

Quelle contribution des universités
au développement en Afrique ?

Volume II

Collection « Études africaines »

dirigée par Denis Pryn et son équipe

Forte de plus de mille titres publiés à ce jour, la collection « Études africaines » fait peau neuve. Elle présentera toujours les essais généraux qui ont fait son succès, mais se déclinera désormais également par séries thématiques : droit, économie, politique, sociologie, etc.

Dernières parutions

FODOUOP (Kengne) (dir.), *Le Cameroun. Jardin sacré de la débrouillardise*, 2015.

DJILA KOUAYI KEMAJOU (Rose), *Le droit pénal des affaires au Cameroun*, 2015.

ATTISSO (Fulbert Sassou), *Le mal togolais. Quelle solution ?*, 2015.

PUÉPI (Bernard), *Les gouvernances foncières et leur impact sur le processus de développement*, 2015.

OLOMBI (Jean-Claude), *Guerre et paix : leçons de l'intervention de l'ONU en République Démocratique du Congo*, 2015

MOSSOA (Lambert), *Où va la Centrafrique ?* 2015

AMBOULOU (Hygin Didace), *La déjudiciarisation et les procédures non contentieuses en Afrique*, 2015.

BOUOPDA (Pierre Kamé), *L'indépendance du Cameroun, Gloire et naufrages politiques de l'UPC*, 2015.

YEKOKA (Jean Félix), KIDIBA (Samuel) et LEMBIKISSA (Augus) (dir.), *Le mariage coutumier chez les Suundi du Congo-Brazzaville*, 2015.

VITA (Ndugumbo), SAVARD (Denis), FOURNIER (Jean-Pierre), *Reconstruire l'éducation "après-guerre" en R.D. Congo*, 2015.

NGOULOURE NJOYA (Moïse), *Les unions consensuelles chez les femmes africaines*, 2015.

DE YEIMBÉREIN (Bali), *Quand l'Afrique réapparaîtra...*, 2015.

DIANE (Moustapha), *La liberté des médias en Guinée. Entre textes et institutions, quelles réalités ?*, 2015.

TINOOU (Robert), *1700 proverbes vili*, 2015.

TINOOU (Robert), *Abécédaire du Kouilou*, 2015.

N'GUET'IA KOUASSI (René), *La Côte d'Ivoire de notre rêve*, 2015.

TABEZI PENE-MAGU (Bernard-Gustave), *Évaluer l'élève en Afrique Noire, De la pédagogie traditionnelle aux estimations contemporaines*, 2015

NZENGUI (Aaron Septime), *De Kant à l'Afrique. Réflexion sur la constitution républicaine en Afrique noire*, 2015

HOUEDANOU (Sessinou Emile), *La gestion transfrontalière des forêts en Afrique de l'Ouest*, 2015

EKANZA (Simon-Pierre), *Le Moronou, notre patrimoine, Géographie, Agriculture, et Sociétés*, 2015

Sous la direction du
professeur Gnon BABA

Quelle contribution des universités au développement en Afrique ?

Volume II

*Actes du colloque scientifique international de l'université de Kara
12-16 mai 2014*



L'Harmattan

© L'Harmattan, 2015
5-7, rue de l'École-Polytechnique, 75005 Paris

<http://www.harmattan.fr>
diffusion.harmattan@wanadoo.fr

ISBN : 978-2-336-30909-5
EAN : 9782336309095

REMERCIEMENTS

Plusieurs sponsors et généreux donateurs ont répondu à l'appel de l'Université de Kara lorsqu'elle a pris l'initiative d'organiser son premier colloque scientifique international. Leur apport a été déterminant pour l'organisation de ce colloque et pour la réalisation des présents actes. L'Université de Kara tient donc à leur exprimer sa profonde gratitude. L'Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie (AUF), le Service de Coopération et d'Action Culturelle (SCAC) de l'Ambassade de France au Togo, le Programme des Nations Unies pour le Développement (PNUD), la Délégation de l'Union Européenne au Togo, la Société TOGOCEL, la Loterie Nationale Togolaise (LONATO), la Société TOGOTELECOM, la Société NECOTRANS, la Brasserie du Bénin (BB), la Société Nouvelle des Phosphates du Togo (SNPT) sont de ces institutions dont l'appui multiforme a permis à l'Université de Kara de réaliser cette gageure.

Elle ose croire que le succès de cette première messe scientifique constitue le meilleur encouragement pour l'organisation de nouvelles rencontres scientifiques auxquelles elles apporteront le même appui.

SOMMAIRE

REMERCIEMENTS	5
AVANT-PROPOS.....	11
Langues, littératures, cultures et éducation	17
Le rôle des missionnaires européens dans la promotion des langues et de la littérature au Togo (1884-1960)	19
Socio-Political Alienation in Contemporary African Fiction: A Reading of Chinua Achebe's <i>Anthills of the Savannah</i>	33
Cohesion in text: a systemic-functional analysis of chimamanda ngozi adichie's fiction	49
Abraham Lincoln: an Abolitionist or a Clever Politician?	67
Teaching Students with Emotional and Behavioural Disorders in EFL Classes in Benin: Teachers' Practices and Students' Performance	83
Reversing the Present Order: National Development in the Oeuvre of Lamming and Marshall.....	93
Les Manipulations Linguistiques du « <i>Rex Francorum</i> » dans quelques langues de l'espace UEMOA	119
La science littéraire et les enjeux de développement en Afrique.....	135
Les savoirs universitaires au service du développement en Afrique : un point de vue de littéraire	149
Contribution des universités à la formation pédagogique des formateurs de citoyens : ressources pour le développement des sociétés.....	167
Traumatismes de l'enfance et troubles anxieux chez les adolescents et jeunes des Villages d'Enfants SOS (VESOS) du Togo	183

Relation enseignant/élèves et motivation au travail scolaire : cas des élèves de la sixième des Collèges d'Enseignement Général de la préfecture de l'Ogou	201
Effets relationnels et séquentiels des faits sociaux : de la fugue au phénomène de trafic et d'exploitation des enfants dans les villes de Lomé et Kara au Togo	219
Problématique de nombre de langues togolaises : une analyse de l'état des lieux à la lumière des outils de dialectologie et de dialectométrie.....	233
Alphabétisation des élus locaux et décentralisation : les paradigmes oubliés	251
La représentation sociale du genre à travers les expressions linguistiques du moba.....	265
Regard sur le pays tamberma : approche linguistique	277
Pronoms anaphoriques et coréférence en kabiyè.....	291
Le prétexte africain dans l'œuvre de Georges Siméon	311
L'Aventure ambiguë et Les Gardiens du Temple, de l'Ecole nouvelle à l'épanouissement des Africains.....	327
L'acceptation du tragique dans je, soussigné cardiaque de Sony Lab'ou Tansi.....	337
Contribution des rites de veuvage chrétien et traditionnel au travail de deuil au Togo.....	353
Une nouvelle église, un « nouveau nom » à Lomé aujourd'hui : caractéristiques morphologiques, syntaxiques et motivationnelles	359
La résistance « paganiste » des Kabiyè à l'implantation chrétienne entre 1926 et 1960	379
Recherche et développement au Togo à travers l'œuvre du Centrifan et de l'Irto (fin Seconde Guerre mondiale - années 1950)	397
Atouts et contraintes de développement de Grand-Lahou, ville moyenne de Côte d'Ivoire.....	421
Caractérisation des risques hydrométéorologiques dans la commune de Malanville.....	443
“P-shapes” and objects: reducing redundancy in written language	455
Vers une politique de développement du cinéma au Togo : le rôle des universités.....	469

Démocratie et gouvernance en Afrique & Economie et politiques publiques 481

La décrépitude du chemin de fer Lomé-Kpalimé ou la question de la gestion des infrastructures héritées de la colonisation (1959-2014) 483

Genre et gouvernance : la question de la représentation féminine dans la vie publique et politique 503

Ordre public et droit de manifester dans les Etats africains : mariage et / ou divorce à partir des expériences du Bénin et du Togo 523

La fragilisation de la propriété commerciale dans l'Acte uniforme portant droit commercial général 553

Démocratie et gouvernance au Togo : faiblesses, forces et perspectives 575

Niveaux d'éducation et croissance économique au Togo 589

Dynamique de la croissance économique et capital social au Togo 619

Transferts de fonds des migrants, gouvernance et croissance économique dans l'UEMOA 637

Le jeu des acteurs dans la conquête du marché des deux roues motorisées à Ouagadougou 655

Sciences, énergies renouvelables et innovations technologiques 671

Organisation africaine de la propriété intellectuelle (OAPI) et valorisation de la recherche en Afrique au sud du Sahara 673

Laboratoire sur l'Energie Solaire / Groupe Phénomène de Transfert et Energétique (GPTE) 683

Caractérisation mécanique et géotechnique du Sable silteux en couche de chaussée au sud du Togo et du Bénin 693

Etude expérimentale du comportement mécanique de mortier à base de sable silteux et de liant de sachets plastiques 701

Une académie sur l'e-gouvernance en Afrique, un défi pour nos universités 711

AVANT-PROPOS

2004-2014, l'Université de Kara a dix ans d'existence. Après ce laps de temps, riche d'expériences, elle a décidé d'ouvrir un nouveau chapitre avec une ferme volonté d'opérer en son sein des mutations nécessaires. Elle a pris le ferme engagement d'accroître son utilité sociale et sa capacité d'appui au processus de développement, afin de contribuer ainsi à relever les défis que rencontre le Togo dans sa quête de devenir un pays émergent à l'horizon 2024.

A cet effet, elle s'est dotée d'un plan stratégique décennal de développement, élaboré au regard des nouvelles exigences du contexte national et international de l'enseignement supérieur, marqué par l'émergence de l'économie du savoir, ainsi que par la globalisation et la compétition scientifique et technique.

Prenant la mesure des enjeux que soulève un tel environnement, l'Université de Kara a fait du développement et de la promotion de la recherche scientifique l'un des axes majeurs de son plan stratégique, en vue de devenir un pôle attractif et d'apporter des réponses appropriées aux défis du développement de notre continent. L'organisation d'un colloque scientifique international, pour clôturer les activités commémoratives de ses dix ans d'existence, répond à cette noble ambition.

Le thème choisi, « *Quelle contribution des universités au développement en Afrique ?* », traduit la volonté partagée des partenaires de l'enseignement supérieur de replacer l'institution universitaire au cœur des débats en tant que partenaire privilégié des différents acteurs dans la conception et la mise en œuvre des politiques de développement. A cet égard, la recherche scientifique et technologique doit devenir la pierre angulaire pour accélérer le processus de développement, en particulier dans les pays africains.

L'Université de Kara, en collaboration avec d'autres universités africaines, se doit de mobiliser les ressources pour assurer la promotion et le rayonnement des activités de recherche. La participation de chercheurs chevronnés et de jeunes chercheurs du Bénin, du Burkina Faso, de la Côte d'Ivoire, de la France, du Gabon, du Niger, du Nigéria, du Sénégal et du Togo est la preuve vivante de ce que doit être la contribution des universités au développement de l'Afrique.

Les conférences plénières et les communications réparties en plusieurs domaines ont apporté et proposé des pistes de réponses à la problématique de l'apport des universités au progrès économique, culturel et social de l'Afrique.

La présente publication est l'écho des travaux du colloque organisé par l'Université de Kara, du 12 au 16 mai 2014, à l'occasion des festivités de son dixième anniversaire. Elle rassemble les textes des conférences plénières et des articles qui ont été rigoureusement soumis à un comité scientifique international.

Puissent ces actes recevoir l'audience de la communauté scientifique internationale et apporter quelques réponses à la sempiternelle question du développement de l'Afrique.

Prof. Paalamwé Komi TCHAKPELE
Président de l'Université de Kara

*

COMITÉ DE RÉDACTION

- Professeur Gnon BABA
- Dr Akoété AMOUZOU
- Dr Komlan KOUZAN
- Dr Laré KANTCHOA
- Dr Padabô KADOUZA
- Dr Tom-Irazou TCHALIM
- Dr Nakpane LABANTE
- Dr Komlan ALEMAWO
- Dr Abalo ATATO
- Dr Kwamivi N. SEGBEAYA
- Dr Tchaa PALI
- Dr Abdou-Fataou TCHAGNAO
- Mlle Koudjoukalou ATCHOLADI
- M. Tamba KOLANI
- M. Essoron AGNALA

COMITÉ SCIENTIFIQUE

Président : Professeur Paalamwé Komi TCHAKPELE, Université de Kara

Vice-présidents :

- Professeur Koffi AHADZI-NONOU, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Adama KPODAR, Université de Kara

Membres :

- Professeur Messanvi GBEASSOR, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Toyi ASSIH, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Saliou TOURE, Université Félix Houphouët Boigny, Abidjan / Université Internationale de Grand Bassam

- Professeur Koffi AKPAGANA, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Thiou Komlan TCHAMIE, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Kou'santa Sabiba AMOUZOU, Université de Kara
- Professeur Gnon BABA, Université de Kara
- Professeur Comlan de SOUZA, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Mireille PRINCE DAVID, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Isabelle Adolé GLITHO, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Adovi N'Buéké GOEH-AKUE, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Egnonto Koffi-TESSIO, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Koffi Agnon BALOGOU, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Moctar BAWA, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Ibrahim CHITOU, Université de Paris 13
- Professeur Yvonne BONZI COULIBALY, Université de Ouagadougou
- Professeur Jean-Maurille OUAMBA, Université Marien Ngouabi
- Professeur Kokou TCHARIE, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Koffi-Sa BEIJA, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Kossi NAPO, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Komlan SANDA, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Gado TCHANGBEDJI, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Patrick POINT, Université de Bordeaux IV
- Professeur Géro Fulbert AMOUSSOUGAH, Université Abomey-Calavi
- Professeur Koffi Ayéchoro AKIBODE, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Adoté B. BLIVI, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Jérôme ALOKO-N'GUESSAN, Université Félix Houphouët Boigny
- Professeur Nicoué Ladjou GAYIBOR, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Komlan Messan NUBUKPO, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Raymond VERDIER, Université Paris-Ouest Nanterre
- Professeur Koffi Badjow TCHAM, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Abou NAPON, Université de Ouagadougou
- Professeur Kodjona KADANGA, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Musandji NGALASSO-MWATHA, Université de Bordeaux 3
- Professeur Bakoé BAKONDE, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Koffi N'DAKENA, Université de Lomé
- Professeur Bertrand SOGBOSSI, Centre Universitaire de Savé
- Professeur Amadou SEIBOU H. MAIGA, Université Gaston Berger, Saint-Louis
- Professeur Ouateni DIALLO, Université des Sciences et Techniques et Technologies de Bamako
- M. Kwami Gabriel NYASSOGBO, Maître de Conférences, Université de Lomé
- M. Nadédjo BIGOU-LARE, Maître de Conférences Agrégé Université de Lomé

- M. Akoété AMOUZOU, Maître de Conférences, Université de Kara
- M. Babakane Djobo COULIBALEY, Maître de Conférences, Université de Kara
- M. Koffi Mawunyo AGBENOTO, Maitre de Conférences, Université de Kara
- M. Kako NUBUKPO, Maitre de Conférences, Université de Lomé
- M. Kossi GNEYOU, Maître de Conférences, Université de Lomé
- M. Kossi BADAMELI, Maître de Conférences, Université de Kara
- M. Lalle Y. LARE, Maitre de Conférences, Université de Lomé
- M. Barthélémy BIAOU, Maitre de Conférences Agrégé, Université de Parakou
- M. Akuété AGBODJI, Maitre de Conférences Agrégé, Université de Lomé
- M. Pitchaki F. HEMOU, Anesthésiste-Réanimateur des Hôpitaux de Paris

**LANGUES, LITTÉRATURES,
CULTURES ET ÉDUCATION**

Cohesion in text: a systemic-functional analysis of chimamanda ngozi adichie's fiction*

Abstract

This article aims to explore cohesion in text. It aims to apply the cohesion theory drawn from neo-Firthian or Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) propounded by scholars like Halliday and Hasan (1976), Fowler (1986), Eggins (1994), etc., to Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's fiction to enhance the reading, understanding and interpretation of her creative works. The prose fiction has long been described, treated and interpreted by linguists as a text (Widdowson, 1975, Simpson, 2004). According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), a text is a unit of language in use. Eggins (1994) considers it as a semantic unit in that it coheres with itself and with its environment. Fowler (1986) believes that a text displays some features which distinguish it from non-texts. These features are text-forming patterns drawn from cohesion. Indeed, these patterns are patterns of meaning (Leech, 1965) stretched across the text. It follows from this the observation that one can only track down the meaning of the text as it unfolds by following the patterns of meaning that run through it from the beginning to the end. This is to say, one can only read and interpret the text by means of the patterns of meaning therein. This study, so to speak, seeks to unveil the text-forming properties that create patterns of meaning in the sample texts under study, and check whether or to what extent these properties contribute to the meaning of the texts. The findings reveal that cohesive properties gradually function to build the internal (or narrative) structure of texts, and by so doing they facilitate their reading, understanding and interpretation.

Key-words: Cohesion, Internal structure, Patterns of meaning, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), Text.

* Leonard KOUSSOUHON¹, Ayodele Adebayo ALLAGBE². Laboratory for Research in Linguistics and Literature (LabReLL).

¹ Professeur Titulaire au Département d'Anglais, koussouhon@yahoo.com. ² Doctorant à l'Ecole Doctorale Pluridisciplinaire, ayodeleallagbe@yahoo.com, (+22997907306) FLASH, Université d'Abomey-Calavi.

Résumé

Cet article vise à explorer la cohésion dans le texte. Il vise à appliquer la théorie de cohésion puisée de la Linguistique Systémique Fonctionnelle (LSF) ou néo-Firthienne avancée par les savants tels que Halliday and Hasan (1976), Fowler (1986), Eggins (1994), etc., aux œuvres de fiction de Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie afin d'améliorer leur lecture, compréhension et interprétation. La fiction a été décrite, traitée et interprétée par les linguistes comme un texte (Widdowson, 1975, Simpson, 2004). Selon Halliday and Hasan (1976), le texte est unité de langue en usage. Eggins (1994) considère le texte comme une unité sémantique parce qu'il est cohérent en ce qui le concerne et est cohérent avec son environnement. Fowler (1986) pense que le texte exhibe certains traits qui le distinguent des non-textes. Ces traits sont des ressources textuelles tirées de la cohésion. En effet, ces ressources sont des ressources significatives étendues à travers le texte (Leech, 1965). Il ressort de ceci que l'on ne peut suivre le sens dans le texte dans son développement que si l'on suit les ressources significatives qui s'y étendent du début jusqu'à la fin. Autrement dit, l'on ne peut lire et interpréter le texte que par les ressources significatives qui s'y trouvent. Cette étude, pour ainsi dire, vise à révéler les ressources textuelles qui créent les ressources significatives dans les textes étudiés, et vérifier si ou à quel point ces ressources textuelles contribuent au sens des textes. Les résultats révèlent que les ressources textuelles fonctionnent progressivement à construire la structure interne (ou narrative) des textes, et ce faisant facilitent leur lecture, compréhension et interprétation.

Mots-clés : Cohésion, Structure interne, Ressources significatives, Linguistique Systémique Fonctionnelle (LSF), Texte.

1. Introduction

Previous studies have systematically illustrated how texts are made, read and interpreted. Such studies are those carried out by scholars working within the neo-Firthian or SFL (Systemic Functional Linguistic) construct like Halliday and Hasan (1976), Fowler (1986), Eggins (1994), etc. These studies reveal that texts generally display some discourse patterns which distinguish them from non-texts (Fowler, 1986).

These patterns are text-forming properties drawn from cohesion. Indeed, these patterns are patterns of meaning (Leech, 1965) stretched across the text. This prompts the observation that one can only track down the meaning of the text as it unfolds by following the patterns of meaning that run through it from the beginning to the end. This is to say, one can only read and interpret the text by means of the patterns of meaning therein. In the light of this observation, this study aims to unveil the text-forming properties that create patterns of meaning in the sample texts under study, and check whether or to what extent these properties contribute to the meaning of the texts.

2. Theoretical Background

In SFL, cohesion is viewed as a semantic concept (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). The concept has been defined diversely in the SFL tradition (Xi, 2010: 141). Eggins (1994: 88) defines the concept as “the way we relate or tie together bits of our discourse.” Likewise, Halliday et al. claim that cohesion refers to “the set of possibilities that exist in the language for making text hang together” (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 18). It is obvious in the foregoing definitions that cohesion refers to how the parts of something hang together to form one entity. What normally indicates the occurrence of cohesion in text is the relation between two items: the referring item (or the presupposing) and the item it refers to (or the presupposed). As regards this, Halliday and Hasan give an insightful explanation:

Cohesion occurs where the INTERPRETATION of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one PRESUPPOSES the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are thereby at least potentially integrated into a text (1976: 4)

It follows from this a view that cohesion accounts for how two items by presupposition get integrated into a text, and in this sense it is clear that the notion of cohesion is relational. But, cohesive relations are non-structural in nature; i.e., the relations cohesion creates in text are not constrained by or limited to the sentential (or grammatical) structure. This is to say, “[c]ohesive relations have in principle nothing to do with sentence boundaries.” (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 08) It follows from this that cohesion exists within the boundaries of a sentence but this form of cohesion is not considered as a cohesive relation. It is rather considered as a structural relation, a relation determined by the grammatical structure: “cohesive ties between sentences stand out more clearly because they are the ONLY source of texture, whereas within the sentence there are the structural relations [...]” (Halliday and Hassan, 1976: 09). It is noteworthy to emphasize thus that structural relations are irrelevant to the meaning of cohesive relations.

By the same token, in the quote above the term INTERPRETATION is capitalized; it is used to underscore the necessity for the reader to construe the identity of some element in the discourse or text from the relation established between it and another element elsewhere in the discourse, the established relation between the two elements is what is called a tie (Halliday and Hasan, 1976) and the presence of ties in the discourse signals the presence of semantic relations which produce what Halliday and Hasan call texture, the enabling potential, which makes the discourse function as a text, a complete linguistic message. Or, in a broader context, the term is used to highlight the necessity for the reader to track down the meaning of the text s/he is reading as it unfolds from word to word, phrase to phrase, clause to

clause, sentence to sentence and paragraph to paragraph, etc. It follows from this that the fundamental role of cohesion is to produce links in terms of lexical and grammatical cues across a text; such links ensure a succession of propositions, ideas developed in the text. In other words, the cues in the text ensure the coherence of its language. Halliday and Hasan (1976) outline five distinct types of cohesion, namely:

Reference refers to “how the writer/speaker introduces participants and then keeps track of them once they are in the text” (Eggins, 1994: 95).

Substitution/ ellipsis indicates “a formal (lexico-grammatical) relation, in which a form (word or words) is specified through the use of grammatical signal indicating that it is to be recovered from what has gone before” (Halliday and Hasan 1976, p.308).

Lexical cohesion, as the name implies, is a cohesion which is drawn from “vocabulary items-referring and predicating expressions, nouns and verbs [...]” (Fowler, 1986: 64). According to Eggins (1994), lexical cohesion is subdivided into two broad categories: taxonomic lexical relations and expectancy relations (p.101).

Conjunction refers to how the writer creates and expresses logical relationships between the parts of a text. There are three kinds of conjunctive relations: elaboration (e.g. in fact), extension (for example, and) and enhancement (for instance, meanwhile) (Eggins, 1994).

3. Analyzing Cohesion in the Sample Texts

This section is concerned with exploring cohesion in three sample texts drawn from the two novels, *Purple Hibiscus* (2003), *Half of A Yellow Sun* (2007) and a collection of twelve short stories, *The Thing Around Your Neck* (2009), written by Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie. Following Eggins (1994), each of the sample texts has been split into manageable sentences and each sentence has been given an identifying number. Here all the split texts have been analyzed for cohesive properties (reference, conjunction and lexical cohesion). Due to space, only the summarized statistics of the identified cohesive properties in each text are presented here.

3.1. Analysis of Reference in the Sample Texts

3.1.1. Text 1 (*Purple Hibiscus*, 2003: 97-99)

The identified reference types in Text 1 are counted and tabulated in the table below.

Table 1: Reference Types in Text 1

Reference Types	Homophoric	Exophoric	Endophoric			Comparative	Bridging	Locational
			Anaphoric	Cataphoric	Esphoric			
Frequency	23	01	45	00	00	00	01	00
Percentage (%)	32.85	01.42	64.28			00	01	00

The table above indicates that Text 1 contains all in all 70 reference items. The distribution of these items is, however, not even. As the table shows, the text contains 23 (i.e., 32.42 %) homophoric references, 01 (i.e., 01.42 %) exophoric reference, 45 (i.e., 64.28 %), endophoric references, 00 (i.e., 00 %) comparative reference, 01 (i.e., 01.42 %) bridging reference and 00 (i.e., 00 %) locational reference.

From the analysis, it is inferred that Text 1 contains 29 head words. Out of these head words, 05 chains are most remarkable. The head words of the longest chains are: “Papa” in (1), “us” (the narrator (Kambili) and her father (Papa) or her entire family (the Achikes)) in (1), “Aunty Ifeoma” in (2), “the Priest” in (8) and “You people” in (10). The first two chains span the entire text, so they are the major participants therein. The text, so to speak, spins around the 02 participants. Papa with his family attends a morning Mass at St. Paul’s. In the first long chain, the tokens “we” and its variants “us”, “ours”, “our” and “he” and its variants “his” and “him” are identified. While “we”, “us”, “ours” and “our” refer anaphorically to the narrator (Kambili) of the text and her father (Papa) or her entire family (the Achikes), “he”, “his” and “him” simply point back to the narrator’s father (Papa). Similarly, in the second long chain, such pronouns as “I” and its variant “my” and “We” and its variants “us” “ours” and “our” are identified. The use of “I” and its variant “my” in the current text points back to the narrator, Kambili. Similarly, the use of “We” and its variants “us” “ours” and “our” refers to the narrator, Kambili, and her father (Papa) or her entire family (the Achikes).

The third chain exhibits such reference items as “he” and its variant “his”, I” and “we”. While all the reference items here refer anaphorically to the referent “the Priest”, “we” basically refers to both the referent and his audience. The fourth and fifth chains include a number of cohesive ties inferior to that of the aforementioned 03 chains. The fourth chain exudes “she” and its variant “her”, “they” and its variant “their”. The reference items “she” and “her” clearly refer to the referent “Aunty Ifeoma”. The referent and her children are subsequently referred to with “they” and “their”. The item “They” in (3), for instance, refers to “Aunty Ifeoma and her children” in (2). The fifth chain typically contains only one reference item “You” which is repeated 04 times consecutively in the text. It refers anaphorically to “the pews” the priest is addressing in the text.

There are many other reference items in the text whose retrieval is not anaphoric but context-dependent or through bridging. These are:

Homophoric references: 23 homophoric items are identified in the current text. The following are some of them: “Papa” in (1), “Christmas Mass” in (1), “St. Paul’s” in (1), “Aunty Ifeoma” in (2), “their station wagon” in (2), “the Mercedes” in (2), “the early Mass” in (4), “Amaka” in (4), “the priest” in (8), “the gospel during the sermon” in (8), “You people” in (10), etc. The use of a huge number of homophoric reference items here denotes that the current text depends heavily on the shared context of culture for its interpretation.

Exophoric references: “your lips” in (7) is exophoric in that its referent can only be retrieved from the immediate context of situation. Here, the narrator, Kambili, paints a situation around Amaka’s lipstick which carries within itself an image of doubt and surprise.

Bridging references: “it” in (19) is the only bridging reference item identified in the text. This item bridges its reference from “... we accompanied Papa to a fund-raising...” in (18).

3.1.2. Text 2 (Half Of A Yellow Sun, 2007: 146-148)

Table 2: Reference Types in Text 2

Reference Types	Homophoric	Exophoric	Endophoric			Comparative	Bridging	
			Anaphoric	Cataphoric	Esphoric			
Frequency	38	01	105	01	02	00	01	00
Percentage (%)	25.67	00.67	72.97			00	00.67	00

The table above reveals that Text 2 displays 148 reference items. The figures drawn from the analysis indicate the text includes 38 (i.e., 35.67 %) homophoric references, 01 (i.e., 00.67 %) exophoric reference, 108 (i.e., 72.97 %) endophoric references, 00 (i.e., 00 %) comparative reference, 01 (i.e., 00.67 %) bridging reference and 00 (i.e., 00 %) locational reference. As the table shows, endophoric references rank first in the current text followed by homophoric ones. In fact, this passage contains the 03 sub-categories of endophoric references, viz. anaphoric, cataphoric and esphoric. The most dominating sub-category here is anaphoric references. Out of the 108 endophoric references counted in this text, 105 (i.e., 97.22 %) are anaphoric.

From the study, it is noted that Text 2 displays a total number of 42 head items. Out of these items, 03 chains are most significant because they span the entire text. The head items in the longest chains contains: “Olanna” in (1), “Mohammed” in (1) and “They” (Muslim students) in (3). As the analysis exudes, the text is built around these 03 participants. Olanna and Mohammed are trapped in a riot organized by Muslim students. In the first long chain, the reference items “she” and its variants “her” and “hers”, “I”

and its variants “me” and “my”, “you” and its variant “your”, “s” and “they” are employed. The use of “she” and its variants “her” and “hers”, “I” and its variants “me” and “my”, “you” and its variant “your” refers anaphorically to the referent “Olanna” but “s”, and “they” point back to the referent and her ex-boyfriend “Mohammed”. Likewise, in the second long chain, the participants “he” and its variants “his” and “him”, “you”, “s” and “they” are identified. While the use of “he” and its variants “his” and “him” and “you” points back to the referent “Mohammed”, that of “s” and “they” refers anaphorically to the referent and his ex-girlfriend “Olanna”.

The third chain contains such reference items as “They” and its variants “their” and “them”, “we”, “he” and its variant “his”. In fact, the item “They”, appears 05 times in the chain. It is noted that the “They” in (3) is cataphoric in that it points forward to the referent “the students” in (4). Apart from this, the remainder; we mean the 04 “they”, “their”, “them” together with “we”, “he” and its variant “his” are anaphoric. While the 04 “they” refer anaphorically to the referent “the students”, “their”, “them” and “we” point back to the referent “the crowd of men drifting into the yard”. The use of “he” and its variant “his” points back to one of the rioting men called “Abdulmalik” in the text.

Other reference items’ identity in the text is not retrieved endophorically but homophorically, exophorically or through bridging:

Homophoric references: 38 homophoric reference items are noted in the text. Here are some: “Olanna” in (1), “Mohammed” in (1), “Mohammed’s veranda” in (1), “the delicious cold trickle down her throat” in (1), “the stickiness on her lips” in (1), “the gateman” in (1), “What looked like a pamphlet” in (1), “the students” in (4), “Sule” in (9), “the roads” in (9), “Infidels” in (9), “a short cut to the train station” in (21), “Arize” in (22), “Sabon Gari” in (25), “my uncle’s house in Sabon Gari” in (25), etc. The huge number of homophoric reference here implies that the current text depends heavily on the shared context of culture for its interpretation.

Exophoric references: The only exophoric reference item in this text is “people who were Western-dressed” in (14). With this reference, the narrator-writer portrays a situation of riot which bears out the attitudes of the rioters and the people they often victimize.

Bridging references: The only bridging reference item in this Extract is “it” in (5). This item bridges its reference from “it” in (4) to the fact that “they’re rioting” in (3).

3.1.3. Text 3 (*The Thing Around Your Neck*, 2009: 128-130)

Table 3: Reference Types in Text 3

Reference Types	Homophoric	Exophoric	Endophoric			Comparative	Bridging	Locational
			Anaphoric	Cataphoric	Esphoric			
Frequency	33	00	46	01	01	00	00	00
Percentage (%)	40.74	00	59.25			00	00	00

The analysis of Text 3 exudes that it contains 81 reference items. Just like in other sample Extracts, the items are distributed evenly. As shown in the table above, the text includes 33 (i.e., 40.74 %) homophoric references, 00 (i.e., 00 %) exophoric reference, 48 (i.e., 59.25 %) endophoric references, 00 (i.e., 00 %) comparative reference, 00 (i.e., 00 %) bridging reference and 00 (i.e., 00 %) locational reference. The dominant category of reference type here is endophoric reference. This is followed by homophoric reference.

From the investigation, it is clear that Text 3 involves 32 head words. Out of these head words, only 02 chains are most outstanding in that they span the entire text. The head words in the 02 outstanding chains are: “She” (the nameless woman who goes to the American embassy for a visa interview) in (1) and “the man” in (7). As the analysis exudes, the text is built around these 02 participants, both of whom are victims of the Abacha regime. In the first chain, the reference items “she” and its variants “her” and “herself”, “you”, “our” and “they” are identified. The reference items “she” and its variants “her” and “herself” and “you” are anaphorically used to refer to the head word “She”. The use of “our” and “they” in the chain refers anaphorically to either the head word “She” and the man who talks to her from time-to-time on the line or all the people on the line in search of a visa or all the people (the Nigerian people) in general. The second chain entails reference items like “he”, “our” and “they”. While “he” refers to the referent “the man” “our” and “they” point back either to the referent and the head word “She” he talks to from time-to-time on the line or all the people on the line in search of a visa or all the people (the Nigerian people) in general.

Other reference items’ identity in the text is not retrieved endophorically but homophorically:

Homophoric references: 33 homophoric reference items are extracted from this text. These are some of them: “the American embassy” in (1), “line outside the American embassy in Lagos” in (1), “the smaller, vine-encrusted gates of the Czech embassy” in (2), “the newspaper vendors” in (3), “*The Guardian, Thenews...The Vanguard*” in (3), “the beggars” in (4), “the ice-cream bicycles” in (5), “the tiny fly” in (6), “the man” in (7), “abeg” in (7), “The air” in (8), “Dr. Balogun” in (9), “the visa interview” in (10), “those images of her son Ugonna’s small, plump body...” in (11), “her son” in (11), etc. The extensive use of homophoric reference items here suggests that the

current text depends greatly on the shared context of culture for its interpretation.

3.2. Analysis of Lexical Cohesion in the Sample Texts

3.2.1. Text 1 (Purple Hibiscus, 2003: 97-99)

The types of lexical cohesion in Text 1 are summarized in table 4.

Table 4: Lexical Cohesion Types in Text 1

Types of L. R.	Taxonomic							Expectancy
	Classification				Composition			
	Cohyponymy	Class/Subclass	Contrast	Similarity		Meronymy	Comeronymy	
				Synonymy	Repetition			
Frequency	00	02	11	20	99	17	24	33
Percentage (%)	00	00.97	05.33	57.76		08.25	11.65	16.01

As shown in the table above, Text 1 comprises all in all 206 lexical cohesion items. These items are not distributed evenly. Out of the 206 items, 173 (i.e., 83.96 %) are taxonomic and 33 (i.e., 16.01 %) are expectancy. The 02 sub-categories of taxonomic relations are identified in this text: classification and composition (Eggsins, 1994). But, the former is more used than the latter here. In fact, the analysis of lexical cohesion of this text exudes that 132 (i.e., 64.06 %) classification items and 41 (i.e., 19.90 %) composition items are employed in it. As regards the distribution of classification items in the text, it is noted that similarity (119/ 57.76 %) ranks first, contrast (11/ 05.33 %) second, class/subclass (02/ 00.97 %) third and co-hyponymy fourth (00/ 00 %). It is also noted that, within the sub-type of similarity, repetition (99/ 48.05 %) dominates over synonymy (20/09.70 %).

The most repeated lexical item in the text is “Papa”. It is repeated 08 times: (1), (3), (14), (16), (17), (18), (21) and (23). This is followed by “Priest”. It is mentioned 05 times: (8), (14), (19), (20) and (22). The following lexical items appear 04 times in the text, “Mass”: (4), (7), (8) and (18), “church”: (2), (11), (12) and (18), “house”: (12), (16), (19) and (20), and “said”: (4), (6), (17) and (23). The observation here is that these lexical items encode the field or area of focus of the text. The field of the text can actually be inferred from its major lexical string (s) (Halliday and Hasan, 1985/1989, Eggsins, 1994). Drawing on the major lexical string (s) in the text, one can say that the text develops around the participants “Papa” and “Priest”, their actions (said) and the settings of their actions (Mass, church or house).

3.2.2. Text 2 (Half Of A Yellow Sun, 2007: 146-148)

Table 5: Lexical Cohesion Types in Text 2

Types of L. R.	Taxonomic							Expectancy
	Classification				Composition			
	Cohyponymy	Class/Subclass	Contrast	Similarity		Meronymy	Conymy	
				Synonymy	Repetition			
Frequency	00	00	31	53	219	28	32	56
Percentage (%)	00	00	07.39	64.91		06.68	07.63	13.36

The table above indicates how lexical cohesion items are distributed across Text 2. In fact, it contains a total figure of 419 items. As indicated in the table, the distribution of these items is not even. Out of the 419 items, 363 (i.e., 86.61 %) are taxonomic relations and 56 (i.e., 13.36 %) are expectancy relations. This study reveals that the text contains the 02 sub-categories of taxonomic relations, viz. classification and composition (Eggins, 1994). Indeed, classification is more employed in this passage than composition. With regard to the distribution of classification items in the text, it is discovered that similarity (272/ 64.91 %) comes first followed by contrast (31/ 07.39 %). It is noted that class/subclass (00/ 00 %) and cohyponymy (00/ 00 %) are absent in the text. It is also noted that, within the sub-type of similarity, repetition (219/ 52.26 %) dominates over synonymy (53/ 12.64 %).

The most repeated lexical item in the text is “Mohammed”. It is repeated 17 times: (1), (2), (8), (13), (15), (19), (23) (26), (31), (38), (44), (48), (60), (67), (75), (78) and (83). It is followed by “Olanna”. It is mentioned 13 times: (1), (4), (12), (17), (23), (26), (31), (34), (47), (59), (73), (77) and (79). This item is followed by “said” that is mentioned 09 times: (3), (9), (30), (37), (48), (64), (68), (78) and (83). The subsequent lexical items appear 06 times in the text, “head”: (11), (17), (38), (56), (80), and (82), “looked”: (2), (18), (31), (39), (50) and (77), “go”: (15), (20), (25), (41), (42) and (43), “car”: (26), (48), (52), (67), (74) and (75), and “Arize”: (22), (61), (62), (63), (64) and (65). The observation here is that these lexical items encode the field or area of focus of the text. The field of the text can actually be inferred from its major lexical string (s) (Halliday and Hasan, 1985/1989, Eggins, 1994). From the major lexical string (s) in the text, one can infer that the text spins around the participants “Mohammed” and “Olanna”, their parts (head), their actions (said, looked, and go), their objects (car), etc.

3.2.3. Text 3 (*The Thing Around Your Neck*, 2009: 128-130)

Table 6: Lexical Cohesion Types in Text 3

Types of L. R.	Taxonomic							Expectancy
	Classification				Composition			
	Cohyponymy	Class/Subclass	Contrast	Similarity		Meronymy	Conymy	
				Synonymy	Repetition			
Frequency	00	00	24	15	88	17	19	27
Percentage (%)	00	00	12.63	54.21		08.94	10	14.21

As shown in the table above, Text 3 consists of all in all 190 lexical cohesion items. These items are not distributed evenly. Out of the 190 items, 163 (i.e., 85.78 %) are taxonomic relations and 27 (i.e., 14.21 %) are expectancy relations. The 02 sub-categories of taxonomic relations are identified in this text: classification and composition (Eggs, 1994). However, classification is more employed than composition here. Indeed, the study of lexical cohesion of this text reveals that 127 (i.e., 66.84 %) classification items and 36 (i.e., 18.94 %) composition items are employed in it. Regarding the distribution of classification items in the extract, it is noticed that similarity (103/ 54.21 %) comes first followed by contrast (24/ 12.63 %). It is noticed that class/subclass (00/ 00 %) and co-hyponymy (00/00 %) are not used at all in this text. It is also noticed that, within the sub-type of similarity, repetition (88/ 46.31 %) predominates over synonymy (15/ 07.89 %).

The most repeated lexical item in the text is “said”. It is repeated 08 times: (7), (9), (11), (16), (17), (23), (25) and (26). The following lexical items are mentioned 07 times in the text, “man”: (7), (14), (20), (23), (26), (29) and (29) and “do”: (3), (6), (7), (9), (17), (27) and (28). These are also followed by “soldier”. It appears 06 times in the text: (17), (20), (22), (23), (24) and (28). The observation here is that these lexical items encode the field of the text. The field of the text can actually be inferred from its major lexical string (s) (Halliday and Hasan, 1985/1989, Eggs, 1994). Based on the major lexical string (s) in the text, one can say that the present text is less concerned with the participants “Man” and “Soldier” than it is with their actions (said and do).

3.3. Analysis of Conjunction in the Sample Texts

3.3.1. Text 1 (Purple Hibiscus, 2003: 97-99)

The analysis of Conjunction in Text 1 is tabulated in Table 7.

Table 7: Conjunction Types in Text 1

Conjunction Types	Elaboration		Extension		Enhancement	
	Implicit	Explicit	Implicit	Explicit	Implicit	Explicit
Frequency	12	00	02	03	00	02
Percentage (%)	63.15		26.31		10.52	

The table above indicates how conjunction is distributed in Text 1. As the table shows, the analysis exudes the 03 categories of conjunction, viz. elaboration, extension and enhancement, propounded by Eggins (1994). However, the 03 categories are not distributed evenly. In fact, 19 conjunctive elements are identified in Extract 4. Out of the 19 elements, 12 (i.e., 63.15 %) are elaborating, 05 (i.e., 26.31 %) extensive and 02 (i.e., 10.52 %) enhancing. It is obvious in the foregoing that the dominant category here is elaboration (12/19). This suggests thus that the current text is mainly concerned with restating information in another way. Given that elaboration is an internal (rhetorical) conjunctive item, its frequent use here is indicative of written mode. In fact, all the elaborating relations in the text are encoded in the conjunctive item “*In fact*”. The subsequent example illustrates this.

Example 1: Papa drove us to Christmas Mass at St. Paul’s (X₁). (**In fact**) Aunty Ifeoma and her children were climbing into their station wagon as we drove into the sprawling church compound (X₂).

It is obvious in the example above that (X₂) latches on (X₁) with the help of the elaborating conjunction “*In fact*”. It should be noted, however, that this conjunction is not marked explicitly in the text. This is to say, none of the elaborating relations in the present text is expressed explicitly. The 02 other categories (extension and enhancement) also function to organize the structure of the current text. The use of extension (05/19), for instance, denotes that the text is not only concerned with restating information in a different number of ways but also with extending it by stating additions and variations. The extensive conjunctive relations in the current text are encoded in such conjunctions as “*But*”, “*And*”, “*Although*”, “*Instead*” and “*After all*”, as in:

Example 2: (But) They waited for Papa to stop the Mercedes and then came over to greet us (X3). (**And**) Aunty Ifeoma said they had gone to the early Mass and they would see us at lunchtime (X4)... Although I tried to concentrate on Mass, I kept thinking of Amaka’s lipstick, wondering what it felt like to run colour over your lips (X7)... **Instead** he talked about the zinc (X9)... “**After all**, how many of you give to this church, *gbo?* (X11).

It is obvious in the above that some of the extensive relations here are implicit (02/05) and others explicit (03/05). Again, the use of enhancement shows that the text is concerned with presenting a sequence of events. The 02 enhancing conjunctions “*After*” and “*When*” in the text confirms this. This is illustrated in the example below.

Example 3: *After* Mass, we accompanied Papa to a fund-raising in the multipurpose hall next to the church building (X18)...**When** the M.C. announced the amount, the priest got up and started to dance, jerking his behind this and that, and the crowd rose up and cheered so loudly it was like the rumblings of thunder at the end of the rainy season (X22).

It appears above that all the enhancing conjunctive items in the present text are stamped explicitly. It should be noted that this text has all in all 14/19 (i.e., 73.68 %) implicitly marked conjunctions. This suggests thus that the text has little explicit conjunctive structure which is uncommon in a well rehearsed written text.

3.3.2. Text 2 (*Half Of A Yellow Sun, 2007: 146-148*)

Table 8: Conjunction Types in Text 2

Conjunction Types	Elaboration		Extension		Enhancement	
	Implicit	Explicit	Implicit	Explicit	Implicit	Explicit
Frequency	26	00	05	02	10	01
Percentage (%)	59.09		15.90		25	

The conjunctive structure of Text 2 exudes the three types of conjunction. As shown in the table above, this text contains a total number of 44 conjunctive properties: 26 (i.e., 59.09 %) are elaborating, 07 (i.e., 15.90 %) extensive and 11 (i.e., 25 %) enhancing. It follows from the foregoing that the dominant category here is elaboration, suggesting that the text is mainly concerned with restating information in another way. As elaboration is an internal (rhetorical) conjunctive item, its frequent use here is indicative of written mode. Indeed, all the elaborating relations in the text are expressed with the conjunctive item “*In fact*”. This is illustrated in the example below.

Example 4: He was already heading indoors (Y₁₁). Olanna followed (Y₁₂). (**In fact**) He worried too much, did Mohammed (Y₁₃). (**In fact**) Muslim students were always demonstrating about one thing or the other, after all, and harassing people who were Western-dressed, but they always dispersed quickly enough (Y₁₄).

It is clear in the example above that (Y₁₃) elaborates upon (Y₁₁) and (Y₁₂) with the elaborating conjunction “*In fact*”. It is of note, however, that this conjunction is not marked explicitly in the Extract. This is to say, none of the elaborating relations in the present text is expressed explicitly. The 02 other

categories (extension and enhancement) also function to organize the structure of the current text. The use of extension (07/44), for example, indicates that the current text is not only concerned with restating information in a different number of ways but also with extending it by stating additions and variations. The extensive conjunctive relations in Extract 5 are realized by “*And*” and “*But*”. The example below illustrates this.

Example 5: He was already heading indoors (Y₁₁). **(And)** Olanna followed (Y₁₂)... ‘I look like a proper Muslim woman,’ she joked (Y₁₈). **But** Mohammed barely smiled (Y₁₉).

It is obvious in the example above that some of the extensive relations here are implicit (05/07) and others explicit (02/07). Again, the use of enhancement proves that the text is concerned with presenting a sequence of events. In fact, there are 11 (i.e., 25 %) enhancing relations in the current text. These are encoded in the conjunctive item “*Then*”. Note that only 01 of the 11 extensive relations is marked explicitly. This is illustrated in the example below.

Example 6: The street looked strange, unfamiliar; the compound gate was broken, the metal flattened on the ground (Y₅₀). **Then** she noticed Aunty Ifeka’s kiosk, or what remained of it: splinters of wood, packets of groundnuts lying in the dust (Y₅₁)... ‘Who are you?’ another asked, standing in front of the car (Y₇₄). **(Then)** Mohammed opened his door, the car still on, and spoke in rapid, coaxing Hausa (Y₇₅).

It is obvious in the analysis that the present text has all in all 41/44 (i.e., 93.18 %) implicit conjunctions. This suggests thus that the text has little explicit conjunctive structure which is uncommon in a well rehearsed written text.

3.3.3. Text 3 (*The Thing Around Your Neck*, 2009: 128-130)

Table 9: Conjunction Types in Text 3

Conjunction Types	Elaboration		Extension		Enhancement	
	Implicit	Explicit	Implicit	Explicit	Implicit	Explicit
Frequency	15	00	01	02	02	02
Percentage (%)	68.18		13.63		18.18	

As shown in the table above, the conjunctive structure of Text 3 exhibits the 03 types of conjunction, viz. elaboration, extension and enhancement, propounded by Eggins (1994). However, the 03 categories are not distributed evenly. In fact, 22 conjunctive patterns are identified in Extract 6. Out of the 22 patterns, 15 (i.e., 68.18 %) are elaborating, 03 (i.e., 13.63 %) extensive and 04 (i.e., 18.18 %) enhancing. The dominant category here is

elaboration (15/22). This suggests thus that the current text is mainly concerned with restating information in another way. Since elaboration is an internal (rhetorical) conjunctive item, its frequent use here is indicative of written mode. Indeed, all the elaborating relations in the Extract are expressed by the conjunctive item “*In fact*”. The subsequent example illustrates this.

Example 7: She stood in line outside the American embassy in Lagos, staring straight ahead, barely moving, a blue plastic file of documents tucked under her arm (Z_1). (**In fact**) She was the forty-eighth person in the line of about two hundred that trailed from the closed gates of the American embassy all the way past the smaller, vine-encrusted gates of the Czech embassy (Z_2). (**In fact**) She did not notice the newspaper vendors who blew whistles and pushed *The Guardian*, *Thenews*, and *The Vanguard* in her face (Z_3).

It is obvious in Example 1 that (Z_2) latches on (Z_1) and (Z_3) on (Z_2) with the elaborating conjunction “*In fact*”. Note, however, that this conjunction is not marked explicitly in the text. This is to say, none of the elaborating relations in the present text is expressed explicitly. The 02 other categories (extension and enhancement) also function to organize the structure of the current text. The use of extension (03/22), for instance, denotes that the text is not only concerned with restating information in a different number of ways but also with extending it by stating additions and variations. The extensive conjunctive relations in the current text are encoded in such conjunctions as “*And*” and “*Or*”, as in:

Example 8: **Or** the beggars who walked up and down holding out enamel plates (Z_4). **Or** the ice-cream bicycles that honked (Z_5)... (**And**) The man behind her tapped her again (Z_{14}).

It is obvious in the above that 02 of the 03 extensive relations here are implicit and only 01 explicit. Again, the use of enhancement confirms that the text is concerned with presenting a sequence of events. The use of the 04 enhancing conjunctions encoded in “*When*” and “*Then*” and “*Because*” in the text confirms this. This is illustrated in the example below.

Example 9: **When** the man standing behind her tapped her on the back and asked, “Do you have change, *abeg*, two tens for twenty naira?” she stared at him for a while, to focus, to remember where she was, before she shook her head and said, “No (Z_7)”... (**Then**) She jerked around and nearly screamed from the sharp pain that ran down her back (Z_{15})... (**Then**) She turned to look across the street, moving her neck slowly (Z_{18})... **Because** they had all woken up early-those who had slept at all-to get to the American embassy before dawn; because they had all struggled for the visa line, dodging the soldiers’ swinging whips as they were herded back and forth before the line was finally formed; because they were all afraid that the American embassy might decide not open its gates today, and they would have to do it all over again the day after tomorrow since the embassy did not open on Wednesdays, they had formed friendships (Z_{28}).

It is clear in the example above that some of the enhancing conjunctive items (02/04) in the present text are stamped explicitly and others (02/04) implicitly. Note the structural parallelism created with the conjunction “Because” in (Z₂₈). This conjunction is mentioned 03 times consecutively in the sentence and this denotes emphasis. Like the other texts, Text 3 contains 18/22 (i.e., 81.81 %) implicitly marked conjunctions. This suggests thus that the text has little explicit conjunctive structure which is uncommon in a well rehearsed written text.

4. Discussion of Findings and Conclusion

The analyses carried out above exude that Texts **1**, **2** and **3** display a sum total figure of **295**, **611** and **293** respectively. This figure is in actual fact shared by the 03 cohesive features viz. reference, lexical cohesion and conjunction.

As for the analysis of reference, it has been noted that the 03 texts are knit mainly with endophoric reference ties (64.28 % for Text 1, 72.97 % for Text 2 and 59.25 % for Text 3) and homophoric reference ties (32.85 % for Text 1, 25.67 % for Text 2 and 40.74 % for Text 3). A close analysis of endophoric reference in the 03 texts further reveals that a very large part of the endophoric reference ties is anaphoric (45/70 (i.e., 64.28 %) in Text 1, 102/148 (i.e., 68.91 %) in Text 2 and 46/81 (i.e., 56.79 %) in Text 3). The extensive use of anaphoric reference ties here denotes a written mode. It has also been noted that these anaphoric reference items are specific and personal participants. This is a characteristic of a spoken mode. The anaphoric reference items identified in the texts under study here actually spin around many participants. Some of these participants are noted to span the whole texts while others are not. The participants that truly span the 03 texts are considered as the major participants therein. As a result, they are considered as what is being talked about in the 03 texts. In Text 1, the 02 major participants that are being talked about are “Papa” and “us” (the narrator, Kambili and entire family (the Achikes)). In Text 2, the 03 major participants that are being talked about are “Olanna”, “Mohammed” and “They” (the Muslim students). In Text 3, the 02 major participants that are being talked about are “She” (the nameless woman who goes to the American embassy for a visa) and “the man”. The extensive use of homophoric reference items in the 03 texts simply exudes that the texts depend heavily on the shared context of culture for their interpretation.

As regards the analysis of lexical cohesion, it has been discovered that the 03 texts contain a huge number of lexical cohesion ties (206/295 (i.e., 69.83 %) for Text 1, 419/611 (i.e., 68.57 %) for Text 2 and 190/293 (i.e., 64.84 %) for Text 3). This denotes lexical density. The study further reveals that the identified lexical cohesion ties are shared by the 02 categories: taxonomic and expectancy. In fact, more than 85 percent of the identified

lexical cohesion items in the 03 texts are taxonomic relations. Also, the taxonomic relations involve the 02 sub-types of classification and composition. It has been noted that more than 60 percent of the taxonomic relations are classification items. The classification items also entail the 04 sub-categories of co-hyponymy, class/subclass, contrast and similarity. But the study shows that similarity is the dominant sub-category used in the 03 texts. It represents more than 50 percent of the total number of classification items. The similarity items also involve the 02 sub-types of synonymy and repetition. Repetition is marked to be the dominant sub-type in the 03 texts with an average figure of 48 percent. This denotes that the 03 texts are latched mainly with repeated lexical items. The repeated items in Text 1 are “Papa”, “Priest”, “Mass”, “church”, “house” and “said”. The repeated lexical items in Text 2 are “Mohammed”, “Olanna”, “Arize”, “head”, “said”, “looked”, “go” and “car”. The repeated items in Text 3 are “man”, “soldier”, “said”, “do” and “go”. It follows from this to note that the identified repeated lexical items here encode or are constructed around the field or area of focus of the 03 texts. Given the frequency of each of the repeated items, it can be put forth here that Text 1 develops around the participants “Papa” and “Priest”, their actions (said) and the settings of their actions (Mass, church or house). Text 2 spins around the participants “Mohammed” and “Olanna”, their parts (head), their actions (said, looked, and go), their objects (car), etc. But Text 3 is less concerned with the participants “man” and “soldier” than it is with their actions (said and do).

The analysis of conjunction exudes that the conjunctive structure of the 03 texts displays the 03 types of conjunction, viz. elaboration, extension and enhancement, propounded by Eggins (1994). However, the 03 categories are not distributed evenly. The dominant category in the 03 texts is elaboration (12/19 (i.e., 63.15 %) for Text 1, 26/44 (i.e., 59.09 %) for Text 2 and 15/22 (i.e., 68.18 %) for Text 3. In fact, all the elaborating relations in the 03 texts are encoded in the conjunctive item “*In fact*”. This item is not marked explicitly across the 03 texts. The item adds to, resays or elaborates upon what goes before in the texts. In doing so, it functions to ensure the rhetorical (internal) organization of the texts. Note that most of the logical relations in the 03 texts (Text 1 (12/19), Text 2 (26/44) and Text 3 (15/22) derive from the internal organization of the texts. This reflects thus that the narrator-writer’s concern is with the repackaging of the same information in a number of different ways, rather than with the presenting of a sequence of events in the 03 texts. The 03 texts can then be said to have a little explicit conjunctive structure in that they include many implicit conjunctive items (**14/19** (i.e., 73.68 %), **41/44** (i.e., 93.18 %) and **18/22** (i.e., 81.81 %) for Texts 1, 2 and 3 respectively). This implies thus that the reader will have to supply the unmentioned logical relations where necessary.

In conclusion, this study has helped gain a full insight into the patterns of meaning in fictional texts. These patterns created by the cohesive features:

reference, lexical cohesion and conjunction, function gradually to build the internal (or narrative structure) of the texts. This is to say, they gradually function to generate texture (Halliday and Hasan, 1976) in the 03 texts. Texture is actually what ensures the unity of the language of the 03 texts both at textual and contextual levels (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, Halliday and Hasan 1985/1989, Eggins, 1994, etc.). It is still the same texture that fits the texts into context, which creates meaning (Blommaert, 2005).

Références

- Adichie, C.N. (2003). *Purple Hibiscus*, First Edition. Lagos: Farafina.
- Adichie, C.N. (2007). *Half Of A Yellow Sun*, First Edition. Lagos: Farafina.
- Adichie, C.N. (2009). *The Thing Around Your Neck*, First Edition. Lagos: Farafina.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*, First Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eggins, S. (1994). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*, London: Pinter Publishers.
- Finch, G. (2003). *How to Study Linguistics: A Guide to Understanding Language*, Second Edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic Criticism*, First Edition. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*, First Edition. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. (1985/1989). *Language, text and context: aspects of language in a semiotic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Koussouhon, A. L. and Allagbe, A. A. (2013). “The Lexicogrammar of Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie’s Fiction: A Systemic Functional Contribution”, in *Langage & Devenir*, N°22, Revue Semestrielle. Pp. 19-44.
- Leech, G. N. (1965). “This Bread I Break: Language and Interpretation”, in Freeman D. C. (1970) *Linguistic and Literary Style*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students*, First Edition. London: Routledge.
- Xi, Y. (2010). “Cohesion Studies in the Past 30 Years: Development, Application and Chaos”, in *The International Journal-Language Society and Culture*, Issue 31, pp.139-147.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1975). *Stylistics and the teaching of literature*, First Edition. Hong kong: Longman Group (FE) Ltd.
- Yule, G. (2010). *The Study Of Language*, Fourth Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.