

“LEXICAL COHESION IN EDUCATIONAL DISCOURSE: EXPLORING APPLIED LINGUISTICS RESEARCH ARTICLES’ ABSTRACTS”OF URUN

Michael Mahori Onguta^{*}, Dr. Michael Baffoka A. Baffoka²

^{*}Department of English Language & Literature, Catholic University of South Sudan – Rumbek Campus. Email: michaelonguta@gmail.com

²Associate Professor, School of Education, Department of English and Literature - University of Juba.
Email: mbaffoka54@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: Michael Mahori Onguta
michaelonguta@gmail.com

Abstract

The publication of Halliday and Hasan (1976) appealed to the concept of cohesion in writings among discourse analysts. Depiction on this vital study, scholars have been exploring cohesion in both monologic and dialogic discourses of diverse languages (Taboada, 2004; Angermeyer, 2002), genres (Tanskanen, 2006; Hoey, 2005), and registers (Hasan, 1984; Hoey, 1991). The emphasis of this study was to scrutinise lexical cohesion in abstracts of research articles from Applied Linguistics. The study intended to (1) identify the sorts and frequencies of lexical ties employed in the writing of the Applied Linguistics research articles abstracts and (2) scrutinise how the lexical ties applied in the writing of the Applied Linguistics research articles’ abstracts donate to the coherence of the abstracts. The research method was quantitative and qualitative, and the abstracts of 50 research articles from Discourse Analysis, Critical Discourse Analysis, Contrastive Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition were experimented with. The researcher culled the information from online databases and had 8,690 words. The study employed Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) lexical cohesion framework. The analysis exposed 802 lexical ties intersententially, where Repetition (52%) was the most preeminent, followed by Collocation (15%) and hyponymy (10.9%). The data also established that lexical cohesion underwrites enormously in the propositional expansion of all the move constructions typical of research article abstract as a genre used in Applied Linguistics. To achieve that, the researcher considered the prerequisite for studies of this nature across chastisements.

Keywords: Abstracts, Applied Linguistics, Coherence, Academic Discourse, Genre, Lexical Cohesion.

1. INTRODUCTION

Cohesion investigation is among the approaches to discourse examination. The emphasis of consideration in this type of analysis is to scrutinise how parts of manuscripts (spoken and written) are connected to give an amalgamated entire. Studies of this nature were introduced by Zellig Harris (1952) in his paper titled "Discourse Analysis" (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981; John, 2012; Rotimi, 2010; Widdowson, 2004). Harris observed the patterning of writings by viewing the dissemination of corresponding morphemes across the sentences. He did this by applying the concept of "transformations". To Harris, the higher the number of similarities across sentences in the writings, the more connected the parts of the texts. Harris endeavoured to encompass the scope of grammar and accommodate the analysis of writings – the unit "above the clause or sentence". However, his student N. Chomsky employed the "transformation" concept to examine sentences in his Transformational Generative Grammar (Widdowson, 2004; Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981).

The researcher must emphasise that Harris's method was unlike today's cohesion investigation. For example, Harris's analysis did not consider meaning, for he was concerned with how similar likenesses share an identical environment. Today's cohesion examination focuses on how parts of writings are semantically interrelated. Essential contributions in cohesion studies comprise Gutwinski (1971) and Halliday and Hasan (1976). Unlike Harris's approach, cohesion investigation focuses on how parts of manuscripts are correlated semantically so that the whole writing appears as a semantic unit. That is attained when cohesive bonds and manacles are preserved, and the presupposed fundamentals are all repossessed and satisfied within the manuscript (Eggins, 2014; Flowerdew, 2013; Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

Halliday and Hasan (1976) categorise cohesion into two broad classifications: *grammatical* and *lexical cohesion*. Grammatical substances of the closed class comprehend grammatical cohesion: pronouns, prepositions, demonstratives and auxiliaries. The subdivisions under grammatical cohesion include reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunctions. On the other hand, lexical cohesion is comprehended by the members of the open class: nouns, adjectives, adverbs and (primary) verbs. The classifications here contain Reiteration and Collocation. Reiteration members comprise repetition, synonymy, near-synonymy, superordinate and general words; Collocation members contain Hyponymy, Antonymy, Meronymy, ordered Set, and also Relations that are not Methodical. These classifications and relations have been differently reviewed and adapted by Halliday and Hasan and numerous other scholars.

As the term implies, Lexical cohesion is the cohesion attained through diverse lexical relations. As stressed earlier, the role play by nouns, main verbs, adjectives and adverbs (McCarthy, 1991; Eggins, 2004). Cohesive elements cross the threshold into different semantic relations with other rudiments in clauses and sentences across the text. Unlike reference cohesion, lexical items entering into cohesive relations do not have to have an undistinguishable referent. Though diverse cohesion analysts like McCarthy (1988), Hoey (1991), Martin (1992), Taboada (2004), Tanskanen (2006), and many have today prospered in coming up with novel and adapted models of lexical cohesion, Halliday and Hasan's (1976) central model that invoked the entire phenomenon of cohesion, would be employed in the present study. The model has two broad classifications: reiteration and Collocation. Each of these classifications has some subclasses under it as follows: *Reiteration*; Repetition, synonymy, near synonymy, superordinate and general class words; *Collocation*; hyponymy, antonymy, ordered Set, part-for-whole, and associations problematic to describe semantically. These are momentarily elucidated as follows:

a) Reiteration

- 1) **Repetition** is when a lexical item is repeated in consequent clauses or sentences. The recurrent item may appear in a slightly adapted form, henceforth, "exact" or "inexact" reiteration. Repetitive items need not refer to the identical referent or mean the same entity. It is a widespread cohesion in scripts (Hoey, 1991; Gonzalez, 2010; Taboada, 2004; and Tanskanen, 2006).
- 2) **Synonymy:** As the name proposes, this uses lexical items with comparable meanings to accomplish cohesion. It is one of the areas of controversy amongst discourse analysts. Some investigators pronounce that synonymous associations should be strongminded by the background, and no reference should be made to decontextualised connotations (Gonzalez, 2010 and Tanskanen, 2006).
- 3) **Near-synonymy** is the relation between lexical items that are "near" but not precisely synonymous. Halliday and Hasan (1976) instance road and path. They are also used for cohesive outcomes in scripts.
- 4) **Superordinate:** this is the relationship between lexical items in which the connotation of one stated later governs the meaning of the other mentioned previously in the lexical taxonomy, for example, ascent/task, boy/child and so forth.
- 5) **General words:** these are the kinds of common nouns and some indefinite pronouns used anaphorically to denote previously stated items cohesively. A reference item usually heads it and continuously shares a referent with the previously stated item. Flowerdew (2013) enlightens that different cohesion analysts label overall words differently as: type three terminology (Winter, 1977), (a) anaphoric nouns (Francis, 1986), (b) shell nouns (Schmid, 2000), and (c) signalling nouns (Flowerdew, 2003, 2006, and 2010)

b) Collocation

It is commanding here to point out that some of the relations recognised under this category were later counted, reiterated by Hasan (1984) and Halliday (1985) and numerous other linguists. The nastiest bone of disputation is the entitlement by the same researchers that the label collocation is fundamentally a J.R. Firth's (1957) tenure and should not be used for script examination since it is chastely lexicosemantic and also hard to be systematically accounted for. They say it is ambiguous and relations slackly defined. These linguists advocate for supplementary contextual or

discourse-specific labels (see Gonzalez, 2010; Hoey, 1991a; McCarthy, 1998; Martins, 1992; Tanskanen, 2006). Hasan (1984) proposes that Collocation should be dropped, but Halliday (1985/1994/2014) applied the term for the second time. Halliday's Collocation is when cohesion is attained by associating lexical items that frequently transpire. Relations acknowledged under Collocation in Halliday and Hasan (1976) are debated concisely as follows:

1. **Hyponymy** is the relation between lexical items where X is a type of Y, a condition where an expression or cluster of words falls under a specific superordinate. For instance, apples and lemons are fruits; chairs and desks are pieces of furniture.
2. **Antonymy:** the where lexical items are in opposition, for example, right/wrong, short/tall. Other researchers, such as Eggins (2014), refer to this relationship as a contrast.
3. **Ordered Set:** the relation between lexical items symbolising entities or notions that come in order, examples, days of the week, months of the year and so forth.
4. **Part-for-whole:** This is the meronyms relation, where, for example, the hand is part of the body, and the tyres are part of the car.
5. **Relations that are difficult to describe systematically** are the relations that are hard to capture using any systematic descriptions. Other cohesion analysts commissioning similar relations in their contexts, like Martin (1992), Jordan (1984), and Tanskanen (2006), use the conceptions of frame and activate to elucidate these relations. Frames are expounded as forms of knowledge constructions evoked by lexical items, while triggers are the superficial structural elements that emerge to evoke knowledge.

Following the publication of Halliday and Hasan (1976), diverse cohesion models continue to arise, but most of these are just alterations of this initial model. Re-joining to censures labelled against their model, both Halliday and Hasan have reviewed the model. Hasan's (1984) reviewed model, and she adapted the classifications as follows: *Generalisation category* and *Instantial category*. According to this model, lexical associations under Generalization comprise Repetition, hyponymy, synonymy, meronymy, and antonymy, while the Instantial category entails those relations previously deliberated under Collocation. Hasan's (1984) investigation study was on children's narratives. In this reviewed model, she evades, including Collocation. She displays how lexical items are buried into cohesive relations in bonds and chains.

A single item cannot recognise a cohesive end product. When the two are established, they make a tie. A chain is where we have at least three ties related. They also explicate how coherence is achieved as a result of cohesive synchronisation. Cohesive harmony is when an interface between the chains in the script exists. This cohesive interaction is when at least two adherents of diverse chains bury into cohesive relations with affiliates of other chains. She recognises two tokens: *relevant* and *peripheral*. While relevant tokens are part of chains, peripheral tokens are not part of chains, and the higher the number of relevant tokens in writing, the more coherent the script is. Converse is also the circumstance.

On the other hand, Halliday's (1985) modification was in three classifications: *Repetition*, *Synonymy* such as; synonymy, superordinate, hyponymy, meronymy, co-hyponymy, co-meronymy, antonymy) and *Collocation*. There is also a model by Michael Hoey (1991). Hoey attributes the utmost importance to lexical items compared to grammatical elements since he disputes that they are more cohesive than grammatical elements. Nonetheless, he takes into account grammatical elements like pronouns in his examination. Hoey (1991) was concerned with non-narrative scripts, and he demonstrated how lexical items enter into cohesive ties and relate to supplementary items in networks. According to Hoey (1991), these nets combine and harmonise essential sentences. The same author develops a lexical theory called Lexical Priming (2005), where he preaches that lexical items are well-informed either definitely for cohesion or undesirably to evade cohesion. According to Hoey (2005), as language users, we are also well-informed to see cohesion in scripts based on our acquaintance with lexical items.

Ensuring that both written and spoken scripts are examined using the lexical cohesion models is appropriate. In other words, conversations are transcribed and scrutinised to confirm how diverse parts of the scripts move together as meaningful entities (Gonzalez, 2011; Taboada, 2004; Widdowson, 2004; Tanskanen, 2006). These models are also employed to investigate cohesion in languages other than English or to equate languages (Enkvist, 1975 (Finnish & English); Kallgren, 1979a, 1979b (Swedish); Danes, 1987 (Czech); Taboada, 2004 (English & Spanish)). Diverse studies are being piloted using the cohesion investigation, and different results have been evolving from these studies.

Taboada (2004) conducted a proportional study between English and Spanish conversations. However, her study concentration was to examine the resources employed by interlocutors in 'building coherence and cohesion'; Taboada applied three categories of frameworks: *genre analysis* (Bhatia, 1986), *rhetorical structure theory* (Mann & Thompson, 1988), and *cohesion analysis* (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Nevertheless, the investigation in this study was limited only to the cohesion aspect of the research.

Taboada adapted and reformed Halliday's 1976 model, as evidenced by the fact that conjunctions are omitted, lexical cohesion relations are adapted, where new labels are used, and others shift. Like Halliday's model, this model also has two broad classifications: *grammatical* and *lexical cohesion*. Under Grammatical Cohesion, the sub-categories comprise of: *Reference* (R1. Personal, R2. Demonstrative and R3. Comparative), *Substitution* (S1. Nominal, S2. Verbal and S3. Clausal), *Ellipsis* (E1. Nominal, E2. Verbal, E3. Clausal); whereas Lexical Cohesion has two sub-categories: *Reiteration*; (L1a. Exact, L1b. Rephrased, L2. Synonymy, L3. Superordinate, L4. Subordinate, L5. General word) and *Collocation*; which not at all has sub-categories.

Based on her research findings, Taboada notices that Repetition is the most frequent cohesive bond in both English and Spanish deliberations, while in English, demonstrative reference is the next most frequent, trailed by vague Repetition and then superordinate, collocation relation is the subsequent most frequent in Spanish, trailed by demonstrative

reference and inaccurate Repetition which is finally shadowed by superordinate. When English uses an insignificant amount of substitution, Spanish uses none. There was not even a single occurrence of substitution in the Spanish corpus. In all, Spanish has a complex number of relations (620) compared to English (464), but both languages use an identical proportion of cohesive ties per word closely. Taboada draws the thoughtfulness of researchers to explore whether nominal substitution is 'ruled out' in Spanish. That is why speakers mostly use ellipsis instead.

One of the outstanding discoveries of Taboada's study is that the conversations examined do not display cohesive synchronisation, which prompted Hasan (1984) to pronounce it as an essential property of coherent writing. However, according to the scholar, the discourses appear quite coherent! The chains in a succession of the conversations barely interact. On the other hand, Taboada draws a deduction that different scripts require different degrees of cohesive synchronisation.

Tanskanen (2006) was apprehensive about how cohesion accomplishes coherence in different script types. To Tanskanen, the two collaborate towards coherence when discourse producers produce writings and use cohesive components as signals for the discourse receivers to interpret the signals and decipher information from the scripts. Tanskanen's model is adapted form of Halliday & Hasan (1976). She has two classifications in the model: *Reiteration*, which includes simple Repetition; complex Repetition, substitution, equivalence, Generalization, specification, and co-specification; and contrast—collocation, which includes ordered Set, activity-related Collocation, and elaborative Collocation.

Tanskanen finds that in all her corpus, reiteration and Collocation are used to attain cohesion, and all scripts have longer and shorter manacles. Collocation frequency (10 to 16.5) was also lower than reiteration (90 to 146). Tanskanen concludes that cohesion is rarely attained through Collocation.

Gonzalez (2010), deliberate lexical cohesion in multiparty conversations. The present investigation analysed broadcast deliberations to examine the interaction between cohesion and coherence and how the study can measure lexical cohesion in genre and register examination. Gonzalez's model stretches prominence to context and contemplates how collaborative lexical cohesion can be. It encompasses five meaning relations: *Repetition, synonymy, opposition, inclusion, and associative cohesion*. However, the present study encounters the existing model and advances toward the integrated model, that is, discourse-specific, and makes no reference to decontextualised meanings of lexical items. This model defines relations based on the specific contexts or scripts being analysed. Words may relate differently in diverse writings; for instance, Gonzalez (2011) employed an identical model in her investigation of cell phone conversations.

This multiparty conversation investigation is both quantitative and qualitative. Dig out from the intercontinental corpus of English. Gonzales

(2011) retrieved transmission discussions of 15,683 words. In this corpus, Gonzalez (2011) identified 11,199 lexical ties; Repetition is the most recurrent. They include Repetition (59%), Associative cohesion (24%), and Inclusion relation (8.2%). Most ties befall remote-mediated (81.8%) and over utterer's turns (90.7%). The ties are delicate to genre-specific aspects and collaboration in theme management.

In her description, Gonzalez draws some deductions based on the findings of her study: that transmission conversations are rich in lexical cohesive bonds centred on their nature of being well-ordered opinion expressions for the envisioned audience; that lexical cohesive devices aid as prompts used to evoke diverse frames for sympathetic; that ties are used to create connections across turns, and this infers the genre physiognomies of the conversations where utterers always attempt to comprehend and be understood.

On the other hand, academic discourse has also been an area of productive studies. Academic writings of different spoken and written genres or part-genres have been sightseen, and many stimulating discoveries have emerged (Ahmad, 1997; Anthony, 1999; Bhatia, 1997; Lewin et al., 2001; Samraj, 2005; Swales, 1990; Tanskanen, 2006). Nevertheless, the research article is among the documented genres in the academic discourse paradigm. This specific genre typically contains several genre units or part-genres as portions of its inner structure. Each of the part-genres within the research article has a well-defined determination and is systematised in a specific way (Swales, 1990; Dudley-Evans, 1997; Bhatia, 1997). Research articles genre units like an Introduction, Abstract, and Discussion have been investigated by scholars from diverse research disciplines, such as *English for Specific Purposes (ESP)*, *English for Academic Purposes (EAP)*, and *Discourse Analysis*.

Studies on research articles introduction was carried out by Swales and Najjar (1987), Fredrickson and Swales (1997), Ahmad (1997), Crookes (1986), Samraj (2005), and Lewin et al. (2001). Their study reported diverse findings on the genre. For instance, Ahmad (1997) states that research articles introductions written by the Malays usually do not report the research function. Anthony (1999) learns that research article introductions written by engineers encompass supplementary moves than those recognised by Swales (1990), namely descriptions of terms, samples of concepts, and assessment of the study in interrogation. On the other hand, Bhatia (1993) labelled the research article abstract as the article summation. It has exceptional macro-organisation, and it serves explicit communicative determinations. The distinctive moves established in article abstracts usually comprise the purpose of the study, the methodology, the results and discussion, and the conclusion (Bhatia, 1993; Samraj, 2005). Studies on research article abstracts, both within and across disciplines, have also scrutinised diverse physiognomies of the genre (Bhatia, 1993; Huckin, 2001; Hyland, 2000; Melander et al., 1997). For instance, Huckin (2001) reports, amongst other findings, that biomedical article abstracts do not typically state the determination of the study. Melander et al.'s (1997) study on abstracts from three disciplines displays how diverse Linguistics and Biology abstracts in the American context are in terms of their organisation. Samraj (2005) pronounces that research article abstracts from Conservation Biology encompass some moves typical of the introduction, such that the abstracts here also have specific influential purposes fulfilled by the introductions.

On the other hand, studies on research article abstracts have not concentrated on the roles of lexical cohesion so far. In contrast, lexical cohesion and genre have bi-directional associations and, respectively, genre exhibits its inimitable pattern of lexis. This cohesion has also been publicised to enable script producers to attain coherence and other discourse physiognomies (Morris and Hirst, 1991; Hoey, 1991; Hasan, 1984; Tanskanen, 2006). Contemporary studies seek to take care of this research position. The research could enhance the present literature on lexical cohesion in writings by disentangling the contributions of lexical cohesion brands in abstract writing. Consequently, this investigation aims to explore lexical cohesion in Applied Linguistics Research Articles Abstracts. Scholars and novices in applied linguistics would be exposed to how lexical items are employed to build the discipline's abstracts.

2. The Objectives of the Study

The subsequent objectives direct the study:

- To identify the kinds and frequencies of lexical ties employed in writing Applied Linguistics research articles abstracts.
- To scrutinise how the lexical bonds utilised in writing Applied Linguistics research article abstracts contribute to the coherence of the abstracts

3. Research Questions

- What are the types and frequencies of lexical ties employed in writing Applied Linguistics research articles abstracts?
- How do the lexical bonds utilised in writing Applied Linguistics research article abstracts contribute to the coherence of the abstracts?

4. The Methodology of the Study:

4.1. Design:

The study employs a diverse method design. It is quantitative since it classifies the types, frequencies, and percentages of the lexical cohesive bonds used by the Applied Linguists in their investigations of the research article abstracts. It is also qualitative since the study evaluates how the use of these ties contributes to the accomplishment of coherence in the abstracts.

4.2. Sampling:

The present study employs a purposive specimen. It targets only research articles written in the field of Applied Linguistics. The statistics were experimented with in Discourse Analysis, Critical Discourse Analysis, Comparative Linguistics, and Second Language Acquisition.

4.3. Data collection:

The data for the current study consists of 10 journal research article abstracts, each from the five research disciplines acknowledged, for 50 abstracts. The corpus had 8,690 words and 357 sentences. The data were attained from online databases, particularly from websites of higher education institutions.

4.4. Analysis framework:

The contemporary investigation relies on Halliday and Hasan's (1976) lexical cohesion model. This framework has the succeeding relations: General words, Repetition, Superordinate, Synonymy, Near-synonymy, Collocation, Antonymy, Meronymy, Co-meronymy, and Hyponymy.

4.5. Analysis procedure:

Founded on this framework, cohesive associations are established intersententially. Intra-sentential cohesion, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976), is delivered by structural relations. Hence, in the custody of this, and also accepted by the nature of the data as primarily simple sentences, the researcher examines cohesion only across the sentence and not within the same sentence. In this investigation, scripts are first segmented into sentences, each coded with a number. At that juncture, items entering into cohesive associations are highlighted, and outlines are established to connect cohesively related items (Hoey, 1991). Cohesive units can be either simple or complex. Single-item lexical items comprehend simple, cohesive units, while complex lexical units are understood by multi-item lexical items, such as phrases, word groups, or idioms (Eggins, 2004; Martin, 1992). So, cohesive relations can exist in solitary words and collections of words or phrases. Lexical units are also not orthographically controlled; this also makes numerals cohesive.

5. The Research Results and Discussion

5.1. The Results

The subsequent table displays the types of lexical ties, their frequencies and also percentages of usage in the Applied Linguistics research articles abstracts analysed:

Table 1. The Frequencies and percentages of lexical ties used in the Applied Linguistics abstracts

Cohesive tie	Frequency	Percentage
General nouns	15	1.8
Repetition	419	52
Superordinate	13	1.6

Synonymy	59	7.4
Near-Synonymy	24	2.9
Antonymy	24	2.9
Meronymy	38	4.7
Co-meronymy	08	0.9
Hyponymy	88	10.9
Collocation	121	15

Total: 802 100%

The data of the present-day study confirmed that Applied Linguistics research article abstracts are lexically cohesive. In writing these abstracts, lexical items functioned like threads interlacing the concepts or proposals raised in the abstracts. The writers competently applied lexical units to develop their propositions and express their communications in varied tenors across the expanses of the abstracts.

They attained this predominantly by reiterating keywords, such as study, data, research, language, speakers, writers, and so on, and using collocates from linguistics and research, such as research/findings, study/method, researchers/report, etc. Also, the employment of inclusively related lexis and semantically similar terms, such as study/research, researchers/scholars, findings/results, etc. In other words, the data examined revealed that the authors mainly attained coherence by reiterating keywords/terms and using words that often co-occur in language studies or research. Hence, the employment of lexical ties permitted abstract writers to link the ideas pronounced in the diverse sentences of the scripts, such that the ideas flowed from sentence to sentence so that the readers could easily follow them with sympathy. Thus, lexical cohesion contributes meaningfully to the coherence of research article abstracts in the Applied Linguistics discipline.

5.2. The Discussion

With a total of 8,690 words and 802 cohesive links, the corpus had a 10.15 cohesion ratio. It is consequently fascinating to remark on what the discoveries of this study prove. The researcher can understand that the abstracts of Applied Linguistics articles, as examined in this study, were lexically cohesive, and the authors employed a diversity of cohesive ties in accomplishing this. Because it occurred more than 52%, Repetition was the utmost recurrent cohesive tie in the corpus. Following Repetition, Collocation (15%) and Hyponymy (10.9%) were the most frequent lexical cohesion in the research abstracts. Earlier studies of cohesion in diverse genres and part-genres of the academic discourse have stated findings comparable to the discoveries of this present study.

Lewin et al. (2001) observed lexical cohesion and movement in the Introduction and Discussion sections of Social Science Research (SSR) articles. The scholars perceive that Repetition and synonymy contribute up to 99% of the cohesive relations in the scripts. They also believe that scholars deliberate on these types of cohesion to attain clarity, accuracy, and definitions in their writings.

Mirzapour and Ahmadi (2011) investigated lexical cohesion in English and Persian research articles. They noticed that in both English and Persian articles, Repetition, Collocation, and synonymy are the most recurrent types of lexical cohesion in the corpus. However, while English articles are inclined to exhibit Repetition and Collocation, Persian articles tend to display Repetition and synonymy. Mohammed-Sayyidina (2010) examined cohesion in academic scripts produced by Arab EFL authors. The study discloses that Repetition is the most excellent recurrent cohesion used by these authors. Other cohesion investigations focused on other manuscript types and diverse genres, and they also captivately reported Repetition as the most recurrent type of cohesion in their corpus. That can be evidenced by Gonzalez (2010) on cell phone conversations, Taboada (2004) on English and Spanish conversation, and Hoey (1991a) on the patterns of lexis in non-narrative writings.

The cohesively rich nature of these abstracts reveals how the authors brand their connotations clearly, especially by recapping keywords and using collocates, hyponyms and synonyms. With these plentiful and genre-driven cohesive indications provided by the discourse producers, the discourse receivers would find the scripts relatively coherent. The study has earlier remarked on the generic rationale or determination of writing abstracts in research articles. These linguistic indications built on the writing surface can simplify how readers grip the messages. Thus, these ties contribute to the accomplishment of generic coherence in the abstracts of applied linguistics research articles.

6. Conclusion

The contemporary study discloses the distinctive patterns of lexical cohesion in the abstracts of Applied Linguistics research articles. This genre unit of academic discourse also revealed how lexical cohesion is used to build coherence. The researcher proposes comparable studies using a larger corpus across diverse disciplines.

Bibliography

1. Ahmad, U. K. Scientific research articles in Malay: A situated discourse analysis. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan (1997).
2. Anthony, L. Writing research article introductions in software engineering: How accurate is a standard model? *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 1999, 42, 38–46.
3. Angermeyer, Philipp Sebastian. "Lexical cohesion in multilingual conversation." *International Journal of Bilingualism* 6.4 (2002): 361–393.
4. Bhatia, V. K. *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. London: Longman (1993).
5. .., *Genre-mixing in academic introductions*. English for Specific Purposes, (1997), 16, 181–195.
6. Carter, Ronald, and Michael McCarthy. *Vocabulary and language teaching*. Routledge, 1988.

7. Crookes, G. 1986. Towards a validated analysis of scientific text structure. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 57–70.
8. de Beugrande, Robert, and W. Dessler. "Introduction to text linguistics." (1981).
9. Dudley-Evans, T. Genre models for teaching academic writing to second language speakers: Advantages and disadvantages. In T. Miller (Ed.), *Functional approaches to written text: Classroom applications* (pp. 150–159). Washington, DC: USIA (1997).
10. Eggins, Suzanne. *Introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. A&C Black, 2004.
11. Enkvist, Nils Erik. *Tekstilngvistiikanperuskäsitteitä*. Gaudeamus, 1975.
12. Flowerdew, John. *Discourse in English language education*. Routledge, 2012.
13. González, María de losÁngeles Gómez. "Lexical cohesion in multiparty conversations." *Language Sciences* 33.1 (2011): 167-179.
14. ,.María de losÁngeles Gómez. "Evaluating lexical cohesion in telephone conversations." *Discourse Studies* 12.5 (2010): 599-623.
15. Gutwinski, Waldemar. "Cohesion in literary texts." *The Hague: Mouton* 276 (1976).
16. Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood, and Ruqaiya Hasan. *Cohesion in English*. Routledge, 1976.
17. Halliday, Michael AK, and Christian MIM Matthiessen. *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar*.Routledge, 2013.
18. Halliday, Michael AK. "Functional grammar." *London: Edward Arnold* 1994.
19. Hasan, Ruqaiya. *The structure of the nursery tale: An essay in text typology*. No, 1984.
20. Hoey, Michael. "Patterns of lexis in text." 1991.
21. ,. *Lexical priming: A new theory of words and language*. Psychology Press, 2005.
22. Fredrickson, K. M., & Swales, J. M. Competition and discourse community: Introductions from Nysvenska Studier. In B. L. Gunnarsson, P. Linell, & B. Nordberg (Eds.), *Text and talk in a professional context* (pp. 9–22). Sweden: ASLA, (1994).
23. Huckin, T. Abstracting from abstracts. In M. Hewings (Ed.), *Academic writing in context*:
24. Implications and applications (pp. 93–103). Birmingham: The University of Birmingham Press (2001).
25. Hyland, K. Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing. London: Pearson (2000).
26. Jones, Rodney H. "Discourse Analysis." *London and New York: Routledge* 2012.
27. Lewin, Beverly, Jonathan Fine, and Lynne Young. *Expository discourse*. A&C Black, 2005.
28. Mann, William C., and Sandra A. Thompson. "Rhetorical structure theory: Toward a functional theory of text organisation." *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse* 8.3 (1988): 243–281.
29. Martin, James R. *English text: System and structure*. John Benjamins Publishing, 1992.
30. McCarthy, Michael. *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
31. Mirzapour, Fatemeh, and Maryam Ahmadi. "Study on lexical cohesion in English and Persian research articles (A Comparative Study)." *English Language Teaching* 4.4 2011: p245.
32. Melander, B., Swales, J. M., & Fredrickson, K. M. Journal abstracts from three academic fields in the United States and Sweden: National or disciplinary proclivities? In A. Duszak (Ed.), *Intellectual styles and cross-cultural communication* (pp. 251–272). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, (1997).
33. Mohamed-Sayidina, Aisha. "Transfer of L1 cohesive devices and transition words into L2 academic texts: the case of Arab students." *RELC Journal* 41.3 (2010): 253–266.
34. Morris, Jane, and Graeme Hirst. "Lexical cohesion computed by thesaural relations as an indicator of the structure of the text." *Computational linguistics* 17.1 (1991): 21–48.
35. Samraj, Betty. "Exploring a genre set: Research article abstracts and introductions in two disciplines." *English for specific purposes* 24.2 (2005): 141–156.
36. Swales, J. M., &Najjar, H. The writing of research article introductions. *Written Communication*, (1987) 4, 175–191.
37. Swales, J. M., &Najjar, H. The writing of research article introductions. *Written Communication*, (1987), 4, 175–191.
38. Swales, John. *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
39. Taboada, María Teresa. *Building coherence and cohesion: Task-oriented dialogue in English and Spanish*. Vol. 129. John Benjamins Publishing, 2004.
40. Tanskanen, Sanna-Kaisa. *Collaborating towards coherence: Lexical cohesion in English discourse*.Vol. 146. John Benjamins Publishing, 2006.
41. Widdowson, Henry George. *Text, context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis*. Vol. 12. John Wiley & Sons, 2008.