
Grammatical Cohesion in Sports Discourse: A Dissection of Selected Radio Programmes in Ibadan Metropolitan Area, Nigeria

Adewole Oluwaseun Alolade¹

¹ Corresponding author, Department of English and Literary Studies, Kings University, Ode-Omu, Nigeria: adewolealolade@gmail.com

Received: 17 July 2023

Accepted: 3 December 2023

Published: 8 January 2024

Abstract

There is rarely any radio station that do not present programme on sports in the contemporary age. Most radio stations have their sports analysis in the various languages that their prospective listeners understand. It is possible because the issue of sports has become an inevitable phenomenon to the people irrespective of age, status, and gender. It has become a unifying force among people of varied background. This, therefore, necessitated the linguistic investigation into the grammatical properties utilized by the sports analysts in their presentations on the radio in Ibadan between September and December, 2020. The study examines the occurrence of the grammatical properties in enhancing cohesion in the presentations made by sports presenters on the radio stations. These grammatical devices include; reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. Ferdinand de Saussure's Model of Language Structure on Syntagmatic Relations was utilized as the theoretical framework for the study. The data for analysis in the study comprised thirty sports presentations that were recorded and afterwards transcribed to examine the manifestations of the grammatical devices. The results from the analyses show that personal reference is the most prominent of all the types of reference. Nominal substitution and nominal ellipsis are the most recurrent of the types of substitution and ellipsis. The striking manifestations of coordinating, subordinating, and additive conjuncts dominate the types of conjunction employed by the sports analysts on the radio. The study suggests that radio analysts should see language as a weapon for expressing content and meaning by practically influencing the people around them.

Keywords: Conjunction, discourse, ellipsis, grammatical cohesion, reference, substitution



To cite this article: Alolade, A.O. (2024). Grammatical cohesion in sports discourse: A dissection of selected radio programmes in Ibadan Metropolitan Area, Nigeria *SALEE: Study of Applied Linguistics and English Education*, 5(1), 43-60. <https://doi.org/10.35961/salee.v5i1.957>

DOI: 10.35961/salee.v5i1.957

1. Introduction

Writing and producing scientific papers involves supporting material in the form of a topic sentence provided by references (Basori, 2017). Frequently, scientific paper represents the greatest challenge for students (Lina & Supriyono, 2021). Writing scientific papers involves supporting material in the form of a topic sentence provided by references (Basori, 2017). Relating to this content, it's important to observe the processes for obtaining expert opinions other than direct quotations. The procedure of picking and borrowing sentences to support the primary concept in our work is not permitted to utilize the same words as the phrases we are referencing. In this situation, the exact phrases are presented as quotes. The majority of our written work demonstrates our inability to reformulate the meaning of a sentence and alter its grammatical structure.

The systematic organization of a conversation projects the unity that operates in it. This bond bothers on how every part of the conversation holds together. Thus, cohesion has to do with the explicit connections which link the different parts of a text and enable them to hang together (Adiantika, 2015). It is the grammatical and syntactic relations that provide links among the various parts of a text. Cohesion links the components of the surface structure of the text through the grammatical forms (Afzaal, Chishti & Imram, 2019). It is the formal connective tools which connect the actual words that we see or hear in sequence (Munjizah, 2015). A text is cohesive when the various components of the surface text are jointly and mutually connected within a particular kind of sequence. It concentrates on the grammatical dependencies and syntactic knowledge that a language user demonstrates in constructing the relations that makes the text to be unified (Ademilokun & Taiwo, 2013). These relations are the devices that are used to achieve cohesion in the text. They are the parameters which specify whether grammatical cohesion is evident in the presentations of sport presenters on radio stations in Ibadan, Nigeria.

Any conversations, dialogue, arguments, chat, and analysis made concerning sports-related topics, events, and issues can be termed sports discourse. It is the exchanges, debates, commentary, and inscriptions about several aspects of sports. This includes games, athletes, strategies, rules, controversies, and the wider cultural and social implications of sports in society (Alolade, 2023). Grammatical discourse in sports deals with sports discourse in which

the grammatical properties that reside in the language are considered. These grammatical items are used to enrich cohesion in discourse (Ogunsiji & Farinde, 2013). Sporting events are replete with many activities that are documented in text. The text forms are either spoken or written. The spoken form of the documentary is the discourses that are aired using the mass media as the means to reach the audience. The analysts who engage in these documentaries are expected to demonstrate high level of communicative competence in their utterance. Competence is the speaker's ability to produce and understand sentences which are appropriate to the context in which they occur (Taha & Reishaan, 2008). It is a kind of competence that is defined through other kinds of competence, such as: grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic (Yule, 1996). At the level of grammar, competence is exhibited through the knowledge of lexical items as well as knowledge of morphology, syntax, sentence, semantics and phonology (Canale & Swain, 1980).

However, the societal notion on sports analysis on the radio is that any individual can analyse sports up if they can bear the financial implication of the time allocated to such programme on air. The result, in most cases, has been poor demonstrations of communicative competence by the analysts. Furthermore, the sports discourse is poly-thematic. The conversations are structured across multiple subject matters through language (Taborek, 2012). Whenever sports analysts encode facts in discourse, they do not only use language but also do things with them. The sports analysts on radio convey particular meanings and messages because certain words and expressions are employed in their discourse.

It is pertinent to state that cohesion in discourse has been the salient principle of textuality. It is one of the criteria that a text must fulfill to have communicative function. This concept has been examined to analyze discourse across several fields of linguistics. This study is therefore unique, as it is devoted to explore grammatical cohesion in the field of discourse analysis by scrutinizing grammatical cohesion in the utterances of sport presenters on the radio during the Corona Virus Pandemic lockdown in Ibadan metropolis, Nigeria.

1.1. Research Questions

1. Do sports analysts employ grammatical elements to create bond among sentences in their texts between September and December, 2020?
2. What is the level of occurrence of each grammatical elements in the text of sports analysts between September and December, 2020?

2. Review of Related Literature

The theoretical model employed for this study is Ferdinand de Saussure's Model of Language Structure on Syntagmatic Relations. Syntagmatic relations are generally related to as co-occurrences in some context (Wanying & Kun, 2015). They are the kinds of relation that hold between two or more words that are co-present in a sequence (Pancerz, 2015). They are also a type of semantic relations which exist between words that co-occur in the same sentence or

text. Syntagmatic relations are not committed to concept but simply in the definite co-occurrence of expressions within certain setting (Peters & Weller, 2008). They are conceivable outcomes of blend. They allude intra-literarily to different signifiers that co-exhibit inside the content (Namaziandost, Shafiee & Rasooyar, 2018). The relations occur within single document or between keywords assigned to a document and can be described as a network (Peters & Weller, 2008). They refer intertextually to other co-present signifiers (Clarke, 2013). These relations enjoy an agreement of positioning in the sentence or text (Wanying & Kun, 2015). They are the structural bond that link morpheme, words, phrasal, clausal and sentences together in an order. The order holds on the horizontal axis or axis of chain (Adedimeji, 2005). The axis tolerates the possibility of lexical elements entering into larger whole with other elements of the language through compounds and derivations in the morphological realm, lexical constituents, and sentences in syntax (Geeraerts, 2010) due to the fact that the relations are quick straight relations between units in a segmental succession. The relations admit mixture of two or more words, or word-bunches; one of which is changed by the alternate structures or as a unit is alluded to as syntagmatic (Namaziandost et al, 2018) because they constitute ‘on line’ co-occurrences (Adedimeji, 2005).

Combinations based on sequentiality are called syntagma or syntagm. Syntagmas originates from Greek word, meaning ‘connect to something’. It is the means by which words connect with words to form group of words, and which in turn connects with another group of words to form a sentence and so on (Akbarov, 2016). The notion of a syntagma applies among others to group of words and to complex units of every size and kind (Pancerz, 2015). A syntagma is an elementary constituent segment within a text (KinkyLipids, 2020). It is a syntactic string of words or linguistic units that forms a part or some larger syntactic unit. It is a linguistic unit consisting of a set of linguistic forms that are in a sequential relationship to one another (Akbarov, 2016). The linguistic forms are phonemic, word, phrasal or sentential in nature. These linguistic forms depend largely on the level of analysis. It is also an orderly set of interacting signifiers which form some meaningful whole that are governed by some explicit and implicit rules and conventions. It involves combinations that are based on ordering and the possibilities of combination (Clarke, 2013). It is syntactically indivisible and united as the syntagmas constituents work together to produce a certain meaning. As a syntactic model of connection, it deals mainly with word formation and meaning (Akbarov, 2016).

Consequently, the rule of syntagma in ‘indivisibility’ compels ‘in’ to come before ‘divide,’ ‘divide’ to come before ‘sible,’ ‘sible’ comes before ‘ly’ and ‘ly’ before ‘ty’ hence, in + divi + sibi + li + ty. This bond of arrangement cannot be altered without breaching the syntagmatic relations. The same chain makes ‘the all-time goal scorer’ to exhibit syntagmatic relationship, which is lost when it is reversed as ‘scorer goal all-time the’ - an ungrammatical construction. So the dimensional sequence that spoken and written bits of language follow is

the syntagmatic relationship holding between or among them. That is why syntax studies word combination processes or how linguistic units are arranged in horizontal chain-like axis (Adedimeji, 2005).

Furthermore, syntagma can be syntactically predicative and non-predicative in form (Akbarov, 2016). The predicative aspect of the syntagma is communicative. It produces a predication. The non-predicative syntagma deals with word combinations and is used to express certain opinion. It is nominative (naming). The non-predicative syntagma is attributive, objective, and relative in nature. On the other hand, notional syntagma is identified by Namaziandost et al. (2018) to consist of: predicative (the blend of a subject and a predicate), objective (- / - a verb and its question), attributive (a thing and trait), verb-modifying (a changed notional word, for example, a verb, descriptive word, or intensifier, with its verb-modifying modifier). Syntactic collocation is another kind of syntagma which enable backward and forward phrasal associates to be employed in the relation (Lapesa, Evert, & Schulte im Walde, 2014).

Nevertheless, paradigmatic relations can also be expressed syntagmatically. This is because paradigmatic related adjectives tend to co-occur within the same sentence with nouns at the subject or predicative position (Clarke, 2013). Generally, both paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations enable the language users to peruse concept classifications for appropriate search terms and also help such users to demand expansion (Peters & Weller, 2008). The relations emphasize systematic analysis of language (Olujide, 2007).

2.1. Grammatical Cohesion

Just like lexical cohesion, grammatical elements can be used by encoders to achieve cohesion in discourse (Osisanwo, 2003). This is done as a means of creating links between sentences in a text through the use of the grammatical resources of the language (Taiwo, 2010). This is the type of cohesion in which Bex (1996) states that cohesion can be seen as residing in the grammatical properties of the language. Grammatical items like pronouns, preposition, conjunctions, which are referred to as particles by some linguists, can be used to achieve cohesion in the same way the lexical items could be used to bring about cohesive ties in discourse (Ogunsiji & Farinde, 2013). These items that are grammatical in nature are not the same as the ones that are lexical in nature. Halliday and Hasan (1976) conceptualize cohesion to comprise four types of grammatical cohesive ties (Dontcheva-Navratilova, 2017). These grammatical resources are: reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunctions. These are considered below.

2.1.1. Reference

This is a grammatical device commonly used for cohesion in texts (Taiwo, 2010). Reference, in cohesion, is used to retrieve presupposed information in the text (Sudirman & Tiasari,

2017). It can be identified as the situation in which one element in a text cannot be semantically interpreted unless it refers to another element in the text (Bahaziq, 2016). An item cannot be interpreted semantically on its own. It has to be interpreted by looking at other elements that have been used before it or the ones that will be used after it (Taiwo, 2010).

Reference can either be exophoric or endophoric in nature (Bloor & Bloor, 2013). Endophoric reference is also known as textual reference while exophoric reference is addressed as situational or contextual reference. Exophoric reference contributes to the creation of the text because it links the language with the context of situation, but it does not contribute to the integration of one passage with another, so that the two, together form part of the same text (Ayodabo, 2002). Endophoric (textual) reference is a kind of reference that is within the text. Whatever is being indicated as the referent can be found within the text. Such a referent can be anaphoric, cataphoric and homophoric (Ayodabo, 2002; Ogunsiji & Farinde, 2013). An anaphoric reference is a reference whose referent precedes it. It is a reference that points backwards to previously mentioned information in a text (Paltridge, 2012; Bloor & Bloor, 2013). Cataphoric reference points forward to information that will be presented later in the text. This is done when the information needed for the interpretation is to be found in the part of the text that follows. Anaphoric reference is the most relevant aspect of reference that is used to achieve cohesion. This is done so as to provide a link with a preceding portion of the text (Sudirman & Tiasari, 2017). Homophoric reference is a reference that requires some kinds of general knowledge to understand. It is where the identity of the item can be retrieved by reference to the general cultural knowledge rather than the specific context of the text (Paltridge, 2012). This kind of reference can be explained by identifying the class of the referent item collectively and by explaining it based on the context in which it is found (Ogunsiji & Farinde, 2013).

However, reference in the text can be indicated using pronominals, demonstratives, definite articles and comparatives (Sudirman & Tiasari, 2017). Three types of reference are identified by Halliday and Hasan (1976). These are personal, demonstrative and comparative reference (Bahaziq, 2016). Personal reference is indicated through its function in the speech situation. It is by means of function in the speech situation through the category of person (Ayodabo, 2003). Personal care is mainly used to reflect with possessive determiners and possessive pronouns (Li, 2013). Demonstrative reference is reference by means of location. The writer or speaker locates this kind of reference along a scale of proximity defined in terms of selective participation and circumstances that define the textual occasion (Taiwo, 2010). Instructions are mainly composed of demonstrative pronoun and indicating adverbs (Li, 2013). Comparative reference is a form of indirect reference that is established by means of identity and similarity (Ayodabo, 2002). Comparative reference is often reflected by the comparative of adjectives and adverbs. Besides, the textual features of reference across the sentence boundaries when it connects, allows the writer or speaker to use the short form of

the demonstrative pronoun to express the objects which was once mentioned or to be mentioned in the context of the content, so that the discourse can be concise and compact. Consequently, all reference items except demonstrative adverbs and some comparative adverbs function within the nominal group (noun phrase) in grammar and that the logical structure of the nominal group is one of the modifications. It consists of a head with optional modifier. The modification preceding the head is termed premodifier and the following post modifier.

2.1.2. Substitution

It is a situation in which a word or an item is substituted for another one instead of repeating it (Ogunsiji & Farinde, 2013). Substituted element can include a word, a group of words or a clause with an item in the next clause or sentence (Osisanwo, 2003). It is a relation between linguistic items; a relation in the lexico-grammatical level (the level of grammar and vocabulary, or linguistic form) (Ayodabo, 2002). It is a grammatical category that depends on words resources rather than on semantics (Adiantika, 2015). A substitute can be compared to a kind of counter which is used instead of repetition of a particular item. The substitution must have the same structural function as the item in which it is a substitute (Owolabi, Alabi & Ayodabo, 1994; Adiantika 2015). Substitution resembles reference from the point of view of textual cohesion. This is because, it is potentially anaphoric, and constitute a link between parts of a text. Therefore, substitution, being a verbal relation, is essentially confined to a text (Ayodabo, 2002).

The different forms of substitution in the text occur at the nominal, verbal, verb + Object, verb + Adverbial, and clausal level (Osisanwo, 2003; Bahaziq, 2016). Nominal substitution points to the fact that the use of a nominal substitute is employed to replace a nominal item. Verbal substitution is the use of a verbal substitute, typically the 'do' form of the verb to replace a verbal item. Clausal substitution is the use of a substitute to replace an entire clause (Taiwo, 2010). Verb + Object Substitution and Verb + Adverbial Substitution are nearly synonymous with Verbal Substitution. According to Osisanwo (2003), the former substitute the verb and the object in the sentence with the 'do' form of the verb while in the latter, the verb and the adverbial are substituted with the 'do' verb. Other items that can be substituted in the text, according to Taiwo (2010), are the cardinal numbers.

2.1.3. Ellipsis

Ellipsis means deletion. The deletion of a syntactic element is used to make room for grammatical cohesion in discourse (Osisanwo, 2003). It is the omission of a lexical item. This item is usually and easily recoverable form of the linguistic context of the text (Taiwo, 2010). It is the substitution of lexical item by zero (Ayodabo, 2002). Ellipsis occurs to the

syntactic and semantic components of discourse (Adiantika, 2015). Syntactic ellipsis is the non-expression of a word or phrase that is expected to occupy a place in the syntactic structure of a sentence. It represents the default interpretation of the term ellipsis. Semantic ellipsis, on the other hand, underlies the non-expression of items which are important to the full semantic interpretation of a part or parts of the text.

It is important to note that by ellipsis, we are not referring to every instance in which something is not said. Whenever there is ellipsis, there is a presupposition in the structure that something is to be supplied or understood (Ayodabo, 2002). An item is elliptical if its structure does not express all the features that have gone into its makeup. This makeup is all the meaningful choices that are embedded in it. This is an implication that ellipsis occurs when something that is structurally necessary is left unsaid. Ellipsis occurs at three levels. These levels are synonymous with the types of substitution. They are: Nominal, Verbal and Clausal ellipsis (Adiantika, 2015). In nominal ellipsis, nouns and nominal element are elided while the verb and the verbal are elided in the verbal substitution. The clause is intentionally omitted in the clausal ellipsis. One thing that is pertinent about ellipsis is that it is a relation within the text; the presupposed item is present in the preceding text. This makes it an anaphoric relation. Sometimes, the presupposition in an elliptic structure may however be exophoric. Though, exophoric ellipsis does not have a place in cohesion (Ayodabo, 2002). Another type of ellipsis identified by Paltridge (2012) is situational ellipsis. This is an intentional omission made by a speaker because of certain circumstances that exist between speaker and hearer or circumstances that the interlocutors find themselves.

2.1.4. Conjunction

This is also referred to as connective or linker. It refers to the way in which one sentence is logically related to another owing to the fact that it makes sense (Ogunsiji & Farinde, 2013). Conjunction is the type of cohesion that involves the use of ties that perform the main function of connecting sentences (Paltridge, 2006). The connection components often use the transitional words with some logical relationship such as: time, cause and condition (Li, 2013). Conjuncts, according to Osisanwo (2003) are of four types. These are; coordinating conjuncts, subordinating conjuncts, compound adverbs and continuatives. Coordinating conjuncts use conjunctions like ‘and, but’ to join ideas together in discourse. Subordinating conjuncts make use of ‘although, because, yet’ as connectives in discourse. Compound adverbs are transitional devices in discourse such as; ‘furthermore, moreover, however, nevertheless’ to link issues in discourse. Continuatives are devices such as ‘well, anyway, hence, besides’ in discourse. Taiwo (2010) is of the view that there are four types of conjunctions. These are; additive, adversative, causal, and temporal conjuncts (Wang & Guo, 2014). Additive conjunct is a conjunction that introduces an addition to the previous clause. ‘And’ is the most commonly used additive conjunction. Other words that are used as additive

conjunctions are; also, yet, so, further, moreover, instead, alternative (Sharif, 2015). Adversative conjunct signals a relationship that is contrary to expectation. The proposition expressed in the second clause is contrary and different from what is stated in the preceding clause. Adversative conjuncts are introduced by words such as; but, however, instead, rather, etc. Causal conjunct makes use of causal relation. It expresses that something is responsible for another thing to happen. Causal conjunct signifies result, purpose or reason for the initial statement. Words such as: so, hence, therefore, consequently, and so on, are used to indicate causal conjunct. Temporal conjunct is a relation between two successive sentences in sequence of time. This could be sequential (then, next), simultaneous (simultaneously, at the same time), preceding (earlier, previously), immediate (at once, immediately), durative (meanwhile).

3. Method

3.1. Design

This study is a descriptive research of the survey type. Data from sports presentations from the selected radio stations were used to find out whether there were manifestations of grammatical cohesion in the utterances of sports presenters on radio stations in Ibadan metropolis between September and December, 2020. The choice of this design is justified because it allows the researcher to elicit relevant data from a representative sample of the target population. These data were in turn described, analyzed and interpreted.

3.2. Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques

The concern of this study was limited to the sports discourse presented in English. Sports discourse from five (5) radio stations were purposively selected for this study. Such discourse include presentations made by one-man or by panel of analysts on the radio. These radio stations were selected based on their strategic locations. Only one radio station was selected from each Local Government Area in Ibadan in order to allow wide coverage of the study in Ibadan. Thirty presentations on various issues in sports were considered in the study as six presentations were considered from each of the selected radio stations. The presentations cut across various kinds of sports that were analyzed by presenters on the radio. These presentations were purposively selected for analysis. The selected radio stations comprise:

1. 100.5 - Inspiration FM, No 7 Osuntokun Avenue, Ibadan (Ibadan North)
2. 92.5 - Impact Business Radio, Akobo, Ibadan (Ibadan Northeast)
3. 107.1 – Noble FM, Bopa Hill, Ologuneru, Ibadan (Ibadan Northwest)
4. 105.5 - Splash FM, Felele, Ibadan (Ibadan Southeast)
5. 92.9 - Royal Root FM, Jericho Area, Ibadan (Ibadan Southwest)

3.3. Procedure for Data Collection and Analytical Techniques

Since the study is primarily embarked on in order to examine the grammatical cohesive devices in the presentations of the radio presenters in Ibadan metropolis between the month of September and December, 2020, the sports analysts on the selected radio stations were not informed in order to make their presentations real and natural. Also, since the study was intended to come up with spontaneous assessment of the inherent textual principle employed in the utterances of the presenters, the researcher needs not notify the radio stations in order to get accurate and unprompted data that were being analyzed for the study. However, the researcher records the presentations of sports analysts on the selected radio stations in Ibadan metropolis into tape for five (5) minutes. These recorded presentations were afterward transcribed into written texts. The transcription took the researcher two (2) months so that the grammatical cohesive devices in their utterances can come into bare.

Ferdinand de Saussure's Model of Language Structure on Syntagmatic Relations is employed for analytical expediency in this study. It is the theoretical tool that was used to analyze the presentations of the sports analysts in order to investigate the grammatical devices of cohesion that were inherent in their discourse.

From each of the presentation, words, phrases, clauses and sentences were examined to ascertain the extent at which each of the grammatical devices of cohesion is inherent in the presentation of sports presenters on the radio in Ibadan metropolis between September and December, 2020. These devices were analyzed using their occurrence in each datum and simple percentage was used to analyze the manifestation of each device based on the thirty presentations considered in the study.

3. Results and Discussion

This section presents tables on the grammatical elements that were analyzed in the sports presentations of radio presenters in Ibadan between September and December, 2020.

Table 1. Textual Features that Indicate Personal Reference in the Text of Sports Analysts on the Radio Based on the Number of Data.

	Personal Care			Possessive Determiner	
I	22	73.3%	My	04	13.3%
Me	08	26.6%	His	12	40%
We	18	60%	Our	01	3.3%
Us	08	26.6%	Their	08	26.6%
You	18	60%			
He	16	53.3%			
Him	09	30%			
Her	01	3.3%			
It	26	86.6%			
They	20	66.6%			

Them	10	33.3%
------	----	-------

Table 2. Textual Features that Indicate Demonstrate Reference in the Text of Sports Analysts on the Radio Based on the Number of Data.

Demonstrative Pronoun			Indicating Adverb		
This	22	73%	Here	02	6.6%
These	07	23.3%	There	08	26.6%
That	19	63.3%			
Those	04	13.3%			

Table 3. Textual Features that Indicate Comparative Reference in the Text of Sports Analysts on the Radio Based on the Number of Data.

Much	01	3.3%
More	01	3.3%
Most	01	3.3%
Or	02	6.6%
Better	04	13.3%
Whether	02	6.6%
Heaviest	01	3.3%
Lighter	01	3.3%
Than	01	3.3%
Between	02	6.6%
As fast	01	3.3%
So much	01	3.3%
Much better	01	3.3%

Table 4. Analysis showing the Number of Occurrence of Substitution in all the Presentations

Nominal Substitution	171	95.5%
Verbal Substitution	08	4.5%

Table 5. Analysis showing the Number of Occurrence of Ellipsis in all the Presentations

Nominal Ellipsis	16	72.7%
Verbal Ellipsis	02	9.1%
Clausal Ellipsis	03	13.6%
Situational Ellipsis	01	4.5%

Table 6. Analysis showing the Number of Occurrence of Conjunction in all the Presentations

1.	Coordinating Conjunct						Total	Percentage
	And	76	But	55	Or	11	142	18.4%
2.	Subordinating Conjunct							

	That	62	When	20	Who	15	What	19	Where	06			
	Which	01	Whom	02	While	13	How	06	Because	24	168	21.8%	
3.	Adversative Conjunct												
	But	55	Or	11	Against	25	Despite	04	Although	03			
	Meanwhile	02										100	13%
4.	Additive Conjunct												
	And	98	Also	18	Again	07						123	16%
5.	Temporal Conjunct												
	Early	05	Then	13	Now	18	Until	01	When	16			
	Later	05	Before	08	Sometimes	01	After	10	Since	04			
	While	05										86	11.1%
6.	Causal Conjunct												
	Because	24	If	19	So	16						59	7.7%
7.	Continuatives												
	Still	03	Yet	04	Especially	03	Talk less	01	Actually	19			
	Definitely	07	Really	06	Well	20						63	8.2%
8.	Compound Adverb												
	As well	06	Of course	14	Apart from	01	Right now	02	Against whom	01			
	At times	02	At the same time	01	So far so good	01	Sooner than later	01				29	3.8%

Note: Total Conjunctions Used = 770

Table 7. Summary of Manifestations of Grammatical Elements in the Thirty Presentations on Sports on the Radio in Ibadan, Nigeria.

Reference			
i.	Personal Reference	30	100%
ii.	Demonstrative Reference	26	86.6%
iii.	Comparative Reference	10	33.3%
Substitution			
i.	Nominal Substitution	29	96.6%
ii.	Verbal Substitution	04	13.3%
Ellipsis			
i.	Nominal Ellipsis	11	36.6%

ii.	Verbal Ellipsis	03	10%
iii.	Clausal Ellipsis	02	6.6%
iv.	Situational Ellipsis	01	3.3%
Conjunction			
i.	Coordinating Conjunct	27	90%
ii.	Subordinating Conjunct	30	100%
iii.	Additive Conjunct	27	90%
iv.	Adversative Conjunct	26	86.6%
v.	Causal Conjunct	18	60%
vi.	Temporal Conjunct	23	76.6%
vii.	Continuatives	22	73.3%
viii.	Compound Adverb	07	23.3%

The study critically examines grammatical elements in selected sports programmes on the radio stations in Ibadan, Nigeria between September and December, 2020. The grammatical devices that manifest in the presentations are reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. They are used to bring about cohesion in the same way the lexical items could be used to achieve cohesive bond in human discourse (Ogunsiji & Farinde, 2013; Dontcheva-Navratilova, 2017).

Reference denotes expressions or words whose meaning refer to other words in a text and at the same time show how the writer introduces the participants and keep tract of such participants throughout the text (Fakuade & Vargs, 2007; Sudirman & Tiasari, 2017). The types of reference identified in this study are personal reference, demonstrative reference, and comparative reference. Personal reference occupies the largest chunk of reference that is utilized by the presenters in their discourse. It manifests through textual items tagged as personal care and possessive determiners. Demonstrative reference occurs through demonstrative pronouns and indicating adverbs. Items used in indicating comparison are categorized as comparative reference (Ayodabo, 2002). This is in conformity with the affirmation of Li (2013) who posits that the textual feature of reference is to connect across sentence boundaries. Dontcheva-Navratilova (2017) carried out a study on the frequency of pronouns as indexical by writers and readers in Applied English corpus and finds out that the usage of first person plurals and third person possessive determiners dominate the study. This is a corroboration of the finding of this study as they enable the interlocutors to use pronouns to express objects in the context of the content in order to enhance that the discourse is concise or compact.

Substitution has to do with replacing a word or an item with another one instead of repeating it in the text. The replacement can include a word, a group of words or a clause in the next clause or sentence (Osisanwo, 2003; Ogunsiji & Farinde, 2013). Substituted elements adopted in the text are categorized as nominal and verbal. However, nominal

substitution is most prominent among the types of substitution employed by the commentators in their discourse. The study is different from the discovery of Adiantika (2015) who posits that substitution is not recurrent in students' EFL expository writing as almost all the presenters employ the usage of substitution in their presentation on the radio.

The omission of lexical item which can be recovered from the linguist context of the text or the substitution of lexical item by zero is ellipsis (Ayodabo, 2002; Taiwo, 2010). This aspect of grammatical cohesion manifests through nominal, verbal, clausal, and situational ellipsis. The usage of omission in the data examined in this study is very scanty; however, nominal ellipsis is the most popular. Also, Bahaziq (2016) singled nominal ellipsis out as the recurrent form of ellipsis in the essay written by undergraduate students in order to create certain omission and avoid repetition.

Conjunction is another grammatical property of cohesion that involves the use of ties that perform the main function of connecting sentences (Paltridge, 2006). It is an explicit marker of connecting meaning and establishing relationship between two words, phrases, or clauses (Taiwo, 2010; Venkenna, 2015). Coordinating conjunct, subordinating conjunct, additive conjunct, adversative conjunct, causal conjunct, temporal conjunct, continuatives, and compound adverbs are the divisions of conjunction examined in the study. The occurrence of subordinating conjunct, coordinating conjunct, and additive conjunct respectively dominate the usage of other types of conjunction in the study. The finding of this study is partially similar to the discovery of Venkenna (2015) who posits that 'and' dominate the usage of conjunction. However, 'and' as a conjunct is used in this study to join words and phrases together (additive conjunct) and clauses together (coordinating conjunct).

4. Conclusion

This study reveals that the grammatical elements of the language can be used to establish cohesive ties in discourse. These are mechanisms which glue the text together as a unit. They manifest on the surface of the text to harness the structures of the text. This is indicated in the commentaries of sport presenters on the radio as their utterances are fasten with certain grammatical resources which dominates the text. The presenters adopt the usage of reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction as instruments of grammatical cohesion. Personal reference, nominal substitution, nominal ellipsis, coordinating and subordinating conjunctions are the dominant grammatical resources which dominate the discourse of the sports presenters on the radio. However, this study is limited to Ibadan in coverage. It can be extended to other metropolitan cities in Nigeria. The study is conducted to examine grammatical cohesion. Other cohesive devices can also be studied. The researcher recommends that sports presenters on the radio should therefore see language as an important weapon used to express content and meaning by practically influencing the people around them. Language should be considered as a carrier of meaning and images on the mind of the listeners by conveying it in form of message.

Acknowledgement

Our profound gratitude to the radio stations whose sports programmes provided the data that were analysed in this study. The presentations of their sports analysts enabled us to come up with this study.

References

- Adedimeji, M. (2005). Word structure in English. In Alabi, V. & Babatunde, S. (Eds) *Basic Communication Skills for Students of Science and Humanities*. Ilorin: University of Ilorin; Department of English.
- Ademilokun, M. & Taiwo, R. (2013). Discursive strategies in newspaper campaign advertisements for Nigeria's 2011 Elections. *Journal of Discourse and Communication*, 7. Sage Publication.
- Adiantika, H. (2015). Cohesive devices in EFL students' expository writing. In *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 4 (1), 94 -102, <https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/ERJEE>
- Afzaal, M., Hu, K., Chishti, M. & Imran, M. (2019). A study of Pakistani English newspaper texts: an application of Halliday and Hasan's model of cohesion: a discourse analysis. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9 (5). Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education, <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n5p78>
- Ahmad, M., Mahmood, M. & Sidique, A. (2019). Organisational skills in academic writing: a study on coherence and cohesion in Pakistani research abstracts. *Languages*, 92 (4).
- Akbarov, H. (2016). Syntagmatic and paradigmatic features of relative syntagmas in Azerbaijani and English languages. *European Scientific Journal*, 2 (20), 214 – 231. <http://dx.doi.org/10.19044/esj.2016.v12n20p214>
- Alolade, A. (2023). Constituted associated lexical signifiers for discourse cohesion in selected sports presentations on radio stations in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Journal of English Scholars' Association of Nigeria*, 25 (3), 101 – 114. www.journalofenglishscholarsassociation
- Ayodabo, O. (2002). Cohesion as an aspect of textuality in vacancy advertisement in newspapers. In Babatunde, S. & Adeyanju, D, (Eds). *Language, Meaning and Society: Papers in Honour of Prof. E. E. Adegbija at 50*. Ilorin; Haytee Press and Publishing co. Nig. Ltd
- Ayodabo, O. (2003). 'A Pragma-stylistic study of Abiola's historic speech of June 24, 1993' In Lawal, A. (Ed.) *Stylistics in Theory and Practice*, (2nd ed). Ilorin: Paragon Books, Haytee Press and Publishing Company.
- Bahaziq, A. (2016). Cohesive devices in written discourse: a discourse analysis of a student's

- essay writing. *English Language Teaching*, 9 (7). Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education, www.ccsenet.org/elt
- Bex, T. (1996). Variety in Written English. *Text in Society: Societies in Text*. London and New York; Routledge.
- Bloor, M. & Bloor, T. (2013). *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. USA; New York, 711 Third Avenue, Abingdon, Milton Park, Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980) *Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approach to Second Language Teaching and Testing In Applied Linguistics*. <https://www.researchgate.net>3126>.
- Clarke, R. (2013). Paradigmatic and syntagmatic views of developer work practices. *SIG Prag Workshop on IT Artefact Design & Workpractice Improvement*. Netherlands, Tilburg, www.vits.org
- Dontcheva-Navratilova, O. (2017) Coherence and cohesion in research articles: The role of indexicals. In Dontcheva-Navratilova, O., Jančaříková, R., Miššíková, G. & Povolná, R. (Eds) *Coherence and Cohesion in English Discourse*. Masaryk University, Faculty of Education, <https://doi.org/10.5817/CZ.MUNI.M210-8857-2017>
- Fakuade, G. & Vargs, J. (2007). Cohesion and text creation. *The Language Learning Journal*, 5 (1), 88 - 89.
- Geeraerts, D. (2010). *Theories of Lexical Semantics*. Oxford; Oxford University Press
- Halliday, M. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London; Longman.
- KinkyLipids (2020). Syntagma (linguistics). Retrieved from www.en.m.wikipedia.org on July 27, 2020
- Lapesa, G., Evert, S. & Schulte im Walde, S. (2014). Contrasting syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations: insights from distributional semantic models. *Proceedings of the Third Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics*, 160–170. Ireland, Dublin.
- Li, J. (2013). The application and significance of discourse cohesion and analysis in practical teaching of foreign language. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3 (8), 1393-1398. Finland; Academy Publisher, www.academypublication.com
- Munjizah, S. (2015). Textuality Found in Jakarta Post in Education Section of Opinion Column. Sarjana Sastra Thesis from Maulan Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University of Malang; Faculty of Humanities; English Language and Letters Department.
- Namaziandost, E., Shafiee, S. & Rasooyar, H. (2018). Paradigmatic relations and syntagmatic relations: are they useful in learning grammatical structures? *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 5 (5), 20 – 34. www.jallr.com
- Ogunsiji, Y. & Farinde, O. (2013). *Analytical Linguistics*. Ago-Iwoye; Olabisi Onabajo University Press.
- Olujide, T. M. (2007) A diachronic study of syntax. In Obafemi, O., Ajadi, G., & Alabi, V.

- (Eds) *Critical Perspectives on English Language and Literature*. University of Ilorin, The Department of English, 41 - 66
- Osisanwo, W. (2003). *Introduction to Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics*. Lagos; Femolus-Fetop Publishers.
- Owolabi, A., Alabi, T, & Ayodabo, O. (1994). Halliday's Systematic Approach to Language Study and the Place of Cohesion in English Language. Delivered During Modern European Language MA Seminar, University of Ilorin (Unpublished).
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction* (2nd ed). UK: London; 50 Bedford Square, Bloomsbury Publishing Ltd. www.bloomsbury.com
- Pancerz, K. (2015). *Paradigmatic and Syntagmatic Relations in Information Systems over Ontological Graphs*. Poland; University of Management and Administration Akademicka. www.logic.mimuw.edu.pl
- Peters, I. & Weller, K. (2008). *Paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations in knowledge organisation systems*, 59 (2), 100 - 107. Dusseldorf; Dusseldofer Informations Wissenschaft.
- Sharif, A. (2015). The analysis of cohesive devices in psychology research papers using discourse analysis technique. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities (IJELLH)*, III (VI), 125 – 143. www.ijellh.com
- Sudirman, A. & Tiasari, L. (2017). Cohesion in Undergraduate Theses: A Discourse Analysis. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 6 (11), www.ijsr.net
- Taborek, J. (2012). The Language of Sport: Some Remarks on the Language of Football. In Lankiewicz, H. & Wasikiewicz-Firlej, E. (Eds). *Informed Teaching – Premises of Modern Foreign Language Pedagogy*, 237 - 254. Panstwowa Wyzsza Szkola Zawodowa im. Stanislawia Staszika w Pile, ISBN 978-83-62617-10-4
- Taha, W. & Reishaan A. (2008). The relationship between competence and performance: towards a comprehensive TG grammar. *Adab Al – Kufa Journal*, 2, University of Kufa: College of Arts.
- Taiwo, R. (2010). *Discourse Analysis*. Lagos; Victoria Highland, National Open University of Nigeria: School of Arts and Social Sciences.
- Venkanna, K. (2015). Do ESL learners use conjunctions as cohesive devices in writing? *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities*, 3, (7).
- Wang, Y. & Guo, M. (2014). A Short Analysis of Discourse Coherence. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5 (2), 460 – 465. Finland; Academy Publisher, <https://www.researchgate.net>
- Wanying, C. & Kun, L. (2015). *Paradigmatic Relations and Syntagmatic Relation: Are they Related?* 6-10. USA: MO, St. Louis, ASIST,
- Yule, G. (1996). *The Study of Language* (2nd ed). Great Britain; Cambridge University Press.