An Investigation of the Relevance on English Textbook Input on Learner's Acquisition of Cohesion in Grammar in Secondary Schools in Kenya

Ephraim M. Waihiga
Department of Literary & Communication Studies, Laikipia University, Kenya
Kanjuki Agnes
Department of Languages, Linguistics & Literature, Egerton University, Kenya
Bowen K. Dave
Department of Arts, Kabarak University, Kenya

Abstract:
We present findings of a study carried out to investigate the relevance of English textbook input on the learner's acquisition of cohesion in grammar in secondary schools in Kenya. A sampling frame of textbooks was constructed from all the Form 1 recommended textbooks. Six textbooks were selected from recommended textbooks. The grammatical structures were tabulated alongside the content in the English syllabus by the Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD). A quantitative analysis of the data was done with tables drawn to quantify the data. The data collected was analyzed by use of statistical measurements and presented in tables. The findings are expected to assist the curriculum planners and publishers to reorganize and repackage the Form 1 English textbook. It will also assist learners in easier acquisition and internalization of rules of grammar and eventually improve in performance.

Keywords: Acquisition, Cohesion, syllabus, Content, Learner and Text

1. Introduction

Communication is said to take place if meaning is perceived by the hearer. This process can only take place if the grammar structures used has cohesion. When words in a sentence agree, then we are able to get the meaning. Rutherford (1987) looks at cohesion as what 'ties' sentences together such that we perceive them collectively as constituting a single text. Cohesion is a surface relation and it connects together the actual words and expressions that we can see or hear.

The rules are important to allow cohesion in the output that the learner produces. Cohesion allows for agreement of words or phrases in a sentence. As Wilkin (1997) puts it, errors of agreement in speaking are sometimes difficult to avoid. In writing, however, these errors should be easier to avoid because the writer always has the time and the opportunity to revise his work before presenting it to the reader. The writer is also able to write properly connected sentences in their essays.

Learners need to develop fluency in language use, which enables them to act independently and with confidence. Such fluency comes from exposure to a great deal of spoken and written language to experience using language without fear of being inaccurate or wrong (Ayot, 1984). This exposure will enable a learner practice more on the said structures and setting a base for practice, which will make them fluent. Krashen (1988) postulates that learning is a product of formal instructions and comprises a conscious process, which results in conscious knowledge about the language and acquisition as the product of a subconscious process very similar to the process children undergo, when they acquire the first language. It requires meaningful interaction in the target language.

Learning how rules operate is useful but more so to know how to use language in real life situations. A learner who has mastered grammar knows how to apply the rules to communicate in acceptable language forms. According to the ministry of education English syllabus (KIE, 2003), a grammar item should be presented to the class within the context in which it appears.

1.1. Objectives of the study
The study intended to investigate the frequency and availability of cohesion (agreement) structures in the form 1 English textbooks.

1.2. Research Question
How frequent and available are cohesion structures in form one English textbook?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Cohesion in English Grammar

Halliday and Hasan (1976), take the view that the primary determinant of whether a set of sentences do or do not constitute a text depend on cohesive relationships within and between the sentences, which create texture. A text has texture and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not text. Also a text has texture which is dictated by its interpretation within a particular context or environment.

Rutherford (1987), looks at cohesion as what it is that 'ties' sentences together such that we perceive them collectively as constituting a single text. Cohesive relationships within a text are set up where the interpretation of some elements 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.

Beebe (1979), as cited in Rutherford (ibid), observes that conjunctive ties was overwhelmingly preferred by learners and that problems, abound for the learners in the appropriate use of and, but and so; and that conjunctive ties also appear in the learners text where they are not called for. It should therefore not be altogether surprising that 'and' bears an unnaturally heavy semantic load in the learner's written production. Reiteration of a lexical item is another simple means of achieving cohesion in inter-language. Reiteration is a ready-made tactic for binding textual matter where synonymy and grammatically governed anaphora, ellipsis and substitution are still beyond the learner's present competence

Brown and Yule (1983:193) substitute reference with co-reference. Co-referential forms are forms, which instead of being interpreted semantically in their own right they make reference to something else for their interpretation. These forms direct the hearer / reader to look elsewhere for their interpretation. Exophoric relationship is an interpretation that lies outside the text, that is, in the context of situation and plays no part in textual cohesion. Endophoric relations have its interpretation lying within a text and they do form cohesive ties within the text. Under endophoric relations, two kinds; anaphoric and cataphoric arise. Anaphoric relations are those which look back in the text for their interpretation while cataphoric relations are those which look forward in the text for their interpretation.

Cohesion within a text can of course be proved by relationships other than those involving co-reference. Cohesion may be derived from lexical relationships like hyponymy (daffodil is a hyponymy of flower), part- whole (arm is part of a man), collocability (Monday relates to Tuesday), Structural relationships like clausal substitution (Sarah is very fond of Rachael. So am I), comparison (thumb is stronger than that hammer), by syntactic repetition (We came in, they came in), by consistency of tense, by stylistic choice and so on.

According to Wilkins (1997:107), except for "be", English verbs show a difference between singular and plural only in the third person and only in the present tense. The third person singular present tense ends in "s" it is clear that cohesion is realized in the omission of "s" in pronouns "I" "you" "we" and "they"; and the presence of "s" in the verb preceded by pronouns he, she and it. Wilkins (ibid) continues to raise issue with the verb "be" and its special problems in cohesion. First the 2nd person pronoun "you" is always used with the plural form of the verb. Second, the difference between singular and plural is shown in the past tense as well as in the present tense. You/we/they are the subject words in the above structures and represent the third 1st, 2nd and 3rd person plural. Due to this the expected verb should carry a plural tense due to the number. The subject determines whether the verb is singular or plural. A singular verb is used with a singular subject and vice versa. The verb does not agree with any other part of the sentence.

Subject precedes the verb in English and is one of the ways that we can tell subjects in English. Subjects in English control subject/verb agreement. Verbs change in form to match or agree with particular features of the subject such as person and number. This is what the researcher terms as cohesion. Verbs in many languages agree with one or more of their arguments. This means that inherent features of the noun phrases are also marked on the verb. English has very little verbal and only that third person singular in the present tense is overtly marked (for example, I play vs. He plays.) This is the dual role of the –s suffix and represents both third person singular and present tense (Tallerman 1998).

2.2. The Syllabus

Prabhu (1987) defines a syllabus as a statement of what is to be taught. He looks at the syllabus from several angles. He sees it as an operational construct, a form of support to the teaching activity that is to be carried out and in construction of appropriate lesson plans. In this view, the syllabus is concerned with what is to be done in the classroom, not necessarily with what is perceived to be taught or learnt and therefore seen as only an operational construct. He sees the syllabus as an illuminative construct concerned with the product of learning. It is a specification of what is to be learnt in terms of a conceptual model, which aims to provide an understanding of the nature of the subject area concerned, in this case, English as a subject. This is a view held by Rutherford (1987) who looks at a language syllabus as being concerned with particular specification of the content upon which teaching and learning would act. It is also an instrument of organizational control where it exercises supervisory control in institutionalised education and a basis on which common examinations are set for learners in different classrooms.

Ayot (1984) states that a syllabus defines and informs the teacher of objectives or goals as far as teaching of that subject is concerned. It gives a teacher a fairly well defined prescription of what may appear in the exam. A syllabus also contains standards. It attempts to convey, as clearly as possible, the acceptable level of facility in the subject, which we regard as appropriate for any level of education, but fails to stipulate how cohesion should be taught.

Prabhu (1987) says that syllabuses can be set up either as a sequence of fixed levels of expected achievement or as a general direction for learner's progress. A fixed level syllabus implies a demand that all learners reach a common level of achievement at a certain stage and therefore the assumption that learning depends relatively directly on teaching.

A syllabus organized in terms of 'communicative' content is said to have the additional advantage of being divisible into stages such that each stage represents a distinct level of learner achievement, and has an immediate surrender value. The English syllabus has been divided into levels covering the progression stage of a learner right from Form 1 to form 4. The said grammar structures presented in a spiral way. The English syllabus is important in all the above ways, as has been discussed earlier, but it is even more so in the curriculum, because at present English is the medium of instruction in Kenya. Any decision made concerning the syllabus will have far reaching repercussions on the teaching, achievement and standards of all other subjects in the curriculum. English is the medium of discourse for the entire economic life in the country; both commercial and industrial and also features largely in these administrative and legal systems of our country.

Any form of thinking depends on language. If pupils are to do well in other subjects, they must be able to express themselves well in English. Therefore, English holds a pivotal role in our curriculum, as it affects performance in all other subjects on the timetable. As Pearson (1981) puts it, English is not another subject on the timetable; it is an instrument of all learning.   Due to this, the learner needs to be well equipped, fluent and master the language to enable them perform well in other subjects. English performance continues to fall as has been pointed in the background information.

The English syllabus has adopted a linear order of the grammar items to be covered in each of the class level. Language acquisition is not a linear progression but a cyclic one, even metamorphic one. The learner is constantly engaged in reanalyzing data, reformulating hypotheses, recasting generalizations among others. Grammatical specification in the syllabus has to assume that encounter with any particular grammatical construct will be appropriately timed for all users of that syllabus. This becomes a hindrance as the personal learning schedules of individual learners vary a great deal. This is one of the shortcomings this study revealed in the way the syllabus has not outlined how cohesion should be taught.

2.3. Language acquisition

Acquisition can be broadly defined as the internalization of the rules and formulas, which then is used to communicate in the language two (L2). In this sense the term 'acquisition' is synonymous with the term learning. Krashen (1988) sees acquisition as consisting of the spontaneous process of rule internalization that result from natural language use, while learning consists of the development of conscious L2 knowledge through formal study. A learner needs to understand the rules to be able to communicate fluently. Response data from the questionnaire asserts that learners do make mistakes in cohesion and therefore a need arises for the rules to be taught in totality.

According to Wesche, as cited in Gallaway (1994), oral language input to the language development level of learners might play a casual role in language acquisition. Human possess innate knowledge specific to language known as universal grammar-UG, which constraints the linguistic data required in language acquisition (Chomsky 1965). It has been argued that ambient input data may provide to degenerate a model due to performance errors. Universal grammar proposes that learners possess a set of abstract linguistic principles, which can vary in certain ways and which restrict what is possible in human language. Krashen's input hypothesis, largely predated UG approaches to SLA research, continues to make the strongest claim about the role of the linguistic environment in SLA (Krashen 1985). In Krashen's view, evolved from his earlier formulation of Monitor Theory, a second language is acquired.

Stern (1924) provides a comprehensible statement of his views of the major stages of language acquisition. He sees development as scanning five-time period, of these the transition stage is presented as one that a child goes beyond the limits of its earlier associative links between sounds and real life events. This concurs with the syllabus presentation of grammar in 'chunks' at each level from form one to four.

Ingram (1989) calls these changes as the principle of syntactic structure one, which directs the child to formulate rules of sentence structure within the restrictions of universal grammar and some theory of acquisition. The ability to use analogy will account, for the child will notice the regular inflections and apply them to irregular forms, for example 'drinked' for 'drunk' or 'badder' for 'worse'. Maturations approach to language acquisition will minimize the influence of the environment if a principle of grammar has not yet matured, then no amount of linguistic input will lead to its acquisition, if it has matured, then presumably some minimal exposure will be sufficient. Goodluck (1986) also says that the biological program for learning is envisaged as a set of innate blue prints for possible language type, that is, universal grammar (UG). UG is not a set of properties that are true of all languages; rather, it is a set of specifications for the shape of permissible kinds of languages; by spelling out the nature of the various types of grammatical systems observed in the world's languages. UG will in effect also exclude all non-occurring systems; the errors he makes on the path to adult knowledge may be expected to be constrained accordingly.

Ellis (1985) goes ahead to suggest that SLA follows the sequence, that it does so, because the processes that the learner calls on to participate in discourse are themselves developmental. That is, their prominence in SLA coincides with different stages of development. This is in line with Krashen's input hypothesis stipulation that we move from one level to the next, that is, i+1. Schumann (1978) acculturation model looks at SLA as just one aspect of acculturation and the degree to which a learner acculturates to the target language (TL) group will control the degree to which a learner acquires the second language (SL).

Krashen's monitor model has enjoyed considerable prominence in SLA research (Ellis 1985). The acquisition-learning hypothesis is applicable to the process of internalizing new L2 knowledge, to storing this knowledge and also to using it in actual performance. Acquisition occurs subconsciously as a result of participating in natural communication where the focus is on meaning. Learning

occurs as a result of conscious study of the formal properties of language. When these properties lack in the input, the learner is handicapped in attaining fluency. The findings show lack of enough input to enable the learner practice more on cohesion.

2.4. Instructed Second Language Acquisition
Sharwood (1981) argue that raising learners' consciousness of grammatical properties may accelerate SLA. In the second language classroom, learners should be made aware of the grammatical properties of the target language. The learner needs to be introduced to the rules of cohesion as early as possible. There is a need for cohesion to be taught as a topic in form one.
Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) in support for the need of instruction, say that with language learning: while comprehensible input may be necessary and sufficient for SLA, instruction may simplify the learning task, alter the process and sequences of acquisition, speed up the rate of acquisition and improve the quality and level of second language ultimate attainment.
Pica (1983), as cited in Larsen-Freeman and Long (ibid), did a research on the effect of instruction on acquisition process. He looked at the kinds of errors made by the learners in all groups and compared the acquisition strategies and processes revealed by those errors. Pica found that learners who had never received formal SL instruction tended to omit grammatical morphemes, such as –ing and plural –s, whereas classroom learners (and to a lesser degree, and in late stages mixed learners) showed a strong tendency to over apply morphological markings of this kind.
Rutherford and Sharwood, as cited in Philipson et al (1991), say that in many approaches to language teaching, there is little room for explicit grammatical instructions. Yet many teachers continue and rely on explicit presentation of grammatical rules and many students continue to expect L-rules which in their terms are rule constructs devised by the formulator a linguist and set down on paper. Schimdt (1990) argues that nothing in the target language is available for intake into a language learner's existing system unless it is consciously noticed. He says that there is no such a thing as learning a second language subliminally. Thus a significant role is assigned to prior knowledge or experience as an activator of selective attention. With regard to SL learning, attention is what allows a learner to notice a mismatch between what she produces or knows and what is produced by speakers.

2.5. Theoretical Framework

2.5.1. Krashen's Monitor Model
Krashen's Monitor Model consists of five central hypotheses. The first of this is the Acquisition –learning hypothesis. This hypothesis advances two independent systems of language performance: 'the acquired system' and the learned system. The acquired system or otherwise 'acquisition' is the product of a subconscious system very similar process children undergo when they acquire their first language. This means that the learner has to interact more in the target language though natural communication will be the ultimate goal of communication.
The second hypothesis is the monitor hypothesis which explains the relationship between acquisition and learning and defines the influence of learning on acquisition. The monitor is used as a device to edit the learner's language performance. It utilizes learner's knowledge by acting upon utterances generated form acquired knowledge.
The third hypothesis, the Natural Order Hypothesis is based on research findings which suggest that the acquisition of grammatical structure follows a 'natural order' which is predictable. For a given language, some grammatical structures tend to be acquired early while others late disregarding the learner's age, L1 background and condition of exposure
The fourth hypothesis, Input hypothesis claims that we need to move from a stage that contains i+1 and that acquirer understands input that contains i+1. The learner improves and progresses along the 'natural order' when he/she receives second language 'input' that is one step beyond his/her current stage of linguistic competence.
Finally, the fifth hypothesis, the Affective Filter hypothesis holds the view that a number of affective variables play a facilitative, but a non-causal role in second language acquisition. These include motivation, self-confidence and anxiety. High motivation, self-confidence, a good self-image and a low level of anxiety are better equipped for success in second language acquisition. The reverse of this 'raise' the affective filter and form a 'mental block' that prevents comprehensible input from being used for acquisition. All the above hypotheses will be useful in this study except the Affective Filter hypothesis which the researcher held the variables involved in it constant.

2.5.2. Frequency Hypothesis
Frequency, as a hypothesis to be investigated, was proposed by Hatch (1974).The frequency hypothesis states that the order and rate of a learner's acquisition of L2 grammatical feature is determined by the frequency of those features in the input, more frequent features are acquired before the less frequent ones. Hatch suspected that the rather limited ranges of potential topics for conversation with children determine the frequency of different native speakers (NS) question types, and that relative frequencies might in turn help to explain the orders observed by other researchers for accurate production of certain forms. Butoyi (1978),as cited in Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991), found a significant positive correlation between the relative frequencies of noun phrase compliment structures in speech addressed to adult ESL students and the rank order in which they appeared accurately supplied by the learners. Thus the importance of frequency hypothesis in this study. This was also helpful in defining what constitutes those input available to the learners. The frequent mode of testing inclined more on "filling in the blank" and "rewriting sentences" in most of the textbooks analyzed. There were also fewer structures with cohesion rules and thus the frequency of those structures proved inadequate to enable proper mastery of cohesion.

3. Methodology

This was a survey study. The researcher used an ex-post facto design. This is a systematic empirical enquiry where the researcher did not have direct control of the independent variable because their manifestations have long occurred or they are inherently not manipulatable (Mugenda and Mugenda (1999).

The researcher investigated the independent variable, that is, the textbooks input which the researcher could not manipulate. The textbooks have been published and already in the market and in use by the teachers. The researcher could not change any data within the selected textbooks, as this would infringe on the copyright of the author. The data from the textbook was picked as it was. The independent variables were investigated in connection to the dependent variable the acquisition of cohesion. Inferences about relations among those variables were made.

The target population of the study was all the recommended English textbooks. Ministry of Education has recommended six textbooks that ought to be used in teaching of English in Kenya Secondary Schools. These textbooks are from various publishers in Kenya. These are: New Integrated English Book 1, Advancing in English Book 1, Head Start English Book 1, Exploring English Book 1, New Horizons English Book 1 and Excelling in English Book 1.

Four textbooks were selected through stratified random sampling and subjected to an analysis. The researcher prepared six ballot papers each with a number corresponding to a given textbook and placed them in a box after folding them. Four students were requested by the researcher to pick one ballot paper each from the box. The papers were opened and their number recorded and matched to the corresponding textbooks.

The textbooks were subjected to an analysis with qualitative mode of enquiry the content analysis being used to show the input available for the learner. The researcher isolated the grammar structures from the table of content list. The structures were analyzed to find out how they treated cohesion. Frequency tables and percentages were drawn to present the findings.

3.1. Data Presentation and Analysis

This is a presentation of analysis and interpretation of data to establish the relevance of English textbooks input on the learner's acquisition of cohesion in grammar in Secondary Schools in Kenya. The research was a survey type; hence the findings are presented in descriptive statistics consisting of tables of frequencies and percentages. This research investigated the conformity of the content to that of the English syllabus and the frequency and availability of cohesion structures in the Form 1 English textbook.

3.2. The English Syllabus Order of Grammar Content

The grammar content in the English syllabus is divided into three key sections. These sections are:
- Parts of speech which are words classified according to their function in a sentence. Areas comprising this section are nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions and conjunctions.
- Phrases which covers the constituents and examples of noun phrases, and lastly
- Simple sentences which comprises of sentence structure and types of sentences.

The English syllabus is also specific on the areas to be covered. The researcher labelled them divisions. These divisions in section 1 were nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions and conjunctions. Some of these divisions had also areas to be covered. The researcher labelled them sub-divisions. The division that caters for nouns had other six sub-divisions, namely: common nouns, abstract nouns, number in nouns and articles. Pronouns had four sub-divisions; personal pronouns, possessive pronouns, reflexive pronouns and functions of pronouns. The division in verb had two sub-divisions; lexical verb and tense. Adjectives have three subdivisions; comparative and superlative adjectives, regular and irregular adjectives and gradable and non-gradable adjectives. The division on adverb, preposition and conjunctions had no sub-divisions and were treated as complete divisions.

Section two had only one division, that is, the phrase, which was also treated as a complete division. Section three had only one division with two sub-divisions. These sub-divisions were: the sentence structure and types of sentences.

3.3. The Effect of Order of Grammar Content in the English Textbook

The objective of teaching grammar is to help students understand how language works and to use it correctly and appropriately in different contexts. The English syllabus is very specific on the grammar items to be taught (KIE, 2003). The study of grammar should help the learner communicate clearly and understand accurately and adequately what is heard and read. Emphasis should be placed on the parts of speech before the teacher progresses to the noun phrases and subsequently to simple sentences. It was on this basis that the researcher compared the contents in the textbooks analyzed. All the grammar structures were placed one after the other as they appeared in the syllabus. The arrangement in the syllabus formed the order by which the researcher did the comparison to find out the conformity. Each of the textbooks was subjected to an analysis using the syllabus to identify the grammar structures in the textbooks. The findings of each of the textbooks are given below. Table 1 below shows a comparison in the order of content presentation in the *New Integrated English Book 1* and *Advancing in English Book 1* against the *English Syllabus*. The *English syllabus* content on the left was used as the yardstick from which the comparison was made. The three sections of the syllabus outlined earlier are listed down in table form and both textbooks content order was compared to it. The first section in both the syllabus and the *New Integrated English Book 1* displays some similarity. It is only the adjective division that brings a break in the order. In section two, a complete contrast is observed with the order in the *New Integrated English Book 1 completely* contrasting with the order in the *English syllabus*. Section three takes position of section two thus affecting the order. Section three which is divided into sentence structure and types of sentences has some two other addition sub-divisions, that is, subject verb agreement and verb to have. Lastly in the order is section

two which is the division on phrases which is followed by some divisions on conjunctions, adverbs, adjectives and prepositions which are supposed to be covered in section one.

English Syllabus	New Integrated English Book 1	Advancing in English Book 1
1. Parts of speech	1. Parts of speech	1 Parts of speech
a) Nouns	a) Nouns	a) Nouns
i) Common nouns	i) Proper nouns	i) Common and proper nouns
ii) Proper nouns	ii) Common nouns	ii) Proper nouns
iii) Concrete nouns	iii) Collective nouns	iii) Concrete nouns
iv) Abstract nouns	iv) Concrete/abstract	iv) Abstract nouns
v) Number	v) Articles	v) Number in nouns
vi) Articles	d) Adjectives	vi) Articles
b) Pronouns	b) Pronouns	b) Pronouns
i) Personal pronoun	i) Personal pronoun	i) Personal pronouns
ii) Possessive pronoun	ii) Possessive pronoun	ii) Possessive pronouns
iii) Reflexive pronoun	iii) Reflexive pronoun	iii) Reflexive pronouns
iv) Functions of Pronouns	iv) Functions of pronouns	iv) Functions of pronouns
Iv) Emphasizing pro.missing	v) Emphasizing pronouns	iv) Emphasizing pro. missing
c) Verbs	c) The verb to 'be'	c) Verbs
i) Lexical	Spelling rules	i) Lexical
ii) Tenses	c) ii) Tense	iii) Tense
d) Adjectives	i) Verb irregular	d) Adjectives
i)Comparative & Superlative	3) Simple sentence structure	i)Comparative & Superlative
ii) Regular & irregular	i) Sentence structure	ii) Regular & irregular
iii) Gradable & non-gradable	ii) Subject verb agreement	iii) Gradable & non-gradable
e) Adverbs	c) Verb to have	e) Adverbs
f) Prepositions	2) Phrases (noun phrases)	f) Prepositions
g) Conjunctions	g) Conjunctions	g) Conjunctions
2) Phrases	e) Adverbs	2) Phrases (Noun Phrases)
3) Simple sentences	d) Adjectives	3) Simple sentences
i) Sentence structure	Direct speech	i) Sentence structure
ii) Type of sentences	f) Prepositions	ii) Type of sentences

Table 1: Comparison of the order of presentation of content between the English Syllabus
and the New Integrated English Book 1 and the Advancing in English Book 1

The syllabus is also looked at as an operational construct. It acts as a form of support to the teaching activity. It specifies the content to be imparted to the learners. The ordering of grammar structures matters a lot in the teaching activity. If publishes stuck to the order as per the syllabus then a uniformity will be achieved to all the learners.

On the far right of Table 1 is a presentation made in the comparison in the order of grammar structures in *Advancing in English Book 1* and against the *English syllabus*. The *English syllabus* on the left was also used as the yardstick for comparing the grammar structures. All the sections in the syllabus were placed at par with those of the *Advancing English Book 1*. There were similarities in all the sections. This meant that there was conformity in the order of grammar content. There is uniformity that is displayed in this textbook. The function of the syllabus is to create uniformity in the standard of education throughout the country. Thus if teachers were to use this textbook as their reference tool, then a uniformity would be achieved. This textbook, *Advancing in English Book 1,* was found to adhere to the syllabus stipulation. Krashen's natural order hypothesis as earlier said, suggests that the acquisition of grammatical structures follows a 'natural order' which is predictable. In this case, the order in *Advancing in English Book 1* follows the English syllabus strictly and thus predictable. This is also beneficial to a learner as grammatical structures should be presented in a given order. The ordering pattern is important as it makes the learner move in stages and not an abrupt introduction to materials that are not of that particular stage. For example, adjectives tell us more about nouns, pronouns and also the verbs. A learner therefore needs first to understand what a noun, a pronoun or a verb is before being introduced to a word that is supposed to modify it (adjectives). An amorphous presentation of the content may not be suitable to the learner.

Table 2 below shows the comparison of the order of grammar structures in *Head Start English Book 1* and *New Horizons English Book 1* against the *English syllabus*. In this table, the *English syllabus* grammar content on the left was placed alongside the *Head Start English Book 1*, on the right. Section one from both contents were similar except a slight change. For instance, *Head Start English Book 1* covers tense before verb and conjunctions come before the prepositions. This presentation goes counter that of the syllabus. The rest of the sections showed some similarities in ordering of grammar structures. As earlier said the syllabus functions as a standardizer and this is not the case with the *Head Start English Book 1*. This textbook does not offer explanation on what a simple sentence is, but goes straight to give examples of sentence types. A learner needs to understand what a sentence is before being

introduced to types of sentences. This again goes counter the syllabus stipulation that a grammar item should be to a learner from the simple progressing on to the complex. Input hypothesis stipulates that we acquire by going for meaning first and as a result we acquire structure. A learner needs to understand has to be introduced to these grammar structures in chunks from the simple to the complex.

On the far right of Table 2, presents the comparison of the grammar structures in the *New Horizons in English Book 1* to the *English syllabus*. Section one in both contents are similar with only b (IV) (functions of pronouns) missing in *New Horizons in English Book 1*. The other sections (phrases and simple sentences) display some similarities. This textbook displays the same behavior as in *Advancing in English Book 1*. It follows the syllabus order strictly. The presentation of grammar conforms to that of the *English syllabus*. The textbook had also reserved some units (or revision of the already covered structures). The textbook is also more detailed in some structures. *New Horizons in English Book 1* showed a need for the part dealing with the negative statements to have its rule formation explained. This part is lacking.

English Syllabus	Head Start English Book 1	New Horizon in English Book 1
1. Parts of speech	1. Parts of speech	1 Parts of speech
a) Nouns	a) Nouns	a) Nouns
i) Common nouns	i) Common nouns	i) Proper nouns
ii) Proper nouns	ii) proper nouns	ii) common nouns
iii) Concrete nouns	iii) Abstract nouns	iii) Concrete nouns
iv) Abstract nouns	iv) Concrete nouns	iv) Abstract nouns
v) Number	v) mass nouns	v) Number in nouns
vi) Articles	d) Articles	vi) Articles
b) Pronouns	b) Pronouns	b) Pronouns
i) Personal pronoun	i) Personal pronoun-case & gender	i) Personal pronouns
ii) Possessive pronoun	ii) Possessive pronoun	ii) Possessive pronouns
iii) Reflexive pronoun	iii) Reflexive noun	iii) Reflexive pronouns
iv) Functions of Pronouns	iv)Functions missing	iv)Functions missing
c) Verbs	c) Verbs	c) Verbs
i) Lexical	ii)Tense	i)Lexical
ii) Tenses	i) Lexical	ii) Tense
d) Adjectives	d) Adjectives	d) Adjectives
i)Comparative & Superlative	i)Comparative & Superlative	i)Comparative & Superlative
ii) Regular & irregular	ii) Regular & irregular	ii) Regular & irregular
iii) Gradable & non-gradable	iii) Gradable & non-gradable	iii) Gradable & non-gradable
e) Adverbs	e) Adverbs	e) Adverbs
f) Prepositions	g)conjunctions	f) Prepositions
g) Conjunctions	f) Prepositions	g) Conjunctions
2) Phrases	2) Phrases	2) Phrases
3) Simple sentences	i) Pre-modified	3) Simple sentences
i) Sentence structure	ii) Post-modified	i) Sentence type
ii) Type of sentences	3) Simple sentence	ii) Tag questions
	i)Sentence type	

Table 2: Comparison of the order of presentation of content between the English syllabus and the Head Start in English Book 1 and the New Horizons in English Book 1
English Syllabus Head Start English Book 1New Horizons English Book 1

3.4. Frequency and Availability of Cohesion (Agreement) Structures in the Form 1 English Textbooks
One of the objectives of this study was to find out on the frequency and availability of the grammatical structures that would assist learner's acquisition of cohesion. The researcher listed down all the grammar structures from the English syllabus in the Form 1 level. These grammar structures were compared to those in the Form 1 English textbook. These structures had been grouped into three sections. *The New Integrated English Book 1* had its cohesive structures in noun (articles and plurals in nouns), pronouns and verbs (spelling rules and tense) and in the sentence structures. *Advancing in English Book 1,* covered cohesion in nouns (numbers in nouns and articles) pronouns, verb (tense), adjectives and sentence type (interrogative statements and tag questions).*New Horizons English Book 1* covered cohesion in noun (concrete, number - regular and irregular, and articles), pronouns (personal and reflexive), verbs (regular and irregular and tense), adjectives (comparatives and superlatives, conjunctions and sentence type (simple sentence, tag questions and declarative statements). Finally, *Head Start English Book 1* had cohesion covered in nouns (plurals in nouns and articles), pronouns, verbs (tense and lexical), adjectives (comparatives and superlatives), conjunctions and prepositions.

Section one had been named parts of speech, section two phrases and section three simple sentences. From the divisions and sub-divisions (explained earlier in 4.2), the researcher extracted all those structures that touched on cohesion. The researcher considered structures where rules were explained in their formation and usage in sentences. The sub-divisions touching on cohesion from each

section were picked and listed down in table form. A percentage representation was arrived at after grouping these structures as in Table 3. Frequency stands for the number of sub-division in each division identified to have cohesion structures. The sub-division (f) in each textbook labelled other(s) represented those grammar structures that did not have cohesion.

Table 3 shows a percentage representation of what each of the Form 1 English textbook contained in terms of cohesion structures. The table showed that *New Integrated English Book 1* had a total of 53% of its structures containing cohesion. The rest (other(s)) 47% of grammar structures did not contain cohesion structures. The results mean that there are 53% available structures that can be used to teach cohesion and the rest 47% cannot assist in the teaching of cohesion. In *Advancing in English Book 1*, 52% of its grammar structure touched on cohesion and 48% had no structures with cohesion. As in *Integrated English Book 1, Advancing in English Book 1* had half of its grammar structure touching on cohesion. The textbook had available grammar structures that could be used to teach cohesion. *Head Start English Book 1* had 52% of its grammar structures containing cohesion while 48% was lacking. This is similar to*Advancing in English Book 1* which displays the same information. This means that half of the grammar structures in this textbook, *Head Start English Book 1*, are available for teaching of cohesion to learners.

Lastly, *New Horizons in English Book 1* had only 44% of its grammar structures containing cohesion. The other 56% could not assist in teaching of cohesion. This text, displayed the smallest percentage of structures that were useful in teaching of cohesion.

The tabulation shows that the sub-division on nouns in three textbooks (Integrated English Book 1, Advancing in English Book 1and Head Start English Book 1) had the same percentage of 9, but one textbook (New Horizon in English Book 1) had the highest percentage of 13, although the textbook had less grammar structures containing cohesion (44%). In sub-division on pronoun, a similar observation is made, where the first three textbooks in the table have a percentage of 17, but the fourth textbook has only 9%. The results show a big disparity in this book as compared to the other three.

The sub-division on verbs is uniform in all the textbooks. *New Integrated English Book 1* and *Advancing in English Book 1* had the same percentage in sub-divisions of adjectives and sentence. The two textbooks did not have a sub-division on conjunctions which is present in *Head Start English Book 1* and *New Horizon in English Book 1*. The sub-division carried a percentage of 4 in both textbooks. *Head Start English Book 1* only the sub-division on preposition and it did not have a sub-division on sentence which differs with the other textbooks.

It can generally be observed that, all the textbooks analyzed contain grammar structures that were helpful in the teaching of cohesion. This means that teachers had available input on cohesion teaching. If these grammar structures were well utilized, they can effectively assist in acquisition of cohesion by learners. It was also seen that teachers have fairly large chunks of structures that they can utilize in the teaching of cohesion. Even though there are enough structures, the findings show that when teaching is not on cohesion per se but on meaning and function and therefore cohesion rules are not emphasized.

TEXTBOOK	AREA COVERAGE	FREQUENCY (f)	PERCENTAGE (%)
New Integrated English Book 1	• Nouns	2	9
	• Pronouns	4	17
	• Verbs	2	9
	• Adjectives	3	13
	• Sentence	1	5
	• Other (s)	11	47
	TOTAL	**23**	**100**
Advancing in English Book 1	• Nouns	2	9
	• Pronouns	4	17
	• Verbs	2	9
	• Adjectives	3	13
	• Sentence	1	4
	• Other (s)	11	48
	TOTAL	**23**	**100**
Head Start English Book 1	• Nouns	2	9
	• Pronouns	4	17
	• Verbs	2	9
	• Adjectives	2	9
	• Sentence	1	4
	• Prepositions	1	4
	• Other (s)	11	47
	TOTAL	**23**	**100**
New Horizons in English Book 1	• Nouns	3	13
	• Pronouns	2	9
	• Verbs	2	9
	• Adjectives	1	4
	• Conjunctions	1	4

	• Sentence	1	5
	• Other (s)	13	56
	TOTAL	**23**	**100**

Table 3: Percentage Area Coverage of Cohesion in Textbooks

4. Summary of Findings

The first objective was necessary for the study to answer the question;

Does the order of grammar content in the English textbooks affect cohesion acquisition?

It is clear from the above findings that adherence to the guidelines in the syllabus is flouted without care. As the syllabus serves as the guideline, it should be strictly adhered to. It is also observed that the order of structures presentation is very important to a learner, starting with the nouns and verbs and then the other structures, as nouns and verbs forms the core of cohesion. There is also a need for explanations of the structures to enable a learner understand them. It has also emerged that there is importance of teaching cohesion and at least a unit be reserved for it as in the New Integrated English Book 1. This text has dedicated a whole unit of cohesion (subject-verb agreement) that proved beneficial in the learning of cohesion. The syllabus is so general on the issue of cohesion and does not stipulate its mode of teaching in the content, although the texts show its importance and hence covering it in their presentation of structures. The above view concerning the treatment of cohesion in the syllabus raises a lot of concern.

The second question that this study sought to answer was how frequent and available are cohesion structures in the form 1 English textbook? The findings showed that in the three texts, grammar structures presented had half the structures containing cohesion and the rest of the structures could not help in teaching of cohesion. This then implies that the textbooks contained structures that could be used to teach cohesion. If these structures with cohesion were well utilized, then the learners have enough input to help them acquire cohesion.

4.1. Conclusion

Following the findings of this study, a number of conclusions are made.   First it can be concluded that the analyzed texts have enough structures to enable the learners acquire cohesion. Most of the textbooks had only 50% of their grammar structures containing cohesion. Available input on cohesion if well utilized would help the learner acquire cohesion.

Another conclusion made was that of publishers flouting the laid down syllabus outline. It was concluded that most of the textbooks had no set order of presentation of the grammar items. This contravenes the input theory that stipulates order of presentation from the known to the unknown that is the i+1 level.

Another conclusion made from the findings was that the textbooks did not dedicate any unit in the teaching of cohesion (except New Integrated English Book 1). It was further concluded that the syllabus, which acts as the guideline to the preparation of these text does not give guidelines on how the issue of cohesion should be handled. The publishers of the recommended textbooks are left groping in the dark and therefore this area is left to the whim of the teacher.

The finding from the syllabus layout concludes that the syllabus is so general on the issue of cohesion. It does not recommend when, how and where cohesion should be taught. This leaves the teaching of cohesion also to be neglected by most teachers and the amorphous way it is taught. This conclusion showed that this area is neglected and raises concern over the future of cohesion. It is from the above conclusion that led to the following recommendations.

4.2. Recommendations

In view of the findings discussed in the preceding chapter, the following measures if undertaken will improve on the mastery of cohesion. The syllabus should be reviewed to come up with particular areas of teaching cohesion. It should also give guidelines on how teaching of cohesion should be done. This is to avoid the amorphous way the teaching of cohesion is done. A unit should be reserved in the textbooks published to take care of cohesion. This should be given priority as part of the grammar structures that should be taught to the learners. This will avoid learners making cohesion errors when they are writing essays or even in sentence construction. That deals with curriculum planning should come up with a single text that would be used countrywide as with the case in the old syllabus. This makes it possible for uniformity to be attained as schools currently use different texts. The school administration should go an extra mile and buy at least a copy of each of the recommended textbook for their teachers. This is to enable the teacher consult these textbooks when preparing for lessons. Teachers should not confine themselves to only one text but should make sure to use a variety of texts when preparing lessons. Teachers should also seek to understand the texts that have been recommended and to have access to these texts.

5. References

1. Ayot, A. O. (1984). Language for Learning. Nairobi: Macmillan Press
2. Brown, G. and Yule, G., (1987). Discourse Analysis. Cambridge: CUP
3. Bukenya, A., Kioko A., Njeng'ere D., Mutei, V. (2003). Head Start English Form 1. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
4. Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the Theory of Syntax Cambridge: Mass. MIT Press
5. Ellis, R. (1985). Understanding Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. Gallaway, C. and Richards B., (1994). Input and Interaction in Language Acquisition. Cambridge: C.U.P

7. Gathumbi, A., Kimaliro, E., Mugambi, H., Bwonya J., Newman J., Kiio, N. (2003). New Integrated English Student's Book1.Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.
8. Goodluck, H. (1986). 'Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theory' In Language Acquisition. Paul Fletcher and Michael Garman(ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
9. Halliday, M.A.K and Hassan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.
10. Hatch, E. (1974). Second Language Learning Universals. Working Papers on Bilingualism 3:118
11. Ingram, D. (1989). First Language Acquisition: method, description, and explanation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
12. Kiai A., Oduor, B., Owuor, E. (2003). New Horizons in English: A course for Secondary Schools. Nairobi: East African Education Publishers
13. K.I.E. (2003). The Ministry of Education: Secondary Education English Syllabus. Nairobi: K.I.E
14. Krashen, S. (1988). Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning. Prentice Hall International
15. Krashen, S. (1985). The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications: New York: Longman
16. Larsen-Freeman, D. and Long, H. M. (1991). An introduction To Second Language Acquisition Research. New York: Longman Group UK limited
17. Mugenda, O. M. and Mugenda, A. G. (1999). Research: Quantitave and Qualitative Approaches. Nairobi: Acts Press
18. Pearson, H., (1981). The Teaching of Language Skills. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
19. Pica, T., (1983). Adult Acquisition of English as a second Language under Different Conditions of Exposure: Language Learning 33 (4; 465-97)
20. Philipson, R. (1991). 'Some items on the hidden agenda of second/foreign language. Acquisition' In Foreign Second Language Pedagogy Research: R Philipson. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
21. Prabhu, S. (1987). Second Language Pedagogy. New Delhi: OUP
22. Rutherford, W., (1987). Second Language Development. Pergamon: Press
23. Schmidt, M., (1980). Coordinate Structures and Language Universals in Inter-language. Language Learning 30:397-416
24. Schumann, J., (1978). The Pidginization Process: A Model for Second Language Acquisition.
25. Mass Newbury House Rowley.
26. Sharwood-Smith, M. (1991). Consciousness-raising and the Second Language Learner. Applied Linguistics 11: 159-69.
27. Stern, W. (1924). Psychology of Early Childhood up to the Sixth Year of Age. New York : Holt
28. Tallerman, M. (1998). Understanding Syntax. London: Oxford University Press.
29. Vikiru, L., Oburu H., Omwoyo, H. (2004). Advancing in English Form 1 Nairobi: Longhorn Publishers (K) Ltd
30. Wilkins, J. R. (1997). Building English Skills Handbook. McDougal, Illinois: Littell and Company