

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

<https://llrjournal.com/index.php/11>

**A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF COHESIVE DEVICES IN HIGHER
LEVEL ENGLISH TEXTBOOKS OF KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA**



**Zubair Ahmad¹, Yasir Ahmad^{*2}, Inam Ullah³,
Israr Ahmad⁴**

*¹M.Phil, Scholar, Department of English, University of
Malakand, KPK, Pakistan*

*^{*2,3}M.Phil, Scholar, Department of English, Air
University*

*⁴BS English Literature and Linguistics, University of
Malakand, KP, Pakistan*

¹zubairhasrat2001@gmail.com,

*^{*2}yasiruom541@gmail.com, ³inamlaa44@gmail.com,*

⁴israrahmad72246@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: Yasir Ahmad

Abstract

The current study examines the lexical and grammatical cohesion employed in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Higher-level English textbooks. The linkages and connections that exist between words and sentences within a text are referred to as lexical cohesiveness. Repetitions, synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms, and meronyms are examples of cohesive devices that are used to establish coherence and unity in written or spoken speech. Grammatical cohesion is the use of linguistic devices and structures to provide a text consistency and unity. Pronouns, conjunctions, repetitions, ellipses, and referencing are some of the linguistic elements that contribute to grammatical cohesiveness. Using a mixed method research approach, the current study examines the coherence patterns in the chosen English textbooks of Higher Secondary Schools of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Higher Level English textbooks used in public schools throughout Khyber Pakhtunkhwa make up the research sample. To ensure that the results are representative and broadly applicable, six chapters from higher-level English textbooks are chosen at random using a sampling technique. In addition, the study used an extensive corpus linguistics approach to examine lexical coherence. The frequency, distribution, and diversity of lexical items are examined using statistical techniques. After textual analysis of the units coherent devices are extracted. Furthermore, specific examples of lexical cohesiveness are qualitatively analyzed to see how well they preserve coherence and aid in comprehension. The results of this study shed light on the prevalent pattern of lexical and grammatical coherence in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa higher-level English textbooks. The study highlights areas that might need improvement in terms of coherence and clarity, illuminating the advantages and disadvantages of higher-level English textbooks. Curriculum designers, textbook writers, and educators can use the research findings as a foundation to improve the caliber of teaching resources and make sure they successfully support learning and comprehension for students at higher levels.

Keywords: *Cohesion, Higher Level Textbooks; Mixed Method; Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.*

INTRODUCTION

In 1964, Halliday for the first time proposed the idea of "cohesion." Cohesion occurs when one textual element interpretation depends on another. It can offer continuity between one section of a text and another, cohesion is essential to text production. Additionally, readers or listeners can rely on continuity to provide coherence and fill in the gaps in the text that are essential for its explanations but are not included in the text itself. In his book, Halliday emphasized time and again that the cohesive strength of the underlying semantic relation is stronger than that of a peculiar cohesive marker (1976, p. 229). Halliday, however, highlights that the texture is formed by

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

cohesive markers.

Understanding lexical coherence is the most challenging since it involves advanced cohesive means. "Lexical cohesion is a cover term for the cohesion that follows from the co-occurrence of lexical items that are in some way associated with one another because they tend to co-occur in the same environment," claim Halliday & Hassan (2001, p. 287). The cohesive effect of lexical coherence is achieved when two or more lexical components are connected to one another within a sentence or outside of it. This connection could be related to co-occurrence, opposite, or relevant or equivalent meaning (Wu, 2010).

Lexical and grammatical forms can also contribute to the creation of cohesion. Reiteration and collocation are examples of lexical cohesion, whereas references, substitutions, ellipses and conjunctions are examples of grammatical cohesion. Text quality and texture are influenced by these two forms of cohesiveness. According to McCagg (1990), the systematic correlation of ideas is referred to as coherence. It also highlights a semantic aspect of textuality. Readers tend to think about this part of comprehension because they understand how the concepts in a text relate to what they already know about the world (Alarcon and Morales, 2011).

In academic writing, coherence and cohesion work together to keep the paragraphs cohesive. For readers to understand the content, coherence the contextual fitness of the sentences is more important. However, readers find it easier to understand and grasp the writer message when a text has cohesive relationships and coherence (Poudel and Dhankuta, 2018).

The cohesive devices in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa intermediate-level English textbooks is the subject of the current study. Lexical and Grammatical Cohesion are the two categories of cohesion. Therefore, the researchers in this study would recognize the many cohesive devices found in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa intermediate level English textbooks.

The significance of this research study lies in its analysis of lexical and grammatical coherence in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa intermediate-level English textbooks. Moreover, the study would also help to identify any gaps or inconsistencies in teaching materials, enabling policymakers and curriculum developers to make informed decisions about curriculum revision and improvement. It would also help students to promote active reading, critical thinking and deeper comprehension, ultimately enhancing students' motivation and interest in the subject matter.

Different studies have been conducted on the various dimensions of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa textbooks but little attention is given to the Linguistic Hybridity of English Textbooks at higher level. Therefore, the primary focus of this study is the examination of lexical and grammatical coherence in intermediate-level textbooks, particularly those written in English. So, this research is an attempt to investigate the extent and effectiveness of grammatical and lexical cohesion in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa intermediate-level English textbooks, to identify potential areas of improvement to enhance students' reading comprehension and learning outcomes.

Theoretical Framework

Within the systematic functional linguistics framework, Halliday's concept of cohesion provides a theoretical basis for analyzing how lexical and grammatical features are employed to establish cohesion within texts. The primary goal of Halliday and Hassan's theoretical model (1976) is the explanation of cohesion as a linguistic feature impacting coherence is to treat text as a linguistic reality. In other words, discourse qualities are treated by Halliday and Hassan as linguistic or language-like properties. In putting forth the idea of cohesion as a component of what is typically

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

referred to as a text's coherence.

Research Objectives

- To find out the different kinds of cohesive devices used in Intermediate-level English textbooks of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.
- To examine how using cohesive devices affect the organization and clarity of intermediate-level English textbooks.

Research Questions

- What type of cohesive devices are employed in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa intermediate-level English textbooks?
- What is the connection between the quality of intermediate level English Textbooks and the employment of cohesive devices in terms of organization and clarity?

Review of the related literature

Imagining a world without discourse is equivalent to imagining a world without language, thus envisioning something that is beyond imagination. We exchange a variety of spoken and written words (or, conversation and text) throughout the course of the day. We communicate or discourse by connecting sound waves and orthographic shapes, not in separate auditory or visual units, to which we ascribe meaning based on prior interaction with them and the contexts in which they are employed. Discourse analysis focuses on the situations and processes by which humans use written and spoken language to target audiences, achieve certain goals, and operate in particular contexts (HE, 2017, Discourse Analysis, p. 447).

The phrase "Discourse Analysis" describes a broad range of methods for studying texts that have developed from numerous academic traditions and disciplinary contexts. In actuality, there are numerous different analytical approaches that all claim to be discourse analysis. These perspectives disagree with the realist idea that language is merely a neutral way of reflecting or describing the world and they both believe that discourse plays a crucial role in creating a social life (Gill, 2000, Discourse analysis).

Discourse, according to Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000), is any written or spoken language that has clear internal relationships of form and meaning (words, structures, and cohesion, or how pronouns and conjunctions connect textual elements) and that relate logically to an external communicative function or purpose as well as a specific audience or interlocutor.

Coherence has mainly been discussed thus far as a textual quality, either in terms of the connections between the text's claims (staying on point) or the word associations (cohesion). But according to others (Carrell, 1982 and Rumelhart, 1977), who are both based on schema-theoretical theories, a text cannot be considered separate from the reader, and coherence necessitates a fruitful exchange between the reader and the discourse being processed (Johns, 1986).

In 1976, Halliday and Hassan defined coherence as "the continuity that exists between one part of the text and another" (Halliday and Hassan 1976). Accordingly, coherence is considered a semantic notion that "refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text" (Halliday and Hassan 1976). A literary work's ability to withstand this type of interpretation is influenced by its cohesiveness. Cohesion is defined by the quality of togetherness, claim Flowerdew and Mahlberg (2009). The usage of vocabulary words or grammatically connecting words that facilitate textual relations is a

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

reflection of connectivity or the flow of information (Flowerdew and Mahlberg 2009).

Cohesion is a mental construct, according to Stoddard (1991). According to this concept, coherence necessitates interpretation on the part of the reader and demands mental effort. To ensure that information is dispersed rationally, clauses and sentences must have particular words or grammatical components that aid to transmit meaning and purpose (Tsareva, 2010).

The system of connections that binds a text together and gives it meaning is called cohesion. The two types of cohesion are lexical cohesion, which relates to the verbal coherence of the piece, and grammatical cohesion, which refers to the structural substance of the piece (Linguistic Cohesion, 2012) (Klimova, and Hubackova, 2014).

Izwaini and Alomar (2019) state that when sentences are connected by linguistic and semantic clues, this is referred to as overt-sentential cohesion (Alek et al., 2022).

Cohesion, according to Halliday & Hassan (1976), is an internal feature and is what holds the passage together. According to Emilia, Habibi, and Bangga (2018), Dastjerdi & Samian (2011) state that it is one of the indicators that the reader can use to connect the meaning of the text as a whole.

Cohesion in textbooks is crucial because it contributes to the creation of a coherent and cohesive text that conveys information in a clear and organized manner. It makes sure that the information is presented logically, enabling readers to understand the author's arguments or justifications without being confused.

Kinds of Cohesive Devices

The two fundamental forms of coherence are grammatical and lexical. Reiteration and collocation are the two elements of lexical cohesion, while reference, ellipsis, substitution, and conjunction comprise grammatical cohesion (Halliday & Hassan, 1976).

Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion is the study of resonant elements in a text. According to Paltridge (2000), the process of constructing a text using related words is known as lexical cohesion. Repetition is when a word is used more than once or is modified to convey a number or tense. While antonyms relate to opposite or contrastive meanings, synonyms describe the relationship between terms that have similar meanings. (Halliday & Hassan, 1976) claim that the term "superordinate" refers to a more common class and is used to describe a word that possesses general features as opposed to specialized ones. Additionally, Paltridge (2000) noted that collocation is frequently linked to the sense of meaning to develop lexical links. It describes word combinations that frequently occur, such as the pairing of adjectives and nouns, the link between verbs and nouns, and the pairings of nouns (Puspita et al., 2019).

The cohesiveness that results from the semantic ties between words is known as lexical cohesion, and it merely requires that the words be connected in some way.

Grammatical Cohesion

The structuring of language is referred to as grammatical cohesiveness. The sentence is the highest structural unit in grammar (Halliday and Hassan 1976). Where and how each grammatical element relates to other ones depends on the sentence's structure. The linguistic context that is created by a sentence's interactions with other sentences shapes the meaning of each individual sentence. To ascertain whether a text may serve as a single, meaningful unit, a variety of linguistic techniques

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

might be applied (Tsareva, 2010).

Reference, substitution, and ellipsis are instances of grammatical coherence. Another form is lexical coherence, and conjunctions fall somewhere between the two since they are essentially syntactic devices with lexical constituents. In grammar, a conjunction is a speech element that joins words, sentences, phrases, or clauses. According to Klimova and Hubackova (2014), it is sometimes called a conjunction or discourse connective that joins sentences (Klimova and Hubackova, 2014).

There are four distinct cohesion categories in grammar. These four words can be used as parts of speech including references, substitutions, ellipses and conjunctions (Halliday & Hassan, 1976, Alek et al., 2022).

Halliday Theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics

Early in the 20th century, there were many theories in the field of linguistics, each with its own unique research areas, trends, and orientations. Many of these theories, such as those of Halliday and Chomsky, were created independently or by multiple proponents. From a specific perspective, each theory has also been successful in describing certain aspects of language. Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics is one of the more substantial theories; it has garnered the most attention and is regularly referenced in linguistics and literature.

In the UK and Australia in the 1960s, Michael Halliday and his supporters principally developed the SFL approach to language analysis (O'Donnell 2012, p. 1).

Influential linguists like Bronislaw Malinowski and J.R. Firth contributed to the foundation of SFL with their earlier studies. Bronislaw Malinowski, a Polish anthropologist, wrote most of his works while he was living in England. (O'Donnell, 2012). The second linguist is J.R. Firth, who promoted linguistics as a discipline in Britain. Using his linguistic model, he extended Malinowski's thesis on the significance of the situation's context and put it into practice. In addition, he established the "prosodic phonology" school of thought, which allows phonological features to be shared by succeeding phonemes instead of each phoneme possessing a distinct set of traits. (O'Donnell 2012, p. 6).

Among the various uses of the SFL method worldwide, particularly in language instruction, is discourse analysis. Language has maintained a close relationship with sociology despite the fact that many linguistic theories concentrate on language as a form of mental activity. The Halliday tradition, for example, is more concerned with how language is employed in social settings to accomplish specific objectives (O'Donnell, 2012) (Almurashi, 2016).

Importance of Cohesion and Coherence in Textbooks and Curriculum

For effective writing sentence structure and clarity are necessary. In effective writing, each sentence flows naturally into the one before it and into the one after it and work is a cohesive whole. Cohesion is the term for the literary characteristics that give the text a sense of unity or coherence (Halliday & Hassan, 1976). According to Halliday and Hassan (1976), there are five fundamental categories of lexical, grammatical, and semantic methods that promote text cohesion: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion.

Other academics disagree, asserting that cohesion and coherence should not be compared (Carrell, 1982; Hinkel, 2001). The text does not become coherent through merely superficial language qualities, as Carrell (1982) notes. Instead, it is claimed that coherence is a concept that is understood at the level of fundamental propositions.

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

Additionally, they have had a significant impact on ESL/EFL writing education; coherence and cohesion are now the main learning objectives in L2 writing textbooks. However, according to Carrell's 1982 research, several textbooks address the concept of coherence in part with surface cohesion. Those textbooks exhibit the erroneous notion that teaching cohesion to pupils would result in more coherent writing (Cho and Shin, 2014).

Methodology

This section describes and covers data gathering procedures, tools, techniques, and research approaches. Additionally, it depicts the research design. In addition, it provides an explanation of the data analysis and results interpretations. It essentially covers all of the work done for this research study and the information gathered from English textbooks for intermediate school students.

Design of Research

A mix method research design will be used for the given investigation. In the study that follows, both qualitative and quantitative research and data are integrated using a mixed-method research design. Mixed-method research offers the ability to get over the drawbacks of utilizing just one methodology by combining qualitative and quantitative techniques, leading to a more thorough and nuanced knowledge of complex phenomena.

Data Collection Procedure

In the following research study, the researchers sought the help of educational authorities, public schools, book publishers and relevant stakeholders. Data were collected from intermediate-level English textbooks currently in use in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. After that, the researchers examined the provided textbooks to examine lexical and grammatical coherence.

Analysis

This section covers the major section of the thesis which are the results and discussion section of the collected data. Table 4.1 and 4.2 presents the results obtained from collected data from intermediate-level English textbooks of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa about Lexical Cohesion. Many lexical cohesion patterns, such as repetitions, superordinates, meronyms, hyponyms, antonyms, synonyms, and collocations, are found in these textbooks. The results of data collection on grammatical cohesiveness from intermediate-level English textbooks are shown in Tables 4.3 and 4.4. Several forms of grammatical coherence, including conjunctions, ellipses, references, and substitutions, are included in this section. The frequencies and percentages of lexical and grammatical coherence are also shown in this chapter. The explanation of the lexical and grammatical coherence results is included in the final section. The results presented in the data serve as the basis for the discussion. Thus, the data analysis and interpretation comprise the entirety of this chapter.

Table 4. 1: Classification of Lexical Cohesion

S.no	Lexical Cohesion Types	Occurrences
01	Repetitions	33
02	Meronyms	20
03	Synonyms	41
04	Antonyms	06
05	Hyponyms	24
06	Superordinate	40
07	Collocations	38
Total		202

Table 4.1 lists the most frequent lexical cohesive patterns in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa intermediate-level English textbooks along with the occurrence of each type. The categories of lexical cohesion listed above were derived from Halliday and Hassan's 1976 cohesion Model in Linguistics. In this model, Halliday and Hassan identified the above types of lexical cohesion that contribute to the coherence of a text. The above table illustrates the different types of lexical cohesion found in the selected chapters of intermediate-level English textbooks of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa along with their categorization.

In the first category, there are repetitions which refer to the words that are repeated in the text. For example, you are free to go to your temples, you are free to go to your mosques, or any other place of worship in this state of Pakistan (11th class, p. 27).” I gazed and gazed but little thought” (Class 11th, p. 34). There are 33 repetitions in the selected chapters of the English textbooks that have been presented in the given table. Similarly, the next type of lexical cohesion is meronyms which are terms or words that represent the parts or components of the whole. For instance, “Flitted across withered lips” (12th class, p.139). So, in the selected chapters of intermediate-level English textbooks of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, the researchers found 20 meronyms. In addition, the association between words with similar meanings is referred to as a synonym. For example, they shouted in one voice kindness and pity (11th class p.03). By adopting the Sunnah of simplicity and humility we can eradicate social evil like ostentation, arrogance and pride (Class 12th p. 4). There are 41 synonyms in the selected chapters of intermediate-level English textbooks of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa which is the highest occurrence compared to other types of lexical cohesion.

Antonyms refer to opposite or contrastive meanings. For example, no one could ever think to refuse to obey the mandate of the government (Class 12th, p. 40). In Table. 4.1, antonyms are 06 in number in the selected chapters which is the least occurred type of lexical cohesion. Moreover, during the analysis, the researchers found 24 hyponyms in selected chapters of English textbooks that have been presented in Table 4.1. For example, due to excessive pumping of underground water the quality of water has been contaminated with heavy metals like nickel, copper, and cobalt (Class 12th, p. 95). Furthermore, the term "superordinate" refers to a more general class. For example, seventy million people who once had no country to call their own had become a nation with great ideals and great faith (Class 11th, p.26).

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

In Table 4.1, there are 40 superordinates in the selected chapters of English textbooks which is the second-highest figure. In the last, the researchers analyzed collocations in the selected chapters of intermediate-level English textbooks of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Collocations occurred 38 times in the chosen chapters. For example, once again he shouldered his burden (how light it seemed now) and havened down the path, through the shadows and the moonlight, to the little hut in the valley (Class 12th p.65). So, overall, there are 202 lexical cohesive devices that the researchers have found in the selected chapters of intermediate-level English textbooks currently in use in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

Table 4. 2: Distribution of Lexical Cohesion with Percentages and Frequencies

S.no	Types of Lexical Cohesion	Occurrences	Frequencies
01	Repetitions	33	16.33%
02	Meronyms	20	9.90%
03	Synonyms	41	20.29%
04	Antonyms	06	2.97%
05	Hyponyms	24	11.88%
06	Superordinate	40	19.80%
07	Collocations	38	18.81%
Total		202	

The frequencies and percentages of the different kinds of lexical cohesive devices are shown in table 4.2. The researchers began by counting 202 lexical coherent devices in a selection of chapters from Khyber Pakhtunkhwa's English textbooks for intermediate schools. For the study, the researchers used those total cohesive devices as primary data. 202 lexical cohesive devices were first found in the selected sections by the researchers, who then categorized them into several types using the cohesion model in linguistics put forward by Halliday and Hassan in 1976.

In the first category, repetitions become 16.33% of the total lexical cohesive devices in intermediate-level English textbooks of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. It means that there are 16% repetitions in the given textbooks. In the same manner, there occurred 20 meronyms so the frequency of meronyms was 9.90%. It means that there are approximately 10% meronyms in the given textbooks, which is less occurred cohesion as compared with repetitions. It shows that there are fewer meronyms in the given textbooks. On the other hand, synonyms occurred 41 in number which is 20.29% which means that there are 20% synonyms in intermediate-level English textbooks, which suggests the highest occurrence of all lexical cohesive devices.

Antonyms refer to opposite or contrastive meanings. In the given research process, there are 06 antonyms in the selected chapters of intermediate-level English textbooks which is 2.97% that suggests that there are approximately 3% antonyms which is the least occurred lexical cohesion in the given table. The number of hyponyms in the given table is 24 which is 11.88%. So, there are round about 12% hyponyms in the intermediate-level English textbooks. Next are superordinates which are 40 in number, so the percentage of superordinates is 19.80%. So approximately there are 20 % superordinates in the given textbooks.

Furthermore, the researchers also identified collocations which is another type of lexical cohesion. In Table 4.2, there are 38 collocations at the frequency level of 18.81% of all the cohesive devices in the intermediate-level English textbooks. Paltridge (2000) claims that collocation has to do with

the interpretation of meanings to construct lexical links. It explains common word pairings, such as adjective noun combinations, verb-noun relationships and noun pair associations. Meanwhile, in the given research study the researchers analyzed intermediate-level English textbooks with limited resources. So, it suggests that the concerned authorities should inculcate more lexical cohesive devices such as antonyms for better comprehension and understanding.

Table 4. 3: Distribution of Grammatical Cohesion

S.no	Types of Grammatical Cohesion	Occurrences
01	References	421
02	Substitutions	06
03	Ellipsis	22
04	Conjunctions	414
Total		863

The distribution of grammatical cohesiveness is seen in Table 4.3. The table above lists the most common forms of grammatical cohesiveness and the instances in which they appear in English textbooks for intermediate students in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The table's list of grammatical cohesion kinds is taken from Halliday and Hassan's 1976 linguistics cohesion model presentation. According to this approach, Halliday and Hassan identified four primary categories of grammatical cohesion, which include conjunctions, ellipses, references, and substitutes that improve a text's coherence and connection.

The given table of grammatical cohesion illustrates the different types of grammatical cohesive devices which the researchers found in the selected chapters of intermediate-level English textbooks of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa along with their categorization. References fall under the first category. According to Halliday and Hassan (1976), a reference creates a connection between a textual element and another item that the element is perceived to be related to in a certain situation). There are three different kinds of references: comparative, demonstrative, and personal. For example, they owned a bit of land that supplied them with food (Class 12th, p.64).

The researchers in the given study found 421 references in the selected chapters of intermediate level English textbooks that have been presented in table 4.3 which is the most occurred grammatical cohesion in the selected portion. Similar to this, the next type of grammatical cohesion is called substitutions, which entails substituting one linguistics unit with another that fulfills the same structural function. For example, the next day she told him how to make a rope of ashes” Make a rope of twisted straw” (Class 12th, p. 66). So, in the chosen chapters of English textbooks the researchers found 06 substitutions which is the least occurred grammatical cohesion compared with other types of grammatical cohesion. In addition, the removal of a linguistic unit from a text because it is thought to contain evidence is known as an ellipsis.

Thi and Ngo (2019) claim that it is also the omission of a certain piece. For example, friends are no friend, brother, or no... (Class 12th, p. 12). There are 22 ellipses in the selected chapters of intermediate-level English textbooks of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa which is the most occurred grammatical cohesion after references and conjunctions and the result has been presented in table 4.3. Furthermore, conjunctions are 414 in number in the above table. Conjunctions connect utterances in several ways dependent on their underlying meanings and imply a wide range of

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

signal words. For example, whether we have five hundred million or one trillion (Class 12th, p. 39). So, in total there are 863 grammatical cohesive devices in the selected portions of intermediate-level English textbooks which the researchers analyzed during the research study in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

Table 4. 4: Distribution of Grammatical Cohesion with Percentages and Frequencies

S.no	Types of grammatical cohesion	Number	Frequencies
01	References	421	48.78%
02	Substitutions	06	0.69%
03	Ellipsis	22	2.54%
04	Conjunctions	414	47.97%
Total		863	

The grammatical cohesive device types and their frequencies are displayed in the above table. The researchers began by counting the number of grammatical coherent devices—863 in total—that were present in the chosen chapters of the textbooks. The researchers used the information gathered on grammatical cohesive devices as the main source of data for the grammatical cohesion study.

In accordance with Halliday and Hassan's cohesion model, which was introduced in linguistics in 1976, the researchers first identified 863 grammatical cohesive devices before classifying them into four kinds. The first type of grammatical cohesion is references which become 48.78% of the total grammatical cohesion in the selected chapters of current intermediate-level English textbooks of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

This means that there are approximately 49% of references in the given English textbooks which is the highest percentage of all grammatical cohesion. In the same way, there occurred 06 substitutions at the frequency level of 0.69%. This suggests less than 01% substitutions in the current intermediate-level English textbooks which is the least occurred grammatical cohesion compared to other types of grammatical cohesion. On the other hand, ellipses occurred 22 in number so the percentage of ellipses is 2.54%. This means that there are 2% ellipsis occurred in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa intermediate level English textbooks which is less occurred cohesion after substitutions. Additionally shown in the above table is the final category of grammatical cohesion: conjunctions. Since there are 414 conjunctions in the selected chapters, the conjunction percentage is 47.97%. Approximately 48% of the conjunctions in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa's intermediate-level English textbooks, according to this statistic.

The findings of grammatical cohesion suggest that there are fewer occurrences of substitutions and ellipses. So, the educational and other related authorities must include more substitutions and ellipses for excellent comprehension and also for standard and quality education.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this research study was carried out on the intermediate-level English textbooks of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, a province of Pakistan. The study's primary objective is to examine the lexical and grammatical cohesion of intermediate-level English textbooks currently in use in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. In linguistics, there are different kinds of lexical and grammatical cohesion, according to Halliday and Hassan's cohesion model (1976). The study used Halliday and Hassan's

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

cohesion model, which divided grammatical and lexical cohesion into four and seven kinds, respectively.

By considering language as a social semiotic system, Systemic Functional Linguistics highlights the functional aspects of language and how it is employed to generate meaning in a social setting. To determine lexical and grammatical cohesiveness in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa intermediate-level English textbooks, the researchers used the cohesion model. In order to gather information regarding lexical and grammatical cohesiveness, the researchers chose particular chapters from intermediate-level English textbooks for the study. Tables from the collected data were used to analyze the obtained data and develop conclusions. The seven categories of lexical cohesion synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms, meronyms, collocations, superordinates, and repetitions were the primary focus of the study. The four forms of grammatical cohesiveness are substitutions, ellipses, references, and conjunctions. Important information about the linguistic characteristics of instructional materials is also revealed by the examination of lexical and grammatical cohesion. The primary goal of the analysis is to determine how much these textbooks encourage the use of cohesive and coherent language, which is essential for students' language development and successful communication.

In Khyber Pakhtunkhwa intermediate-level English textbooks, the study found more grammatical cohesive devices than lexical cohesive devices. Synonyms are an extremely common lexical cohesive device, accounting for almost 20% of all lexical cohesive devices. Similarly, antonyms are less common, occurring at a rate of roughly 3%. This could be because it makes it harder for students to understand or because it lowers the quality of instructional resources.

References

- Afzaal, M., Hu, K., Chishti, M. I., & Imran, M. (2019). *A Study of Pakistani English Newspaper Texts: An Application of Halliday and Hassan's Model of Cohesion: A Discourse Analysis*. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(5), 78-88.
- Alarcon, J. B., & Morales, K. N. S. (2011). *Grammatical cohesion in students' argumentative essays*. *Journal of English and Literature*, 2(5), 114-127.
- Almurashi, W. A. (2016). *An introduction to Halliday's systemic functional linguistics*. *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics*, 4(1), 70-80.
- Armbruster, B. B., & Anderson, T. H. (1988). *On selecting "considerate" content area textbooks*. *Remedial and Special Education*, 9(1), 47-52
- Bavali, M., & Sadighi, F. (2008). *Chomsky's Universal Grammar and Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics: An Appraisal and a Compromise*. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 11-28.
- Carrell, P. L. (1982). *Cohesion is not coherent*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16(4), 479-488.
- Cho, H. Y., & Shin, J. A. (2014). *Cohesive Devices in English Writing Textbooks and Korean Learners' English Writings*. *English Teaching*, 69(1).
- E, A. W. (2017). *Discourse analysis*. *The Handbook of Linguistics*, 445-462.
- Gebhard, M. (2010). *Teacher education in changing times: A systemic functional linguistics (SFL) perspective*. *Tesol Quarterly*, 44(4), 797-803.
- Gill, R. (2000). *Discourse analysis*. *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound*, 1, 172-190.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hassan, R. (2014). *Cohesion in English* (No. 9). Routledge.

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

- Hidayat, D. N., & Husna, N. (2022). *A Discourse Analysis of Grammatical Cohesion in News Item Text of "Symphony 3" XII Grade English Textbook*. *JELTL (Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics)*, 7(1), 171-183.
- Hinkel, E. (2001). *Matters of cohesion in L2 academic texts*. *Applied language learning*, 12(2), 111-132.
- Hjelm, T. (2021). *Discourse analysis*. *The Routledge Handbook of research methods in the Study of Religion*.
- Iqbal, J. (2013). *A review of English textbooks at intermediate level in the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan*. *Research Journal of Educational Sciences*, 2321, 0508.
- Johns, A. M. (1986). *Coherence and academic writing: Some definitions and suggestions for teaching*. *Tesol Quarterly*, 20(2), 247-265.
- Storrer, A. (2002). *Coherence in text and hypertext*. *Document Design*, 3(2), 156-168.
- Kafes, H. (2012). *Lexical Cohesion: An Issue Only in the Foreign Language? English Language Teaching*, 5(3), 83-94.
- Klimova, B. F., & Hubackova, S. (2014). *Grammatical cohesion in abstracts*. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 664-668.
- Lazaraton, A. (2009). *Discourse analysis*. *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A practical introduction*, 242-259.
- Mahlberg, M. (2006). *Lexical cohesion: Corpus linguistic theory and its application in English language teaching*. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 11(3), 363-383.
- Morris, J., & Hirst, G. (1991). *Lexical cohesion is computed by thesaural relations as an indicator of the structure of the text*. *Computational linguistics*, 17(1), 21-48.
- Poudel, A. P., & Dhankuta, N. (2018). *Academic writing: Coherence and cohesion in the paragraph*. Retrieved August 8, 2019.
- Puspita, G. S., Rizkiyah, F., & Suprijadi, D. (2019). *Lexical cohesion in a news article on the Jakarta Post entitled "why full day school will not work in Indonesia?"*. *Professional Journal of English Education*, II, 507-513.
- Tsareva, A. (2010). *Grammatical cohesion in argumentative essays by Norwegian and Russian learners (Master's thesis)*.
- Wu, S. (2010). *Lexical cohesion in oral English*. *Journal of language teaching and research*, 1(1), 97101.