



# Cohesion in texts: A Discourse Analysis Approach to Newspaper Article

---

Léonard KOUSSOUHON  
Patrice AKOGBETO  
Franck AMOUSSOU<sup>✉</sup>  
Université d'Abomey-Calavi

**Abstract** - This article seeks to explore cohesive elements in an English text drawn from a newspaper. In that perspective, the study is focused on identifying, describing and interpreting patterns of cohesion present in the concerned text. As a matter of fact, understanding how the text is structured, beyond the grammar and lexis of language, and decoding the meanings intended by the organization of words are the basis of this work. Using *The PUNCH* article "Jonathan, hard to sell in S'West-Akintola" (2014) as a basis, the textual characteristics of meaning through cohesion will be studied. The principles of cohesion also put forth by Halliday and Hasan (1976); Bloor and Bloor (1995/2004) and examined by Eggins (1994/2004) will be applied to the article and analyzed to demonstrate the relevance of the cohesive elements that are present in the text which contribute to the overall meaning therein. This study also aims at helping students of English as a Second or Foreign Language "decode" meaning from the understanding of how cohesion functions within text to create semantic links.

**Key words:** Cohesion, discourse analysis, presupposition, tie.

**Résumé** - Le présent article cherche à explorer les ressources de la cohésion dans un texte écrit en anglais et tiré d'un article de journal. Dans cette perspective, l'étude est focalisée sur l'identification, la description et l'interprétation des éléments de cohésion présents dans le texte en question. En fait, le fondement de cette étude est la compréhension des mécanismes de la structuration du texte, au-delà de la grammaire et du lexique de la langue, et le décodage des sens qui y sont supposés. Se servant de l'article "Jonathan, hard to sell in S'West-Akintola" (2014) tiré du journal *The PUNCH*, les caractéristiques textuelles de sens seront étudiées à travers la cohésion. Les principes de cohésion, également mis au point par Halliday & Hasan (1976); Bloor et Bloor (1995/2004), et examinés par Eggins (1994/2004) seront appliqués à l'article et seront analysés pour démontrer la pertinence des ressources cohésives qui apparaissent dans le texte et qui contribuent au sens global y exprimé. Cette étude vise à aider les étudiants ayant l'anglais comme langue seconde ou langue étrangère à "décoder" le sens à partir de la compréhension de la fonction de la cohésion interne du texte et à créer des liens sémantiques.

**Mots clés:** Cohésion, analyse du discours, presupposition, liaison.

## 1. Introduction

The context in which a text unfolds is a key factor for making predictions about the kinds of meaning that are likely to be exchanged. As Brown and Yule (1983 p.27) argue, to take a pragmatic approach to the study of language, the discourse analyst has to take account of the context in which a piece of discourse occurs. Trying to display the interdependency between text and context, Halliday & Hasan (1985/1989 p.52) contend that the two concepts are so intimately related that neither can be enunciated without the other. But, one of the characteristics of a text, if not the most outstanding one, that brings the

---

<sup>✉</sup> [courawin@yahoo.fr](mailto:courawin@yahoo.fr)



text reader or listener to discriminate between a text and a 'non-text' is its unity. Halliday & Hasan (1985/1989) distinguish two types of unity in any text (written or spoken): unity of structure and unity of texture. According to Hasan, the texture of a text is manifested by certain kinds of semantic relations between its individual messages. And it is those semantic relations which form the basis for cohesion between the messages of a text. It follows that a text without texture would just be a group of isolated sentences with no relationships to one another (Fowler, 1986).

To investigate the resources that English has for creating texture, we decide to analyze the discourse of a news article drawn from a Nigerian newspaper named *The Punch*. The concerned article entitled "Jonathan, hard to sell in S'West-Akintola", reports an interview given to a former Deputy Speaker (Chief Adeniyi Akintola) about the Nigerian 2015 general elections, the Goodluck Jonathan Presidency and other issues.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

### 2.1. Principles of Textual Cohesion

Halliday and Hasan's (1976) *Cohesion in English* has laid the foundations of text linguistics. Cohesion, according to these authors, is defined as 'the set of linguistic means we have available for creating texture (Halliday and Hasan, 1976 p.2), i.e., the property of a text of being an interpretable whole, rather than unconnected sentences (Fowler, 1986).

Halliday and Hasan (1976) view cohesion as a semantic relation based on the central notion of *presupposition*. This term refers to the intertextual link between two elements whereby one element [the presupposing] presupposes another one [the presupposed] which is located somewhere (anaphora or cataphora) or in the context of situation (exophora). Presupposition is realized at three levels: the semantic level (as in the case of reference), the lexicogrammatical level (as in the case of substitution and ellipsis) and the grammatical level (as in the case of conjunctions).

Eggs (1994 p.95) argues that whenever a participant is mentioned in a text, s/he may be either presented to us (introduced as 'new' to the text) or presumed (encoded in such a way that we need to retrieve their identity from somewhere). The commonest presuming *reference* items are the definite article, demonstrative pronoun, and personal pronoun. As for Halliday and Hasan (ibid: 31-87), the three types of reference they distinguish are personal, demonstrative and comparative. Both ellipsis and substitution presuppose the existence of certain textual elements. Halliday and Hasan (1976 pp.90-141) identify three types of *substitution*: nominal, verbal and clausal. As for *ellipsis*, Halliday and Hasan (Ibid pp.142-225) claim that there are three kinds: nominal



ellipsis, verbal ellipsis, and clausal ellipsis. *Conjunctions*, classified into additives, adversatives, causal and temporal, establish linkage as in the case of the cohesive temporal 'previously', 'afterwards', and 'meanwhile'. *Lexical cohesion*, which is the fifth resource of textual cohesion in Halliday and Hasan's model, is defined as the cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary (Ibid p.274). It is subdivided into two major sub-categories: reiteration and collocation.

## 2.2. Cohesive devices

Cohesion concerns how a text is constructed as a semantic edifice. It is related to semantic ties or "relations of meanings that exist within the text, and that define it as a text" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976 p.4). The ties make it possible to analyze texts in terms of their cohesive properties, and give a systematic account of their patterns of texture. The different types of cohesive tie which determine the principles of cohesion are the ones mentioned in the subsequent section.

### 2.2.1. Reference

The cohesive resource of reference refers to how the writer/speaker introduces participants and then keeps track of them once they are in the text (Eggs: 2004:33). There are two general kinds of reference: exophoric reference, which refers to information from the immediate context of situation, and endophoric reference, which refers to information that can be "retrieved" from within the text. It is this endophoric reference which creates cohesion in text.

We can subdivide endophoric reference into two main kinds: anaphoric and cataphoric. Anaphoric refers to any reference which has appeared at an earlier point in the text; i.e.; that "points backwards" to previously mentioned information in text. Cataphoric reference, on the other hand, refers to any reference which has not yet appeared, but will be provided subsequently; i.e.; "points forward" to information that will be presented later in the text. As Halliday and Hasan (Ibid p.51) point out, it is only the anaphoric type of reference that is relevant to cohesion since it provides a link with a preceding portion of the text.

They identify three main kinds of cohesive references: personal, demonstrative, and comparative. Personal reference includes the three classes of personal pronouns, possessive adjectives (also called possessive determiners), and possessive pronouns. Demonstrative reference has to do with the identification of the referent by locating it on a scale of proximity with circumstantial (adverbial) demonstratives like "here, there, now, and then". Comparative reference keeps track of identity and similarity through indirect references



using adjectives like “same, equal, similar, different, else, better, more”, etc. and adverbs like “so, such, similarly, otherwise, so, more”, etc. (Ibid pp.37-39).

### 2.2.2. *Substitution*

Whereas reference functions to link semantic meanings within text, substitution differs in that it operates as a linguistic link at the lexicogrammatical level. In Bloor and Bloor (2004 p.95), substitution and ellipsis are used when “a speaker or writer wishes to avoid the repetition of a lexical item and is able to draw on one of the grammatical resources of the language to replace the item”. Unlike reference, substitution is a relation between linguistic items such as words or phrases. It is then grammatical. Halliday and Hasan (1976:90) believe that “since substitution is a grammatical relation [...] the substitute may function as a noun, as a verb, or as a clause”. Hence, the three types of classification for substitution: nominal, verbal and clausal. In nominal substitution, the most typical substitution words are “the one and ones” and they substitute nouns. In verbal substitution, the most common substitute is the verb “do” and is sometimes used in conjunction with “so” as in “do so” and substitute verbs. In clausal substitution, an entire clause is substituted and though it may seem to be similar to either nominal or verbal substitution, the difference is the presupposed anaphoric reference.

### 2.2.3. *Ellipsis*

Like substitution, ellipsis is a grammatical rather than semantic relationship, i.e. it expresses the grammatical relation between words, phrases or clauses in a text. Though substitution and ellipsis are similar in their function as the linguistic link for cohesion, ellipsis differs in that it is “substitution by zero” (Halliday and Hasan 1976 p.42). Ellipsis is ‘something left unsaid’, with unsaid implying ‘but understood nevertheless’.

Halliday and Hasan stress that since language does not function in isolation, i.e. it functions in actual situations of use, an elliptical item is one which, as it were, leaves specific structural slots to be filled from elsewhere. To illustrate that, we consider the following text:

"And how many hours a day did you do lessons?" said Alice, in a hurry to change the subject.

"Ten hours the first day," said the Mock Turtle: "nine the next, and so on." (Halliday and Hasan, 1976 p.144)

In the above passage, the nominal group *nine* is presupposing, meaning *nine hours*, and so is *the next*, meaning *the next day*. The two clauses *nine the next* and *ten hours the first day* are also both presupposing, representing *we did lessons ten hours the first day*, etc.



Focusing on ellipsis as a form of relation between sentences, Halliday and Hasan (1976) distinguish three types of ellipsis: nominal, verbal, and clausal. By nominal ellipsis, the two linguists mean ellipsis within nominal group. The structure of the nominal group consists of a head with optional modifier. Verbal ellipsis, as the name implies, operate on the verbal group. The structure of the verbal group usually expresses its systemic features, i.e. the choices that are being made within the verbal group system. As for clausal ellipsis, it views the clause as its basis. It is an ellipsis which is external to the verb itself, affecting other elements in the structure of the clause.

#### 2.2.4. *Conjunction*

Conjunction signals the way the writer wants the reader to relate what is about to be said to what has been said before. In that perspective, Eggins (1994:105) believes that conjunctive relations refer to “how the writer creates and expresses logical relationships between the parts of a text.” For Bloor and Bloor (1995:98), conjunction acts as a “cohesive tie between clauses or sections of text in such a way as to demonstrate a meaningful pattern between them”, though Halliday and Hasan (1976 p.227) indicate that “conjunctive relations are not tied to any particular sequence in the expression.”

Amongst the cohesion forming devices within text, conjunction is therefore the least directly identifiable relation. Halliday and Hasan identify four categories of conjunctions: additive, adversative, causal and temporal. Additive conjunction acts to structurally coordinate or link by adding to the presupposed item and are signaled through “and, also, too, furthermore, additionally,” etc.; additive conjunction may also act to negate the presupposed item and is signaled by “nor, and ... not, neither”, etc. Adversative conjunctions act to indicate “contrary to expectation” (Ibid: 250) and are signaled by “yet, though, only, but, in fact, rather”, etc. Clausal conjunction expresses “result, reason and purposes” and is signaled by “so, then, for, because, for this reason, as a result, in this respect,” etc. The last conjunctive type, the temporal, links by signaling sequence or time, and is expressed by words such as “then, and then, next, afterwards, after that, until then, sequentially” and a number of other expressions.

#### 2.2.5. *Lexical cohesion*

Lexical cohesion differs from the other cohesive patterns in text in that it is non-grammatical. The cohesive resource of lexical relations refers, according to Eggins (1994 p.101), to how the writer/speaker uses lexical items (nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs), and event sequences (chains of clauses and sentences) to relate the text consistently to its area of focus. Halliday and Hasan (1976:274)



argue that lexical cohesion refers to the “cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary”. They distinguish two basic types of categories of lexical cohesion: reiteration and collocation. Reiteration is the form of lexical cohesion which involves the repetition of a lexical item, either directly or through the use of a synonym, a superordinate or a generally related word. Collocation on the other hand, pertains to lexical items that are likely to be found together within the same text; i.e.; the association of lexical items that regularly co-occur.

### 3. Text Analysis and discussion of findings

Based on the theoretical framework presented in the previous section, we now attempt in this section to analyze a news article drawn from the Nigerian newspaper *The PUNCH*. This will be followed by the discussion of the findings.

#### 3.1. Analysis

##### 3.1.1. Text analysis: reference

**Table 1.** Summary of the reference items in the text (See details in Appendix 2, # 1):

Types of reference							
	Personal			Demonstrative			Comparative
	<i>Personal pronouns</i>	<i>Possessive adjectives</i>	<i>Possessive pronouns</i>	<i>Definite article</i>	<i>Nominal demonstratives</i>	<i>Demonstrative adverbs</i>	
	42	12	2	2	9	2	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>56</b>			<b>13</b>			<b>6</b>

The above table shows that there are fifty-six occurrences of personal reference, thirteen occurrences of demonstrative reference and six occurrences of comparative reference. Of the fifty-six personal references, forty-two are personal pronouns, twelve are possessive adjectives, and only two are possessive pronouns. All of the examples which appear in Appendix 2 are examples of anaphoric reference, the most relevant kind of reference items for cohesion within text. The personal references act as ties to presupposed participants and generally occur outside of the referring clause. For instance, in line 56, “they” refers back to “some people” in line 53. In line 90, “their (leaders)” refers back to line 89 to mean “Nigerians”. In line 77 “his” refers back to line 68 to indicate “Jonathan”.

As for demonstrative, both the definite article and demonstrative adverbs occur twice, whereas nominal demonstratives occur nine times. ‘The’ is used as definite article in the article to identify like “the country” in line 48 to refer back to “Nigeria” in line 30. ‘The’ in that case is “semantically selective” (Halliday & Hasan 1976 p.71). Nominal demonstratives are used not to express a “scale of



proximity" to the presupposed reference (Ibid p.57), but to lay an emphasis on the presupposed element. For example, "that (lady)" in line 18 is used to put a stress on "Mrs. Stella Oduah" previously mentioned in line 15. In the same way, in line 23 "this (country)" does not indicate a country near the one the interactants are in, but signals "the (Nigerian) country" they are living in and which was mentioned in line 4. The only demonstrative adverb used twice is "here" in lines 56 and 61 to refer back to "the polity" (line 51).

Although comparative references are not numerous, they are used to indicate similarity like in "such" in line 57 to refer back to "things" in line 56. Sometimes, they indicate difference as shown by "some of us" in lines 78-79 to refer back to "Nigerians" in line 43.

### 3.1.2. Text analysis: Substitution and ellipsis

**Table 2.** Summary of substitution and ellipsis in the text (See details in Appendix 2, # 2)

	Nominal	Verbal	Clausal	Total
<b>Substitution</b>	0	4	1	5
<b>Ellipsis</b>	1	1	2	4

The article contains five substitution items and four ellipsis occurrences on the whole. Verbal substitution is, as the table shows, the dominant type of substitution (4 against only 1 clausal). The verbal substitute 'do' is always final as can be noticed in "I did" (line 85) used to substitute for "I came on television and was canvassing for him" in lines 83-84.

Regarding ellipsis, all the three categories are present in the text with one nominal, one verbal and two clausal ellipsis. In all cases, something is structurally left unsaid and the reader must supply the missing information. For instance, in line 55, "behave that way" can be interpreted as an elliptical reference to "meddling in the affairs of his successors" in line 54. "Yes" in line 29 refers to line 28 to signify "I mean Jonathan". In short, substitution and ellipsis appear in the article to 'leave specific structural slots to be filled from elsewhere' (Halliday and Hasan, 1976 p.143).

### 3.1.3. Text analysis: Conjunction

**Table 3.** Summary of Conjunction (See details in Appendix 2, # 3)

Types of Conjunction				
Additive	Adversative	Causal	Temporal	Total
0	5	3	1	9

**Table 3:** Summary of Conjunction



From Table 3 above, we count 5 incidences of adversative conjunctions, 3 causal, 1 temporal and no additive conjunctions, leading to a total number of nine conjunctive elements. This logically expresses that the article, richer in adversative conjunctions than any other conjunction, displays the disenchantment of the interviewed (and then of Nigerians) as regards the governance of President Jonathan upon whom much hope was initially placed. As an illustration, the reference “But I do know one thing” of line 22 projects the meaning “contrary to expectation” with its presupposed expression “that is left for the electorate” in line 22. Likewise, “But barring electoral crimes” in line 35 refers back to “ he has lost the game” of lines 34-35 to reveal the sanction likely to lay on the President’s (People’s Democratic Party) party by the Nigerian population if the electoral process had been transparent.

The causal conjunctive elements present in the article are of the reason or result type, which means that the interlocutor not only contents himself with expressing ideas, but also justifies his viewpoints. In line 90, for example, the conjunctive expression “that is why” refers back to the clause “Nigerians have not been asking probing questions from their leaders” in line 89 to explain why the speaker deserves commendation for former President Obasanjo, in spite of his reservation about him.

#### 3.1.4. Text analysis: Lexical cohesion

**Table 4.** Summary of lexical devices in the text (See details in Appendix 2, # 4)

	Reiteration				Collocation	Total number of lexical devices
	The same word (repetition)	Synonym/near synonym	superordinate	General word		
Frequency	42	22	31	5	38	138
Percentage	30%	15%	22%	03%	27%	100%

As can be seen from table 4, there is 27% of collocation in the text, whereas reiteration ranks high with a percentage of  $100\% - 27\% = 73\%$ . Among the four sub-categories of reiteration, repetition (30%) accounts for the largest percentage of use. It is followed by superordinate (22%), synonym/near synonym (15%) and general word (03%). Some of the repeated lexical items appear several times throughout the text. The repetition of ‘country’ for instance starts in the beginning (on line 6), then continues on lines 11, 23, 24, 41, 48, 67. It is the same case with ‘Nigerians’ counted five times. Others like corruption (7, 12), divided (23, 24), people (53, 55, 65) undergo just one or two repetition (s). The speaker has recourse to the same vocabulary items to





emphasize his ideas. It is then evident that those words determine the field of activity in the text. As for synonyms/near synonyms, the narrator uses them to say the same thing differently. For example, 'doubts' is used on line 70 to refer back on line 44 to 'reservations'; 'to correct' ( on line 58 ) to make reference to the former President's desire toward his incumbent 'to manipulate (line 60)' him. Superordinates designate a more general class of words sharing the same features. Lagos, Kano, Sokoto, Oyo Rivers, Imo (33) are all Nigerian states. Likewise, rigging (35), intimidation (36), manipulation (36) can all be classified under the umbrella term 'electoral crimes' in the text. The following lexical items: 'man' (63), 'leader' (93), 'person' (44), 'lady' (18), and 'statesmen' (93) can be grouped together under one general word: 'people' since they all stand for human beings in the text. This means that the text is essentially about human beings performing social actions (Halliday, 2002).

### 3.2. Discussion

It is useful to recall that the foregoing analysis has been carried out on all the five cohesive relations discussed by Halliday and Hasan (1976), viz. reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. In order to better value how those cohesive properties considered as a whole are mutually connected within sequences (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981), it is expedient to summarize them in one table as can be noticed below:

**Table 5.** Summary of the cohesive devices in the text

TYPES OF COHESIVE DEVICES					TOTAL NUMBER OF COHESIVE DEVICES	%
<b>Reference</b>	Personal	Demonstrative	Comparative		75	35.21%
	56	13	6			
<b>Substitution</b>	Nominal	Verbal	Clausal		5	2.16%
	0	4	1			
<b>Ellipsis</b>	1	1	2		4	1.73%
<b>Conjunction</b>	Additive	Adversative	Causal	Temporal	9	3.89%
	0	5	3	1		
<b>Lexical cohesion</b>	Reiteration		Collocation		138	59.74%
	100		38			
<b>Total Number of Cohesive devices</b>					<b>231</b>	<b>100%</b>

The preceding table reveals that lexical cohesion and referential cohesion are the most frequently used in the News article with a total number of 138/231



(i.e. 59.74%) and 75/231 (i.e. 35.21%) respectively. They are followed by conjunction, substitution, and ellipsis the rates of which are nearly negligible (3.89%, 2.16% and 1.73% respectively).

Of the two types of lexical cohesion, reiteration predominates over collocation (100 versus 38). Reiteration in the case of the present text involves the repetition of lexical items (42/138; i.e. 30%), the use of synonyms/near-synonyms (22/138; i.e. 15%), superordinates (31/138; i.e. 22%) and general words (5/138; i.e. 03%). Some of the most commonly repeated words are: "country" in (4, 6, 11, 23, 24, 41, 48, 67), "President Jonathan" in (28, 39, 66, 68), "President Obasanjo" (44, 91), "Nigerians" in (25, 30, 43, 87, 88), etc. Their frequent occurrence in the article is indicative of the field of discourse or the nature of the social action that is taking place (Halliday and Hasan, 1985/1989). As a matter of fact, the text is about the speaker's assessment of President Jonathan's administration, compared with that of his predecessor, President Obasanjo. For him, Nigerians are disillusioned by President Jonathan's ruling of the country (Nigeria) which is characterized by a heavy bondage of corruption. By deciding to make use of a substantial number of synonyms/near-synonyms in the text, the speaker intends to assign to different items the same sense (Lyons, 1968). Thus, "launder" (17) and "boost" (17), "congratulate" (44) and "commend" (45), "reservations" (44) and "doubts" (70), "polity" (51) and "country" (4), "leaders" (93), "statesmen" (93), "President" (54) and "incumbent" (58), etc., are employed to refer to the same categories of people or items. As for superordinates, they are concerned with countries (America, Nigeria), states (Lagos, Kano, Sokoto, Oyo Rivers, Imo), Politics (power supply, re-election, democratically, party, electoral process, president...) and electoral crimes (rigging, intimidation, manipulation). Superordinates in the text are items that dominate the ones they embody, which are their members through a relation of sub-classification, to take a term from Eggins (1994). Lexical items such as "man", "person", "lady", "President", "Vice-President", "leader", "minister" can be gathered under the general word "people". When we interpret "people" by reference to each of the aforementioned lexical items, we identify the kind of people referred to. It can then be deduced that the cohesive environments of the word "people" add specificity to it. The second type of lexical cohesion, viz. collocation, is, as recalled earlier, used in a significant proportion. When collocational cohesion is noticed in the article, a pair of lexical items is associated to regularly co-occur. The different kinds of associations made in that perspective include: verb + noun (asking probing question, deserve commendation, play the ostrich, spent a day, lost the game, etc.), noun + noun (rocket science, oil blocks, a man of courage, etc.), adjective + noun (presidential election, electoral process, transparent process, etc.). As can be inferred from the preceding categories, the cohesive effect of such pairs



depends not so much on any systematic semantic relationship as on their tendency to share the same lexical environment (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). Such patterns occur freely within the same sentence. From all that has been developed so far, we can conclude that the topic of the article, that of the assessment of President Jonathan's administration, is clearly organized through the lexical selection which creates texture in the text.

Lexical cohesion operates in the article with the other types of cohesion, notably reference, which comes immediately after it in terms of predominance. Actually, the incidences of reference patterns in the text are split into the three sub-categories propounded by Halliday & Hasan (1976): personal (56/75; i.e. 74.67%), demonstrative (13/75; i.e. 17.33%) and comparative (6/75; i.e. 08%). Among the personal reference items, personal pronouns are predominant (42/56). The frequent personal pronoun is "He" (17, 20, 25, 26, 32, 34, 37, 45, 58, 69, 75, 80, 81, 91, 92) and its variants "His" (17, 19, 21, 61, 64, 77) or "Him" (45, 79, 84) to refer either to President Jonathan or President Obasanjo, two major participants of the text. Sometimes, "we" (45, 56, 62, 65, 82) occurs to refer to "Nigerians" (including the speaker himself). In case the referent items include the aforementioned presidents together or some Nigerians except the speaker, "they" and its variant "their" are noticed like on lines 56, 87, 88, 95, 96. It follows from the foregoing that personal pronouns in the article are the third personal (singular and plural) and the first pronoun (plural) anaphorically used. The fact that the occurrence of the personal pronouns typically presupposes a singular or plural human masculine proper or common noun in the vicinity is indicative of the fact that the text is both a spoken and written one. The circumstantial demonstratives that are present in the text can be classified into two groups. "This" (11, 23), "that" (18, 22, 73, 83), "the" (48), "those" (56, 94) in the first group anaphorically refer to human referents (lady, man, former leaders, people) or non humans (country, Accord party). It is important to stress that in each case where the demonstrative is used with a noun, the meaning is always identical with that of the presupposed. The second group of demonstrative is made up of the demonstrative adverb "here" (56, 61) which refers to "polity". Its meaning is anaphoric and locative. Comparison, as already mentioned, expresses non-identity and non-similarity. It is introduced by "many of us" (43-44), "some of us" (78-79), "other former leaders and statesmen" (93), all of which indicate part of an entity.

Although there is not a great number of the other remaining cohesive patterns; i.e.; conjunction, substitution and ellipsis in the text, they do contribute to create relations of meaning within the text. Ranking in the third position in the article, conjunctive items are mostly used to show contrastive meanings between ideas. The adversative conjunctions 'but' (22, 35, 49, 82) and 'in spite of' (43-44) are the ones which help to arrive at that goal. They function



to express that contrary to what Nigerians were expecting from the current president, they have entirely been disappointed. Associated with those adversative conjunctions are the causal 'so' (51-52, 86) and 'that's why' (90). They serve either to explain the reasons which justify certain actions or to show the result of some actions described by the speaker.

Verbal substitution is the most noticeable type of substitution. The verbal substitute is, as claimed by Halliday & Hasan (1976) 'do'. It occurs in the text with the usual morphological scatter do, does, done, did like in "he does" (20), "do so" (19), "it is done" (61), "I did" (85) and serves to link two sentences by anaphora. In fact, it substitutes for the verbs "has not declared" (19), "correct" (59), "manipulate" (60), "came" (83) respectively. It goes without saying that the presence of verbal substitution indicates that the text is a spoken one. That deduction is in line with Halliday and Hasan (1976 p.117), who state that the verbal substitute is used more in speech than in writing.

Ellipsis, on the other hand, signals that an item leaves specific structural slots to be filled from elsewhere. For instance, "yes" in (29) and (84) is to be understood "I mean Jonathan" and "I came on the television and was canvassing for him" in (28) and (83) respectively. Like the preceding cohesive resource, ellipsis in the article confirms that the text is a spontaneous conversation. In short, ellipsis and substitution confirm Halliday's (2002) claim that they "are primarily associated with spoken language, especially spontaneous conversation (p.40)".

#### 4. Conclusion

The present study has unveiled the principles that exist which create semantic links between sentence and paragraph boundaries within/in text. Through the ties that relate ideas and actions, cohesion in text creates texture to provide meaning in language. The most frequently used cohesive resources which function to create texture in the newspaper article are lexical cohesion and reference. Lexical cohesion is the central device for making text hang together experientially. As a semantic relation, reference is a primary text-forming agency, since every endophoric reference contributes to the making of the text (Halliday, 2002). Though not numerous, the other types of cohesive devices (substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction) have contributed to signaling underlying semantic relationships between text's elements.

#### References

Bloor, T. and Bloor, M. (1995). *The Functional Analysis of English*. London: Arnold.



- Bloor, T., Bloor, M. (2004). *The Functional Analysis of English: A Hallidayan Approach*, Second Edition. London: Arnold.
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Beaugrande, R. A., Dressler, W.U. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Egins, S. (1994). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Pinter Publishers.
- Egins, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*, Second ed. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic Criticism*, First Edition. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. (1985/1989). *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a social semiotic perspective*. Oxford: Deakin University Press..
- Halliday, M.A.K. (2002). *Linguistic Studies of Text and Discourse*. London: Continuum
- Lyons, J. (1968). *An Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- NWOGU, S. (2014). "Jonathan, hard to sell in S'West-Akintola" in *The PUNCH*. Vol 38, N°. 20,570. p.21

#### Appendix 1

##### **Jonathan, hard to sell in S'West-Akintola**

By SUCCESS NWOGU

The PUNCH, January 7, 2014 (Vol. 38 N°. 20,570 [www.punchng.com](http://www.punchng.com) p.21)

- 1 ***What is your assessment of the performance***
- 2 ***of President Goodluck Jonathan's***
- 3 ***administration?***
- 4 Are you satisfied with what is happening in the country
- 5 today? Power supply even in many cities and towns in
- 6 the country have remained highly epileptic. We talk of
- 7 corruption, it is high. For instance, have you not seen a
- 8 SURE-P emblem or signpost on the Ogbomosho-Ilorin
- 9 Road that was constructed under former President
- 10 Olusegun Obasanjo? Somebody went and erected it there.
- 11 Let us be truthful to ourselves. This country is under a
- 12 heavy bondage of corruption. It is so glaring and thick in
- 13 the eyes that you can't cut it.
- 14 Do you need rocket science to know that the Minister
- 15 of Aviation, Ms. Stella Oduah, should not have spent a day
- 16 longer in office? Even Mr. President should have used that
- 17 to launder his own image and boost his image. He should
- 18 have used that lady as an example.



19 ***President Joanathan has not declared his***  
20 ***intention to seek for re-election in 2015. If he does,***  
21 ***what do you think of his chances?***

22 That is left for the electorate. But I do know one thing  
23 that this country has never been divided like this; the  
24 country is divided down the line now. On paper, forget about  
25 other Nigerian factors. I do not know how he can make it  
26 democratically if he wants to re-contest the presidential  
27 election.

28 ***You mean Jonathan?***

29 Yes! It is so glaring. If you look at the configuration of  
30 Nigerian politics and the political arithmetic of Nigeria,  
31 with apology to late Dr. Chuba Okadigbo, it is very doubtful  
32 if he can make it. Here is a man whose party is not in  
33 the control of Lagos, Kano, Sokoto, Oyo, Rivers, Imo and many  
34 other states. How can he make it? On paper, he has lost  
35 the game. But barring electoral crimes such as rigging,  
36 intimidation and manipulation of the electoral process, if it  
37 is a transparent process, I do not see how he can make it.

38 ***What is your reaction to the exchange of letters***  
39 ***between former President Olusegun Obasanjo***  
40 ***and President Jonathan?***

41 I see it something that is good for the country. It is  
42 good for the masses. I think it is God that is at work. I want  
43 to congratulate Nigerians. In spite of the fact that many  
44 of us have reservations about Chief Obasanjo as a person,  
45 we must commend him for this, he has courage. I do not  
46 share the view of respected Gen. Theophilus Danjuma (of  
47 course, his own case is understandable. He has one of the  
48 most profitable oil blocs in the country today). Danjuma is  
49 a man of courage but when there are other interests; people  
50 may turn to something else. [...].

51 ***So, how can the tension generated in the polity***  
52 ***by the communications be doused?***

53 Some people have been talking about the former  
54 President meddling in the affairs of his successors and that  
55 in other climes, people do not behave that way. In what clime  
56 do they do the kind of things we are doing here? Those who  
57 are saying that such does not happen in America; that 'if the  
58 former President wants to correct the incumbent, he should  
59 go behind the scene and do so'. My question to them is: Is it  
60 possible for any former President in America to manipulate  
61 his successor in power like the way it is done here?  
62 We are operating under a different and peculiar climate  
63 and under a peculiar circumstance. Here is a man, who  
64 has this larger than his life image, who was able to manipulate



65 people into power. If we are to go against the green of  
66 politics, would Jonathan have become even Vice-President  
67 let alone the President of the country? [...]

**68 Are you saying that Jonathan will not win in  
69 the South-West if he re-contests?**

70 I have my doubts. It is beyond political issue. The anger  
71 of the South Westerners against the government is beyond  
72 political party. It is beyond All Progressives Congress or  
73 People Democratic Party or Accord Party. It is beyond that.  
74 It speaks for itself.

**75 Can he win in other geo-political zones?**

76 I would not know what is going to happen in the North,  
77 but I know that his popularity has dwindled so low in the  
78 South-West that some of us are being embarrassed. Some  
79 of us, who canvassed for him and who came out to say that  
80 he should be given the chance, that he is fantastic, educated,  
81 he is a PhD holder. About a month ago, I was taken up on  
82 the MITV, a callerszaid, 'but you are the one who said we  
83 should vote for that man'. That I came on the television and  
84 was canvassing for him. I said yes! I admitted that much,  
85 that I did.

**86 *So what is the way out?***

87 The way out is for Nigerians to take their destiny in their  
88 hands. Nigerians have been too complacent over their own  
89 affairs. Nigerians have not been asking probing questions  
90 from their leaders. That is why in spite of my reservation  
91 about Obasanjo, about the kind of person he is, I think  
92 he deserves commendation for coming out the way he did.  
93 I will expect other former leaders and statemen to tow  
94 the same line rather than play the ostrich. Those who are  
95 playing the ostrich, who say they can do it behind the scene,  
96 how many times have they done it behind the scene? You  
97 need to know the problem the Yoruba Council of Elders  
98 is facing at home, over the issue of marginalisation of the  
99 South-West.



Appendix 2

**1-Referencing summary**

Line	Reference	Line reference	Referenced item	Types of reference		
				Personal	Demonstrative	Comparative
10	It	7-8	a SURE-P emblem or sign post	x		
11	Us	6	We	x		
11	this (country)	4	the country		x	
16	That	14-16	know...that office		x	
17	his (own image)	16	Mr. President	x		
17	his (image)	16	Mr.. President	x		
17	He	16	Mr. President	x		
18	that (lady)	15	Mrs. Stella Oduah		x	
19	his (intention)	19	President Jonathan	x		
20	He	19	President Jonathan	x		
21	his (chances)	19	President Jonathan	x		
22	That	21	his chances		x	
23	this (country)	4	the country		x	
25	He	19	President Jonathan	x		
25	It	23-24	the country	x		
26	He	19	President Jonathan	x		
32	He	28	Jonathan	x		
32	whose (party)	32	a man	x		
33-34	many other states	33	Lagos, Kano, Sokoto, Oyo Rivers, Imo			x
34	He	28	Jonathan	x		
34	He	28	Jonathan	x		
36	It	36	electoral process	x		
37	He	28	Jonathan	x		
41	It	88	the exchange of letters	x		
41	It	38-40	the exchange of letters	x		
42	It	38-40	the exchange of letters	x		
43-44	many of us	43	Nigerians			x
45	We	43	Nigerians	x		
45	Him	44	Chief Obasanjo	x		
45	He	44	Chief Obasanjo	x		
47	his (own case)	46	Theophilus Danjuma	x		
47	He	46	Theophilus Danjuma	x		
48	the country	30	Nigeria		x	





54	his (successors)	53-54	the former President	x		
56	They	53	some people	x		
56	We	43	Nigerians	x		
56	Here	51	the polity		x	
56	Those	55	People		x	
57	Such	56	Things			x
58	He	57-58	the former President	x		
59	Them	56-57	those who are saying	x		
61	His	60	any former President	x		
61	Here	51	the polity		x	
62	We	43	Nigerians	x		
64	his(larger)	63	a man	x		
64	his (life image)	63	a man	x		
65	We	43	Nigerians	x		
67	the country	51	the polity		x	
69	He	68	Jonathan	x		
72	It	70	the anger	x		
73	It	70	the anger	x		
73	That	72-73	All Progressives ... Accord Party		x	
74	It	70	Anger	x		
75	He	68	Jonathan	x		
77	His	68	Jonathan	x		
78-79	some of us	68	Nigerians	x		x
79	him	68	Jonathan	x		
80	He	68	Jonathan	x		
80	He	68	Jonathan	x		
81	He	68	Jonathan	x		
82	You	81	I	x		
82	the one	81	I			x
82	We	43	Nigerians	x		
83	that man	68	Jonathan		x	
84	Him	68	Jonathan	x		
87	their (destiny)	87	Nigerians	x		
87	their (hand)	87	Nigerians	x		
88	their (own affair)	88	Nigerians	x		
90	their (leaders)	89	Nigerians	x		
91	He	91	Obasanjo	x		
92	He	91	Obasanjo	x		
92	He	91	Obasanjo	x		



93	other former leaders and statemen	90	their leaders			x
94	Those	93	former leaders		x	
95	They	94-95	those who are playing the ostrich to tow the same	x		
95	It	93-94	line	x		
96	They	93	those who are playing the ostrich	x		

**2- Substitution/Ellipsis summary**

**2.1 Substitution**

Line	Reference	line reference	Reference substituted information	Types of substitution		
				Nominal	Verbal	Clausal
20	he does	19	has...re-election in 2015	x		
59	do so	59	correct the incumbent			x
61	it is done	60-61	manipulate his successor	x		
85	I did	83-84	came on television... for him	x		
92	he did	92	coming out	x		

**2.2 Ellipsis**

Line	Reference	line reference	Reference ellipsed information	Types of ellipsis		
				Nominal	Verbal	Clausal
29	Yes	28	you mean Jonathan? meddling in the affairs of his successors			x
55	behave that way	54	successors		x	
57	Such	56	Things	x		
84	Yes	83	I came... for him			x

**3- Conjunction summary**

Line	Reference	Line	Conjunction reference	Types of conjunction reference			
				Additive	Adversative	Causal	Temporal
22	But I know one thing	22	that is left for the electorate		x		
23-24	the country is divided down the line now	23	this country has never been divided like this				x
35	but barring electoral crimes	34-35	he has lost the game we must commend him	x			
43-44	in spite of the fact that man of us	45	people may turn to something else	x			
49	but when there are other interests so, how can the tension... be doused?	49-50	power supply...it is high	x			
51-52	doused?	5-7	I came on the television			x	
82	but you are the one	83	his popularity has dwindled	x			
86	So what is the way out?	77-78				x	



90 that is why	89-90	Nigerians have not been asking probing questions	x
----------------	-------	--	---

#### **4- Types of lexical cohesion**

##### **4.1 Reiteration**

###### ***The same word (repetition)***

country (4, 6, 11, 23, 24, 41, 48, 67); corruption (7, 12); glaring (12, 29); image (17, 17); divided (23, 24); on paper (24, 34); re-contest (26), re-contests (69); process (36, 37); good (41, 42); courage (45, 49); people (53, 55, 65); ; climes (55), clime (55); canvassed (79), canvassing (84); Beyond (70, 71, 72, 73); Nigerians (25, 30, 43, 87, 88).

###### **Synonym/ near synonym**

Signpost (8)-SURE-P emblem (8); launder (17)-boost (17); election (27)- game (35); congratulate (44)-commend (45); reservations (44)- doubts (70); polity (51)-country (4); to correct (58)-to manipulate (60); different (62)-particular (62); leaders (93)-statemen (93)-President (54)-incumbent (58); home (98)-country (4).

###### **Superordinate**

States: Lagos, Kano, Sokoto, Oyo Rivers (33), Imo; Countries: America (57), Nigeria (30); Politics: administration (3), power supply (5), corruption (7), minister (14), re-election (20), electorate (22), democratically (26), re-contest (26), election (27), political arithmetic (30), party (32), electoral crimes/power (35), transparent process (37), President (2), power (61), Vice-President (66), political issue (70); Electoral crimes: rigging (35), intimidation (36), manipulation (36).

###### **General word**

People: man (63), leader (93), person (44), lady (18), statemen (93).

##### **4.2 Collocation**

power supply (5), heavy bondage of corruption (12), rocket science (14), spent a day (15), to launder image (17), boost image (17), seek for re-election (20), re-contest the presidential election (26-27), lost the game (34-35), electoral crimes (35), electoral process (36), transparent process (37), share the view (46), oil blocs (48), a man of courage (49), meddling in affairs (54), go behind the scene (59), different and peculiar climate (62), peculiar circumstance (63), life image (64), manipulate people (64-65), go against (65), political issue (70), South Westerners (71), political party (72), geo-political zones (75), South-West (78), canvassed for him (79), given the chance (80), vote for that man (83), canvassing for him (84), take destiny in hands (87-88), complacent over affairs (88-89), asking probing questions (89), deserve commendations (92), to tow the line (93-94), play the ostrich (94), Council of Elders (97), South-West.