarly purposes involving the study of Ewe.

Most teachers contacted in some Senior High Schools in the Ketu District asserted that these constructions were not simply wrong, and for a university student who read Ewe as a major course of study to produce such constructions shows that there is an external influence, which should be investigated. This influence, the majority pointed to, as coming from English.

The researcher finally went to some lecturers in the two research sites – UCC and UEW. He interviewed some lecturers of Ewe and some graduate students reading Ewe in the Department of Ghanaian Languages and Linguistics,

UCC and Department of Ewe Education, UEW. The following are what he gathered from the encounter with them.

First, the constructions in question drew surprise from all these lecturers and graduate students of Ewe. They speculated that since these *wrong* constructions appear as not coming from coordinate bilinguals who are university students, something must be the trigger for these so-called *wrong* sentences. Once again the interference from English is the only reasonable conclusion to draw from these *wrong* Ewe constructions. The findings in question triggered in these scholars to investigate areas of they think is impossible for any language to influence the other.

We can see from the above interviews, first with respondents of the present study, teachers of the language and finally, some lecturers of the Ewe language, that nothing better explains the so-called wrong Ewe constructions gathered from the data than interference from English. If a language can interfere with another in the use of cohesion, even as that language is the second language of the bilingual, then interference as a phenomenon in contact linguistics is a strong one and there definitely cannot be a way where two languages in contact cannot influence one another in any way.

Once again, the researcher reiterates his views based on the findings of this study, specifically in the area of interference, that too much attention is given to studies investigating the influence of first languages on second ones to the neglect of that of the latter on the former. The former studies make it look as though only first languages can influence second ones. This study, however, has

shown otherwise: second languages can and do have some interference on first languages. The present study has noteworthy implications and some questions that need to be answered in further studies. The next section discusses these implications.

#### **5.4 Implications of the Study**

This study has significant implications on the scholarship of cohesion. Since Halliday and Hasan's work on cohesion in 1976, other scholars like Hoey (1991) and Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) have added to the scholarship of cohesion. However, all these works are based on the realization of cohesion in English. Other languages also realize cohesion with some differences from the ways it is realized in English. This study has come to fill the gap on the scholarship of cohesion on a language, Ewe, other than English. This will also serve as the motivation for further investigations into the realization of cohesion in other African languages.

Moreover, this study has broadened the scope of literature in the Ewe language. So far there is no known work on cohesion in Ewe. This study has added to the literature on Ewe by investigating a new area of study.

Another implication of the present study is that it will be used as an aid in the pedagogy of the Ewe language. As we saw in Chapter Two, cohesion is one important part of language teaching and learning. Before this study, if there had been any reference to cohesion in the teaching and learning of cohesion in Ewe, it was based on Halliday and Hasan's work. Using a study aid based on one

particular language to teach another is a great challenge to both teacher and learner. The teaching of cohesion in Ewe is now made easier and simpler by this study.

Finally, as we saw in Chapter Two, cohesion is one main problem for the translator. Since cohesion is realized somewhat differently in different languages, one cohesive device can be realized differently in another language. This problem can be solved if a translator is aware of the similarities and the differences in the way the languages he works on realize cohesion. This knowledge will enable him handle his translations with ease and professionalism. This study aims at making the work of the Ewe-English translator easy. It will be useful to Ewe-English translators on radio, in churches and NGOs. Freelance translators and interpreters will also benefit from the present study.

### **5.5 Suggestions for Further Studies**

The findings of the present study raise some questions to be answered. We have already confirmed that second languages of bilinguals interfere with their first languages, against the popular view that only the latter phenomenon is possible. A question arises: could it be that if more attention were given to new studies on the interference of second languages on the first of bilinguals rather than that of first on second languages, this linguistic gap of wrong perception would be closed? In answer to this question, more studies in contact linguistics should pay more attention to the influence of second languages on first ones rather than hold onto the popular notion to the contrary. When this is done, it will be clear as to whether



only one language of the bilingual's language suffers influence from the other or that the influence is a mutual phenomenon between the two languages of the bilingual.

Another point we must note from this study is that the study investigated two languages from different language families – English from the family of Indo-European languages and Ewe from the Kwa family of languages. These languages notwithstanding their difference in families realize cohesion almost the same way. What about Ewe, Twi, Ga, Igbo, Yoruba and other Kwa languages? Can there be differences in the way these languages realize cohesion even as they belong to the same family? A study can investigate that.

Moreover, the expression *thinking in English* while writing texts in Ewe cropped up in this study. Respondents confirmed that and teachers and lecturers of the language reiterated that. The word *thinking* with regard to interference and bilingualism points to a field of linguistics that is referred to as cognitive linguistics. This area of linguistic study needs be developed in Ghana and other African countries.

Finally, the researcher realized from the data analysis that some students may be actually translating English constructions into Ewe and vice versa, and in these translations, they fell victim to interference from either language. This reveals that the use of cohesion in translation may be a challenge to students as well as Ewe-English translators. A study can be conducted to find out this and solutions found to it to enhance good translations from English to Ewe and vice versa.

## **REFERENCES**

- Akande, A. T. 2005. The Pronunciation Problems in the English of some Yoruba Learners. *Hwa Kang Journal of TEFL 11*, pp.1-23.

- Akande, A. T. and Akinwale, T. O. 2006. A Case Study of the Pronunciation of /θ/ and /ð/ Sounds by Some Yoruba Speakers of English. Ed. A. J. Matiki: *Marang Vol. 16*, pp. 23-34.
- Altenberg, E.P. and Cairns, H.S. 1983. The effects of Phonotactic Constraints on Lexical Processing in Bilingual and Monolingual Subjects. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 1983, 22, 174-188.
- Amegashie, S. 2004. E3egbe ~4`l4a. Aflao:Victus Printing Services.
- Amuzu, E. K. 2006. Language Maintenance in Pervasive Codeswitching: Insights from Ghana. *The Journal of West African Languages*, Vol 33, No. 1 pp.35-52.
- Angermeyer, P. S. 2002. Lexical Cohesion in Multilingual Conversation. – *International Journal of Bilingualism* 6/4, 361–393.
- Ary, D. 2002. Introduction to Research in Education: 6<sup>th</sup> edition. USA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
- Atakpa, F.K. 1993. E3egbe`4`l4 ~uti Sewo. Accra: Ghana Universities Press.
- Bada, E. 2001. Native Language Influence on the Production of English Sounds by Some Japanese Learners. *The Reading Matrix* Vol. 1 No. 2 pp.1-15.
- Baker, M. 1992. In Other Words: A Course on Translation. London: Routledge.
- Berthold, M., Mangubhai, F., & Batorowicz, K. 1997. Bilingualism & Multiculturalism: Study Book. Distance Education Centre, University of Southern Queensland: Toowoomba, QLD.

- Bhela, B. 1999. Native language interference in learning a second language: exploratory case studies of native language interference with target language usage. *International Education Journal* Vol. 1 No. 1 pp.22-31.
- Bloomfield, L. 1933. *Language*. New York: Holt.
- Bloor, M. & Bloor, T. 1995. *The Functional Analysis of English: A Hallidayan Approach*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Blum-Kulka, S. 2000. Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 298–313). London: Routledge.
- Bokamba, E. 1989. *Are there Syntactic Constraints on Code-mixing?* *World Englishes* Vol.8 No.3 pp. 277-292.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Bynon, T. 1977. *Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Callow, K. 1974. *Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God*: Grand Rapids. Michigan: Zondervan.
- Cann, R. 1993. *Formal Semantics, an Introduction*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Carrel, P. L. 1982. *Cohesion is not coherence*. *TESOL Quarterly* 16. 479-88.
- Carstens, W.A.M. 1997. Afrikaanse tekslinguistiek. 'n Inleiding. (Afrikaans text linguistics: An Introduction.) Pretoria: JL van Schaik Akademies.

- Chomsky, N. 2007. Approaching UG from Below: Interfaces + Recursion = Language? Chomsky's Minimalism and the View from Syntax-Semantics. Berlin: Mouton.
- Cook, V. 1993. Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition New York: Hampshire.
- Cruse, D. A. 1986. Lexical Semantics. Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, L. 1997. English as a Global Language. London: Cambridge University Press.
- De Beaugrande, R & Dressler, W. U. 1998. Introduction to Text Linguistics. London: Longman.
- De Beaugrande, R. 1980. Text, Discourse and Process. London: Longman.
- Denzin N. and Lincoln Y. 2000. Handbook of Qualitative Research. London: Sage.
- Eckert, P. 1997. Gender and sociolinguistic variation. In J. Coates (Ed), *Readings in Language and Gender* (pp. 64-75), Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ervin, S., & Osgood, C. (1954). Psycholinguistics: A Survey of Theory and Research Problems. In C. Osgood & T. Seboek (Eds.), *Psycholinguistics* (pp. 139-146). Baltimore, MA: Waverly Press.
- Fairclough, N. 1995. Media discourse. London: Edward Arnold.
- Fairclough, N. 1995. Media Discourse. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Forson, B. (1968): 'Description of language situations classified in a corpus

- representing a bilingual register range (Akan varieties of English)',  
Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Ghana, Legon.
- Forson, B. 1968 'Codeswitching in Akan-English bilingualism', Unpublished  
PhD. Thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Frankel, J. & Wallen, N. 2000. How to Design and Evaluate Research in  
Education, 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research: An  
introduction*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Garrett, M. 1975. The Analysis of Sentence Production. In G. Bower, editor, *The  
Psychology of Learning and Motivation*. Academic Press.
- Gold, D. L. (1986): On "Jewish English in the United States of America". JLR 6:  
121-135.
- Grundy, P. 2000. Doing Pragmatics. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday M. A. K. & Hasan, R. 1976. Cohesion in English. England: Longman.
- Halliday M.A.K. & Matthiessen C.M.I.M. 2004. An Introduction to Functional  
Grammar. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. London:  
Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K., McKintosh, A., Strevens, P. 1970. "The users and uses of  
language" in Readings of the Sociology of Language, ed. J.A. Fishman.  
The Hague: Mouton.
- Hamers, J. F. & Blanc, M. H. 1989. Bilinguality and Bilingualism. Great Britain:

Cambridge University Press.

Haugen, E. (1950a): The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing, *Language*, 26:210-231

Haugen, E. (1950b): Problems of Bilingualism, *Lingual*, 2: 271-290.

Heath, J. 1984. Language Contact and Language Change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 13,367-384.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Hoey, M. 1991. *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holmes, J. 1998. 'Women's Talk: The Question of Sociolinguistic Universals'. In  
Hymes, D. 1974. *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. London: Longman.

Hoover, M. L. 1997. Effects of textual and cohesive structure on discourse processing. *Discourse Processes*, 23(2), 193–220.

James, C. 1990. *Contrastive Analysis*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.

Jibril, M. 1979. *Regional Variation in Nigerian Spoken English*. In *Varieties and Functions of English in Nigeria*, ed. by Ebo Ubaakwe, 43–53. Ibadan: African Universities Press.

Jourda, C. & Tuite, K. 2006. *Language, Culture and Society, Key Topics in Linguistic Anthropology*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

Jowitt, D. 1991. *Nigerian English Usage: An introduction*. Ikeja: Longman.

Kearns, K. 2000. *Semantics*. New York: Fifth Avenue.

Kecskes, I. & T. Papp. 2000. "Metaphorical Competence in Trilingual Language

- Production” in Cenoz, J. and U. Jessner (eds.) 2000. *Acquisition of English as a Third Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. Pp. 99-120.
- Kelly, William J& Lawton, Deborah L. 2006. *From Paragraph to Essay*. 4<sup>th</sup> edition, Pearson: Longman.
- Kempson R. 1977. *Semantic Theory*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Key, M. R. 1975. *Male/female language*. Metuchen:Scarecrow Press.
- Kroeger, P. R. 2005. *Analyzing Grammar: An Introduction*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Labov, W. 1990. 'The intersection of sex and social class in the course of linguistic change', *Language Variation and Linguistic Change* 2:205-54.
- Language and Gender: A Reader*, ed. Coates, Oxford: Blackwell, pp 461-483.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics* (2 volumes). Great Britain; Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J.1995. *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Mack,M. 1986. A Study of Semantic and Syntactic Processing in Monolinguals and Fluent Early Bilinguals. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*,15, 463 – 488.
- Mackey, W.F. 1969. How can bilingualism be described and measured? In L.G.



- Kelley (Ed.), Description and measurement of bilingualism: an international seminar. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Maxwell, J. (1997). Designing a Qualitative Study. In L. Bickman & D. J. Rog (Eds.) Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods (pp. 69-100). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mulac, A. & Lundell, T. L. 1994. Effects of gender-linked language differences in adults' written discourse: Multivariate tests of language effects. *Language & Communication* 14(3).
- Mulac, A., Studley L. B. & Blau, S. 1990. The Gender-linked Language Effect in Primary and Secondary Students' Impromptu Essays, *Sex Roles*, 23, 9/10.
- Muysken, P. 2000. Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-mixing. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 2002. Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Newmark, P. 1988. A Textbook of Translation. New York/London: Prentice Hall.
- Nishimura, M. 1997. Japanese/English Code-Switching: Syntax and Pragmatics. USA: P. Lang.
- Obianim, S. J. 1990. E3egbe ~uti ~unya, akpa gbat4: Revised Edition. Accra: Sedco Publishing Limited.
- Ochola, E. D.A. 2006. English Words and Phrases in Dholuo-English

- Codeswitching: Selected Proceedings of the 36<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference on African Linguistics, University of South Carolina ed. Olaoba F.
- Osisanwo, W. 2003. Pragmatics and Discourse. Lagos: Femolus-Fetop
- Owu-Ewie, C. 2006. The Language Policy of Education in Ghana: A Critical Look at the English-Only Language Policy of Education. Paper presented at the 35th Annual Conference on African Linguistics.
- Paradis, C. and LaCharité, D. 1997. Preservation and Minimality in Loanword Adaptation. *Journal of Linguistics* 33: 379-430.
- Pereira, Vera Regina Araujo. 1977. Adaptações fonológicas dos empréstimos ingleses. *Letras de Hoje* 27: 53-71.
- Philipson, R. 1992. Cultural Politics of English as an International Language. London: Longman.
- Poplack, S. 2000. *Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish* termino en espanol. *Linguistics Publication Inc* 18:581-618.
- Poplack, S. & Meechan, M. 1998. Introduction: How Languages Fit Together in Codemixing. *International Journal of Bilingualism: Instant loans, easy conditions: the product of bilingual borrowing*, ed. by S. Poplack and M. Meechan, 127-138, London: Kingston Press.
- Preston, M. S. & Lambert, W. E. 1969. Interlingual Interference in a Bilingual Version of the Stroop Color-word Task. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 8, 295-301.
- Querol, M. 2005. Substitution As A Device of Grammatical Cohesion in English

Narrative and Its Translation into Spanish, *Jornades de Foment de la Investigacio*, pp1-10.

Quirk, R. and Greenbaum, S. 1973. A University Grammar of English. London: Longman.

Reinard, J.C. 1994. Introduction to Communication Research. Madison, WI: Brown and Benchmark.

Robins, R. H. 1989. General Linguistics 4<sup>th</sup> ed. England: Longman.

Romaine, S. 1995. Bilingualism. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Sanders, T. (1997). Semantic and Pragmatic Sources of Coherence: On the Categorization of Coherence Relations in Context. *Discourse Processes* 24: 119-147.

Sarantakos, S. 1993. Social Research. New York: Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire.

Sekyi-Baidoo, Y. 2002. Semantics: An Introduction. Kumasi: Wilas Press Ltd.

Seliger, W. H. & Shohamy, E. 1990. Second Language Research Methods. UK: Oxford University Press.

Sey, K. 1973. Ghanaian English: An Exploratory Study. London: Macmillan.

Shank, G. 2002. Qualitative Research. A Personal Skills Approach, New Jersey: Merrill Prentice.

Shi, A. 2004. The Importance of Teaching Cohesion in Translation on a Textual Level. *Translation Journal*, Vol. 8, 1-7.

Socanac, L. 1996. Phonological Adaptation of Anglicisms in Italian: Phoneme

Redistribution; Fonoloska adaptacija anglicizama u talijanskom jeziku:  
fonemskaredistribucija SO: Suvremena-Lingvistika 22, 1-2(41-42), 571-  
581.

Tashakkori, A.& Teddlie, C. (Eds.). (2003a). Handbook of mixed methods in  
social& behavioral research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Thomason, S. G. 2001. Language Contact. Washington DC: Georgetown University  
Press.

Thompson, G. 1996. Introduction to Functional Grammar: 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. New York:  
Oxford University Press.

Torto, R. T. 2000. 'Participant relationship in discourse and its effect on code  
choice: A case study of the university community of Cape Coast,  
Unpublished MPhil Thesis, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast.

Verschueren, J. 1999. Understanding Pragmatics. New York: Oxford University  
Press.

Wei, L. 2002. The Bilingual Mental Lexicon and Speech Production Process.  
*Brain and Language* 81:691-707.

Weinreich, U. 1953. *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.

Weinreich, U. 1974. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Hague:  
Mouton.