



ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Cross-Cultural Study of Lexical Cohesion in Political Newspaper Articles

Dr. Maryam Farnia¹ ©

Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics, Department of English Language and Literature, Payame Noor University.



Nafiseh Kabiri

MA in English Language Teaching, Department of English Language and Literature, Payame Noor University



(Received: 14 September 2020; Accepted: 7 November 2020; Published: 30 November 2020)

This study examined the use of lexical cohesion in English political news articles published in local and international English newspapers. To this end, a corpus of 40,000 words (20,000 in each corpus) were randomly collected from political news articles published online in the editorial section of international English newspapers (e.g. the Washington Post, the New York Times) and local English newspapers (e.g. Iran Front Page, Tehran Times) from January to December, and were analyzed based on Tanskanen's (2006) classification of lexical cohesion as reiteration and collocation. The findings showed that international English newspapers used statistically more substitution, equivalence, contrast, activity related, and elaborative collocations than local English newspapers. On the other hand, local English newspapers used significantly more simple repetition, complex repetition, generalization, specification, co-specification, and order set collocation when writing political news article. Additionally, there was a significant difference between the two groups in subset of reiteration and collocation.

Keywords: Lexical Cohesion, Newspaper Article, Political Discourse.

¹ E-mail: mfarniair@gmail.com © (Corresponding Author)

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to study what cohesive lexical ties the local and international newspaper article writers employed to discuss one of the political issues in the Middle East, so-called Iran nuclear program. As a thinking process, writing entails the writer to make a decision on how to organize a text lexically or structurally to convey the intended information effectively (Kuo, 1995). This has become more critical when it comes to journalism and in particular, newspaper articles due to the burden the writer carry in sending the messages in a manner to attain the newspaper goal. For this purpose, the words and sentences are carefully selected and arranged in order to maintain the cohesion and coherence of the texts.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) refer to coherence as the aggregation of semantic configuration of two different types such as cohesion and register. The register referred to as language varieties that are suitable for speech text. Cohesion refers to semantic relation that makes the text-coherent. There are three main categories to cohesion: Referential cohesion, relational cohesion, and lexical cohesion. As the focus of this paper, lexical cohesion is the semantic relations which link the lexical items in a text. In other words, lexical cohesion is about meaning in text, and it is interested in how textual continuity is created by means of lexical items and cohesive devices (Morely, 2009).

Halliday and Hasan (1976) differentiated between reiteration and collocation as two different yet related aspects of lexical cohesion. Reiteration is “the repetition of a lexical item, or the occurrence of a synonym of some kind, in the context of reference; that is, where the two occurrences have the same referent.” (Halliday & Hassan, 1976, 318-319), while collocation is the use of “a word that is in some way associated with another word in the preceding text, because it is a direct repetition of it, or is in some sense synonymous with it, or tends to occur in the same lexical environment” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, 319). Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) model was further revised by Halliday and Hasan (1985) to include other notions such as repetition, synonymy, hyponymy and meronymy. In another revised model, Martin (2001) added elaboration, extension, and enhancement to the model. Lexical cohesion contributes both to the texture of a text and the rhetorical development of the discourse (Morely, 2009). By forming multiple relationships within a text, lexical cohesion is the main source of textual coherence and common form of cohesive ties (Hoey, 1991).

The use of cohesion is subject to variation in different discourse types (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Therefore, several attempts have examined lexical cohesion in different genres such as research articles (e.g., Mirzapour & Ahmadi, 2011), novels (e.g., Al-Pachachi & Naser, 2017; Arifiani 2016; Moini & Kheirkhah, 2016), and in political discourse (e.g., Eyni & Chitulu, 2015; Bader & Badarneh, 2018; Dang,

2020; Destiny 2018; Klebanov, Diermeier & Beigman, 2008). Studying coherence can provide us information about the organization of texts, and how the elements of a text are connected (Berzlánovich, 2008). Although studies on the use of lexical cohesion in newspaper articles are abundant, research on the use of this device in Iranian newspapers around the topic of politics seems to be scanty. For the purpose of topic unity, the present research aimed to examine the use of cohesive devices in newspaper articles published in English at local and international level on Iran nuclear program.

Klebanov, Diermeier and Beigman (2008) studied lexical cohesion in Margaret Thatcher's 1977 political speech on Conservative Party Conference by means of a software. The aim of their study was to examine how ideologies transmitted through the use of lexical cohesion. Hameed (2008) examined lexical cohesion in newspaper articles. Using Halliday and Hasan's (1976) and Bloor and Bloor's (1995) model in data analysis, they found that repetition and collocation were the dominant cohesive devices in the text. Another study on lexical cohesion of political discourse is Malah, Tan and Rashid's (2016) who analyzed lexical cohesion in English Nigerian newspapers with a focus on editorials unfolding national issues. They analyzed 30 editorial texts (20,345 words) published in three Nigerian newspapers. The findings showed that *repetition*, *expectancy relation*, *class/sub-class*, and *synonymy* were the most frequently used types of lexical cohesion in Nigerian English newspapers. Moreover, Puspita, Rizkiyah, and Suprijadi (2019) examined lexical cohesion in a newspaper article published in Jakarta, Indonesia, and analyzed based on Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model of lexical cohesion. The results showed that repetition as the most frequent types of cohesive device in the corpus. Dang (2020) studied lexical cohesion in ten Vietnamese and English editorials based on Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model of cohesion. The results showed that all cohesive devices were present in the two corpora with ellipsis as the most frequently used device.

Due to the importance of the notion of lexical cohesion in understanding the semantic relation of a text and as a tool to achieve coherence, the purpose of this study was to investigate lexical cohesive devices use to carry the editorial message toward Iran nuclear program as one of the critical issues in the Middle East in general and in Iran in particular, and how it is reflected lexically through cohesive devices in Iran English local and English international newspapers.

The objectives of this study were to examine the use of lexical cohesion in the news articles published nationally and internationally around the topic of nuclear program in Iran. Thus, the following research questions guided the study:

1. What are the types and frequency of lexical cohesion used in international and local English newspaper articles?

2. Are there any significant differences in the use of lexical cohesion between the two corpora?

Method

This descriptive analytic design examined the use of lexical bundles in international and local English newspapers.

1. Corpus of the Study

The corpus was randomly selected from three international newspapers (i.e., Los Angeles Time, New York Times, The Washington Post), and two local newspapers (i.e., Tehran Times, Iran Front Page). The selected newspapers published in English and are available online. Only the articles around the topic of political issues around Iran nuclear program were randomly selected from January to December 2018. The total size of corpus collected from 25 international newspaper articles and 59 local English articles was around 40,000 words (20,000 for each corpus)The size of Iran local English articles were shorter compared to their international counterpart. Hence, more articles were selected to maintain the equality of corpus size.

2. Procedure

The data were randomly collected from the newspaper editorial sections around the topic of Iran nuclear program in the time span between January 2018 and December 2018. The articles were stored in two Microsoft Word file and the size of the corpus were kept roughly equal for the purpose of analysis. To analyze the data, the corpus was read sentence by sentence and the types of lexical cohesion were identified and checked against Tanskanen's (2006) model of lexical cohesion. Tanskanen's model is a modified version of Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model. The data were manually analyzed, and the researchers talked over the analyses in several sessions. Finally, to ensure the reliability of coding, the data were checked by the researchers.

3. Data Analysis

The data were coded based on Tanskanen's (2006) lexical cohesion divided in two categories: reiteration and collocation. Reiteration is a repetition of presupposed items, which not only involve the repetition of lexical item, but also involve the repetition of general words that refers back to the lexical item. Reiteration also involves the repetition of a number of things between the use of synonyms, near synonyms, and super ordinate (Halliday and Hasan,1976). Reiteration includes simple repetition, complex repetition, substitution, equivalence, generalization, specification, co-specification and contrast. Collocation is a form of lexical item that refers to the relationship between two words in the same context. Collocation in other word, neither suspends to referential identity nor accomplished by demonstrating. According to Halliday and Hassan (1976), collocation is a kind of opposition in different type (Arifiani, 2016). Collocation consists of order set,

activity related and elaborative collocation. The model and the definitions of subcategories are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Tanskanen's (2006) Framework

Types	Subcategory	Definition
Reiteration	Simple repetition	It occurs when an item is repeated either in an identical form or with no other than a simple grammatical change, e.g. singular – plural, present tense – past tense
	Complex repetition	It involves more change that is substantial: the items may be identical but serve different grammatical functions, or they may not be identical but share a lexical morpheme.
	Substitution	It is a pronoun reiterating a noun.
	Equivalence	It is more commonly referred to as synonymy.
	Generalization	Referred as hyponymy or super-ordinate relation, it is the relationship between an item and more general items. This relation is entitled specific-general.
	Specification	Specification refers to the relation between an item and more specific item. This relation is also called meronymy or general-specific.
	Co-specification	It is the relationship of two items with the general ones. This relation is referred to co-meronymy and co-hyponymy.
Collocation	Contrast	This refers to the opposite meaning of the relation between an item and another item. This relation is also called antonymy and opposition.
	Order set	It refers to the more systematic reiteration relation of three categories include members of ordered sets of lexical items, for example, colors, numbers , months and days of the week.
	Activity related	This relation is nonsystematic collocation. This kind of collocation based on association between items. This is hard to find which items are related or not but with the help of some studies we can find these complex relation.
	Elaborative	Elaborative collocation refers to the relation which cannot be classified as ordered set collocation or activity related collocation.

The data were coded manually, however, they were entered into SPSS software version 22 for further descriptive (i.e., frequency) and inferential (i.e., chi-square) analysis.

4. Results

The overall findings are presented in Table 2. The table shows that simple repetition is the most frequently used types of reiteration in both corpora. Also, equivalence and co-specification is the second and third most frequent used types of reiteration in the two corpora. Moreover, activity related is the most frequent collocation type in the two corpora.

Table 2 *The Distribution of Lexical Cohesion across the Corpus*

	Local English newspapers		International English newspapers		Chi-square Test			
	F	P	F	P	χ^2	df	Sig	
Reiteration	Simple repetition	813	53.90	741	52.10	3.336	1	.068
	Complex repetition	51	3.40	49	3.40	.040	1	.841
	Substitution	76	5	84	5.90	.400	1	.527
	Equivalence	168	11.20	209	14.70	4.459	1	.035*
	Generalization	97	6.40	63	4.40	7.225	1	.007*
	Specification	97	6.40	51	3.60	14.297	1	.001*
	Co-specification	169	11.20	165	11.60	.048	1	.827
	Contrast	37	2.50	61	4.30	5.878	1	.015*
	Total	1508	100	1428	100	2.465	1	.116
Collocation	Order set	43	19.80	37	14.40	.450	1	.502
	Activity related	140	64.20	177	68.90	4.319	1	.038*
	Elaborative	35	16	43	16.70	.821	1	.365
	Total	218	100	257	100	3.202	1	.074

*significant at .05 level

As shown in Table 2, the international corpus used more number of reiteration compared to local corpus. Despite this difference, results of chi-square analysis did not show any statistically significant difference between the two corpora. Also, although the international corpus used more collocation in its corpora compared to local corpus, results of chi-square did not show any statistically significance differences.

4.1. Reiteration

4.1.1. Simple repetition

As shown in Table 2, local corpus used more number of simple repetition (n=813) than international corpus (n=741). Despite this difference, results of chi-square test showed no statistically significant difference in the use of simple repetition in the two corpora (sig. =.068, p-value <0.05). Examples in italics extracted from the corpus are as follows:

Examples from the local English corpus:

- (1) Last month, the two houses of *the U.S. Congress* ratified non-nuclear *sanctions* against *Iran*. The *sanctions* were mainly targeted at Iran's missile capability. *The U.S. Treasury Department* also imposed sanctions on six Iran-based *satellite* companies on July 28 after *Iran* launched Simorgh (Phoenix) *satellitecarrier* rocket into space a day earlier.

Examples from the international English corpus

- (2) The administration must *certify* to the *US Congress* every 90 days whether Iran is adhering to the *agreement*. If Trump refuses to *certify* compliance, *Congress* has 60 days to decide whether to re-impose the sanctions that were lifted under the *agreement*.

4.1.2. Complex repetition

As shown in Table 2, local corpus used more number of complex repetition compared to international corpus. Despite this difference, results of chi-square analysis showed no statistically significant difference in the use of complex repetition in the two corpora (sig. =.841, p-value <0.05). Examples in italics extracted from the corpus are as follows:

Examples from the local English corpus

- (3) We have tried to identify countries which need Iranian products and begun *trading* goods with them. Of course, there is no denying that Iran needs foreign exchange as well. Therefore, we changed our forex transactions from the greenback to the currencies of the countries with which we have *trade*.

Examples of Complex Repetition excerpted from the International English Corpus

- (4) But they appear to have concluded that rather than unravel the deal, they need to find ways to *renegotiate* elements of it, he added. Mr. Tillerson has argued that it is possible to both retain the existing deal and get allies on board for extending the duration of the restrictions on Iran's nuclear activities, while *negotiating* over Iran's development and testing of ballistic missiles.

4.1.3. Substitution

As shown in Table 2, the international corpus used more number of substitution (n=84) than the local corpus (n=76). Despite the difference, results of chi-square test

showed no statistically significant difference in the use of substitution in the two corpora (sig. =.527, p-value >0.05). Examples in italicsextracted from the corpus are as follows:

Examples from the local English corpus

(5)*The French president*, in turn, stressed the need to forge closer cooperation between Tehran and Paris in all areas. *He* said all countries should endeavor to preserve the JCPOA, and that France remains fully committed to the deal. *Macrom*underlined that the JCPOA boosts confidence building.

Examples from the international English corpus

(6) *Rep. Ed Royce (R-Fullerton)*, who chairs the House Foreign Relations Committee, said on CNN that the United States should stick with the *deal* but "enforce the hell out of it."*He* urged the administration to find other ways to rein in Iran's ballistic missile program and other activities not covered by the nuclear deal, without destroying the existing accord.

4.1.4. Equivalence

As shown in Table 2, international corpus used more number of equivalence (n=209) than the local corpus (n=168). Results of chi-square test showedstatistically significant difference in the use of equivalence between the two corpora. In other words, international corpus used more number of equivalence than the local corpus (sig.=.035,p-value=<0.05).

Examples from the local English corpus:

(7) Mohamad Mahdi Eftekhari, another Iranian *lawmaker*, believes that Trump is not able to *pull out* of the JCPOA unilaterally. "Trump's claims about Iran's performance regarding the JCPOA will worsen the situation and isolate Washington on the international stage," said the *legislator*. "The team from Iran's Foreign Ministry first sat down for talks with the issue of 'distrust in the US' in mind, and Iranian diplomats had envisioned Washington's possible *withdrawal* from the JCPOA, and the necessary mechanisms to deal with it had already been worked out," he said.

Examples from the international English corpus:

(8)The United States and the E.U.3 should also address the problem of the nuclear *deal's* expiration date by jointly declaring now that they intend to *expand* and *extend* the *agreement*, rather than allow Iran's nuclear activities to suddenly increase when it *expires*. In parallel, they should seek to strengthen global nonproliferation efforts so that even if nuclear restrictions specific to Iran cannot be extended, Tehran faces more challenges to weaponization when the deal does *lapse*.

4.1.5. Generalization

As shown in Table 2, the number of generalization used in local English articles (n=97) was more than the number of generalization used in international English

articles (n=63). Results of chi-square test showed that there is a statistically significant difference in the use of generalization in the two corpora (sig.=.007, p-value=<0.05). In other words, local corpus used generalization significantly more than the local corpus. Examples from the two corpora are as follows:

Examples of from the local English corpus:

(9) However, French Foreign Minister Jean-Yves Le Drian said in *Washington* that France and *the United States* are determined to “vigorously” raise pressure on Iran over its ballistic missile program, including possibly through sanctions, Reuters reported on Tuesday.

Examples from the international English corpus:

(10) In his speech on Friday, Trump will unveil what he will describe as a new, tougher strategy against *Iran*, and blame his predecessor, Barack Obama, for the rise of Iranian influence across *the Middle East*.

4.1.6. *Specification*

As shown in Table 2, specification was used more frequently in local corpus (n=97) than international corpus (n=51). Results of chi-square analysis showed that there is a statistically significant difference in the use of specification in the two corpora. In other words, local corpus used specification significantly more than the international corpus (sig.=.001, p-value=<0.05). Examples extracted from the corpus are as follows:

Examples of from the local English corpus:

(11) Congressional and *White House* aides said on Tuesday that the Congress will allow the deadline on re-imposing sanctions on Iran to pass, leaving the JCPOA intact, Reuters reported. Despite *Trump*'s anti-Iran rhetoric, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) – the United Nations' nuclear watchdog – has issued nine regular reports each time confirming Iran's adherence to the international deal.

Examples of from the international English corpus:

(12) Iran's great enemy Saudi Arabia and other *Middle East states*, including Israel, had opposed the international deal with *Iran*. Britain, France and Germany have said they remain committed to the deal and will not support any renegotiation.

4.1.7. *Co-specification*

As shown in Table 2, the number of co-specification used in local English articles (n=169) is more than the number of co-specification in international English articles (n=165). Despite the difference, results of chi-square analysis showed that there was no statistically significant difference in the use of co-specification in two corpora. (sig. = .827, p-value <0.05). Examples extracted from the corpus are as follows:

Examples of from the local English corpus:

(13)U.S. President *Donald Trump* has made repeated attacks against the nuclear deal that was signed under his predecessor *Barack Obama*. On October 13, Trump refused to certify Iran's commitment to the nuclear deal despite repeated confirmations by the UN nuclear watchdog that Tehran is abiding fully to the terms of the agreement.

Examples from the International English corpus:

(14)Mattis, Tillerson and European US allies are reported to have suggested ways the US could take a tougher line with *Iran* in other arenas, like *Yemen*, *Syria* and *Iraq*, while staying in the nuclear deal.

4.1.8. Contrast

As shown in Table 2, contrast was used more frequently in international corpus (n=61) than local corpus (n=37). Results of chi-square analysis showed that there is a statistically significant difference in the use of contrast between the two corpora. In other words, international corpus used contrast more significantly than the local corpus (sig.=015,p-value=<0.05).Examples from the two corpora are as follows:

Examples from the Local English corpus:

(15)He said some individuals tried to depict a good picture of the US and convince people to be *optimistic* about that country. "There were also some others who were *pessimistic* about negotiations with the US, and despite support [for dialogue] by the country's negotiators tried to persuade them to stand up to illegitimate demands, but these very people were accused of being unwise at the end of the day," said the MP.

Examples from the International English corpus:

(16)The Trump administration's concerns with Iran have come as the United Nations Security Council, prodded by the United States, has ratcheted up pressure on North Korea to *stop* its nuclear and missile testing and *resume* disarmament talks.

3.2. Collocation

3.2.1. Order set

As shown in Table 2, order set collocation was used more frequently in local corpus (n=43) than the international corpus (n=37). Despite this difference, results of chi-square analyses displayed no statistically significant difference in the use of order set collocation between the two corpora. (sig. = .502, p-value <0.05). Examples extracted from the corpus are as follows:

Examples from the local English corpus:

(17)In a statement released during the EU's Foreign Affairs Council meeting in Luxembourg on *Monday*, the EU foreign ministers strongly backed the nuclear deal, describing it as a key pillar of the international non-proliferation architecture. After months of anticipation, US President Trump on *Friday* said his administration

“cannot and will not” certify Iran’s compliance with the JCPOA to Congress, as he set out a new strategy for dealing with Iran.

Examples from the International English Corpus:

(18) On *Friday*, President Donald Trump decided to “decertify” the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), also known as the Iran Deal. Per law, the Trump Administration certifies Iranian compliance with the deal to Congress every 90 days, and did so once in *April* and again in *July*.

3.2.2. Activity related collocation

As shown in Table 2, the number of activity related collocation used in international English corpus (n=177) is more than the number of activity related collocation in local English corpus (n=144). Results of chi-square analysis showed a statistically significant difference in the of activity related collocation in the two corpora. In other words, the international corpus used activity related collocation significantly more than local corpus (sig. = .038, p-value <0.05). Examples extracted from the corpus are as follows:

Examples from the local English corpus:

(19) Iranian deputy foreign minister says the US president’s move to *sign* an anti-Iran sanctions bill passed by the US Congress was an attempt to kill the nuclear *deal* between Tehran and world powers. Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister for Legal and *International Affairs* Abbas Araghchi made the announcement on Wednesday, shortly after Trump signed into *law* a bill by Congress that *imposes new sanctions* against Russia, Iran and North Korea.

Examples from the International English corpus:

(20) The 2015 accord sought only to block Iran from building a *nuclear weapon*. The U.S. maintains separate *economic sanctions* on Iran for its ballistic missile program and its support for terrorist groups. By most accounts, Iran has lived up to its end of the bargain.

3.2.3. Elaborative collocation

As shown in Table 2, elaborative collocation was used more frequently in international English corpus (n=43) than local English corpus (n=35). Despite this difference, results of statistical analyses showed there was no statistically significant difference in the use of substitution in two corpora. (sig. = .365, p-value <0.05). Examples extracted from the corpus are as follows:

Examples from the local English corpus:

(21) “*Nuclear activities* such as *uranium enrichment*, production of *heavy water*, the re-designing of the Arak *reactor* with China’s help in addition to exploitation of *uranium* quarries are underway better than before, and media reports of internal differences in Iran over the JCPOA are simply political dreams,” said Salehi.

Examples from the International English corpus:

(22) If the deal is scrapped, the Iranians could resume their *centrifuge enrichment* program, which is now being carefully monitored. Iran's stock of highly *enriched uranium* could then grow, possibly within a few months, to provide enough for a *weapon*.

Discussion

In response to the first research question, the findings showed that both categories of reiteration and collocation were present in the two corpora. The results showed that repetition as a reiteration device is the most frequently used lexical cohesive devices in the two corpora, which entails writer's attempt to make the text comprehensible to the readers without any reduction or interruption between the meaning itself. In other words, newspaper writers opt for repetition to "achieve clarity, precision, and definitions in their writing" (Malah, 2015). The high frequency of simple repetition denotes the importance of technical terms in political genre for which no other word equivalence can be substituted. The writers, hence, repeat himself to avoid obscurity and ambiguity in conveying a political message. Moreover, the occurrence of same and similar words in a political news article could be to emphasize the semantic content of the lexicon. The high frequency of repetition was also found in other genres including academic discourse (e.g., Malah, 2015). Moreover, equivalence (i.e., synonym) and co-specification (i.e., homonym) are the next highly frequent cohesive devices in the two corpora. To carry a specific meaning to the reader, the writers of the newspaper articles in both local and international English newspapers preferred to maintain their text cohesiveness by using the variation of words with similar meaning with a position that can be replaced by one another. Although an equivalence of a lexical item may not represent its semantically absolutely synonymous, they might draw the attention to the fact that "the justification and explanation for a relation between lexical items can and should be sought for in the text in which the items occur" (Tanskanen 2006, 55), therefore, the occurrence of equivalence as the second most frequently used cohesive devices invites reader to find the text cohesiveness inter-sententionally. The findings showed that *contrast*, *complex repetition* and *substitution* were the least frequent devices in the two corpora. The low frequency of these devices in a news article is not surprising: the wide, disparate and anonymous audience with various skills and education needs to be communicated straightforward; hence simple repetition is what the writers opted for.

Regarding the collocation group, the most frequent type in both corpora is activity related collocation, and the least frequent types in local English corpus are elaborative collocation and order set collocation. In international English corpus *order set collocation* and *elaborative collocation* are the least frequent types of

collocation. The findings show that the writers in the two corpora favored nonsystematic lexical items to talk over the nuclear issue in Iran; lexicons such as nuclear weapon, economic sanction, and centrifugal pump assembly in a paragraph are examples of activity related collocation. The reader can chain the semantic relation of the topic, and thus related the topic with the chain of lexical devices. On the other hand, although *order sets collocations* are relatively clear in the text and are easy to recognize, they were the most infrequent types of collocation in this study similar to Tanskanen's (2006) study. Moreover, the local English newspaper writers attempted to frame the concept of Iran nuclear deal with the use of elaborative collocation. Elaborative collocation transmits the idea that the relation between the lexical items in a text is not accidentally developed. In this study, for instance, the newspaper writers whether advocate or opposite to political concerns carry the message with as much as other relevant lexical items to convince a lay reader of the editorials political stance.

In response to the second research question, results of chi-square test showed that there was a significant difference in the use of reiteration types of equivalence, generalization, specification, and contrast between the two local and international English corpora. Moreover, results showed a statistical significant difference in the use of collocation type of activity related category. In other words, the international corpus used this device significantly more than local corpus.

The findings of the current study to some extent corroborated the findings of Malah, Tan, and Rashid (2017) who reported that repetition and synonym, as subtypes of lexical cohesion are the predominant types in the newspaper. The findings were also in line with Puspita, Rizkiyah, and Suprijadi (2019) and Hameed (2008) who reported that repetition and collocation have been the most frequently used device in their corpus. They also claimed that class/sub class (generalization or hyponymy) was among the most frequent type of lexical cohesion in the newspaper. Lexical cohesion is useful in various aspects of language such as translation studies, linguistic studies, research studies, teaching, and learning. Knowing how to use the structure of using lexical cohesive and cognitive structure of reader can be affected by different lexical cohesive methodologies. Lexical cohesion is also useful in preparing summaries of the texts in order for converting text to the coherent units.

Conclusion

This study focused on Iran English local and English international newspaper articles to investigate the cohesive devices the editorials used to transmit the idea of Iran nuclear deal. The results showed variation in the use of cohesive devices in the two corpora. Moreover, simple repetition and equivalence were the most frequently used devices of reiteration, and activity related category is the most frequent collocation type in the two corpora. Despite the findings, the following perspectives

are suggested for future research: We have only examined the use of cohesive devices in political news article. Future studies may examine whether variations in the topics can influence the occurrence and type of cohesive devices. Moreover, future research would benefit analyzing the cohesive devices by means of software such as AntConc corpus tool. The findings of this study have some pedagogical implications for language classroom. First, teaching the role of cohesive devices in any text, and specifically in newspaper and media discourse to language learners can enhance their reading ability and have a better interpretation of a text. Additionally, this study could benefit learners in the field of journalism. Future studies may investigate this topic across languages and other newspaper text-types.

References

- Al-Pachachi, A.O. & Naser, A. A. (2017). The use of cohesive devices in English drama texts for adults and children. *Angloamericanae Journal*, 1(1), pp. 28-60.
- Arifiani, D.M. (2016). *An analysis of grammatical and lexical cohesion in Emma Watson's speech text on gender equality*. Faculty of Adab and Humanities, State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah, Jakarta.
- Bader, Y. & Badarneh, S. (2018). The use of synonyms in parliamentary speeches in Jordan. *AWEJ for Translation and Literary Studies*, 2(3), pp.43- 67.
- Berzlánovich, I. (2008). *Lexical cohesion and the organization of discourse*. Center for Language and Cognition Groningen: University of Groningen
- Dang, D. (2020). Grammatical cohesion in political discourse of Vietnamese newspapers and English newspaper. *International Journal of Advanced Scientific Research and Management*. 5(2), 1-5.
- Destiny, I. (2017). Textual organization for effective and meaningful communication: A focus on the speeches of Muhammadu Buhari. *English Linguistics Research*, 6(3), pp.38-61.
- Enyi, A. & Chitulu, M. (2015). Texture, textuality and political discourse: A study of lexical cohesion in Nigeria's president Goodluck Jonathan's inaugural address. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 6(5), pp.76-86.
- Klebanov, B.B., Diermeier, D. & Beigman, E. (2008). Lexical cohesion analysis of political speech. *Political Analysis*, 16, pp. 447-63.
- Kuo, C-H. (1995). Cohesion and coherence in academic writing: From lexical choice to organization. *RELC Journal*, 26(1), pp. 47-62.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R.(1985). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social semiotic perspective*. Geelong, Vic: Deakin University Press.

- Hamed, H. T. (2008). Cohesion in texts: A discourse analysis of a news article in a magazine. *AL-Faith Journal*, 37, 81-114.
- Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Malah, Z. (2015). Lexical cohesion in academic discourse: Exploring applied linguistics research article abstracts. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature*, 3(4), pp. 291-299
- Malah, Z., Tan, H., & Rashid, S. Md. (2017). Evaluating lexical cohesion in Nigerian newspaper genres: Focus on the editorials. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English literature*, 6(1), pp. 240-256.
- Mirzapour, F., & Ahmadi, M. (2011). Study on lexical cohesion in English and Persian research articles: A comparative study. *English Language Teaching*, 4(4), pp. 245-253.
- Moini, M. R., & Kheirkhah, F. (2016). Use of cohesive devices in children and regular literature: Conjunctions and lexical cohesion. *International Journal of Comparative Literature and Translation Studies*, 4(4), pp 12-23
- Morely, J. (2009). Lexical cohesion and rhetorical structure. In J. Flowerdew and M. Mahlberg (Eds.) *Lexical cohesion and corpus linguistics* (pp.5-22). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Puspita, G. S., Rizkiyah, F. K. & Suprijadi, D. (2019). Lexical cohesion in news article on the Jakarta post entitled "Why full day school will not work in indoneisa?", *Poject*, 2(4), pp. 507-513.
- Tanskanen, S.K. (2006). *Collaborating towards coherence: Lexical cohesion in English discourse* (Vol.146): John Benjamins Publishing.

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

Farnia, M. & Kabiri, M. (2020). Cross-Cultural Study of Lexical Cohesion in Political Newspaper Articles. *Language Art*, 5(4):93-108, Shiraz, Iran.

DOI: 10.22046/LA.2020.24

URL: <https://www.languageart.ir/index.php/LA/article/view/201>





مطالعه بینافرهنگی انسجام واژگانی در مقالات سیاسی روزنامه

دکتر مریم فرنی^۱

استادیار زبان‌شناسی کاربردی، گروه زبان و ادبیات انگلیسی، دانشگاه پیام نور، ایران

نقیسه کبیری

دانش‌آموخته کارشناسی‌ارشد آموزش زبان انگلیسی، گروه زبان و ادبیات انگلیسی، دانشگاه پیام نور، ایران

(تاریخ دریافت: ۲۴ شهریور ۱۳۹۹؛ تاریخ پذیرش: ۱۷ آبان ۱۳۹۹؛ تاریخ انتشار: ۱۰ آذر ۱۳۹۹)

پژوهش حاضر به بررسی استفاده از «انسجام واژگانی» در مقالات سیاسی در روزنامه‌های انگلیسی‌زبان محلی و بین‌المللی می‌پردازد. به همین منظور، پیکره‌ای متشکل از ۴۰،۰۰۰ کلمه (در هر گروه ۲۰،۰۰۰ کلمه) به طور تصادفی از مقالات اخبار سیاسی منتشر شده به صورت آنلاین در بخش تحریریه روزنامه‌های بین‌المللی انگلیسی (به عنوان مثال: واشنگتن پست، نیویورک تایمز) و روزنامه‌های محلی انگلیسی (به عنوان مثال، روزنامه ایران فرانت پیج و تهران تایمز) در بازه زمانی دی ماه ۱۳۹۷ تا دی ماه ۱۳۹۸ جمع‌آوری شد، و براساس طبقه‌بندی انسجام واژگانی تانسکانن (۲۰۰۶) مورد تجزیه و تحلیل قرار گرفت. یافته‌ها نشان داد که فراوانی ادوات جایگزین‌سازی، هم‌سنگی، تقابل، فعالیت‌های مرتبط و هم‌نشینی تفصیلی در روزنامه‌های بین‌المللی انگلیسی بطور معنی‌داری بیش از روزنامه‌های محلی انگلیسی می‌باشد. از طرف دیگر، روزنامه‌های محلی انگلیسی هنگام نوشتن مقاله اخبار سیاسی از تکرار ساده‌تر، تکرار پیچیده، تعمیم، مختصه، مختصه مشترک و هم‌نشینی ترتیب مجموعه استفاده می‌کردند. علاوه بر این، بین دو گروه در زیر مجموعه تکرار و هم‌نشینی تفاوت معنی‌داری وجود داشت.

واژه‌های کلیدی: انسجام واژگانی، مقالات روزنامه، گفتمان سیاسی.

¹ E-mail: mfarniair@gmail.com