

GREAT JOURNS

Journal of Linguistics

Vol.1 No.2, July 2026



The Cohesive Strategies used to Construct Thematic and interactional Meaning in Selected Nandi KASS TV interviews on Agriculture

¹Ruth Jerop Mutai

Department of Linguistics, Literature, Film Studies and Foreign Languages, Moi University, Eldoret, Kenya

²Dr. Simon Nganga.

*Department of Literature, Linguistics, Film and Foreign Languages
Moi University, Eldoret, Kenya*

³Prof. Mary Lonyangapuo

*Department of Literature, Linguistics, Film and Foreign Languages
Moi University, Eldoret, Kenya*



ABSTRACT

Effective use of cohesive resources is central to the communication of agricultural knowledge, particularly in oral, community-based broadcast discourse in indigenous African languages. This paper draws on a broader Master of Arts thesis to report on the first objective of a study that examined the cohesive strategies used to construct thematic and interactional meaning in selected Nandi KASS TV interviews on agriculture. The study was guided by Halliday and Hasan's theory of cohesion, extended to include discourse-pragmatic and prosodic resources. An interpretive qualitative design grounded in discourse analysis was adopted, and five purposively sampled KASS TV agricultural interviews broadcast between August 2023 and March 2025 were transcribed using Jefferson conventions and analysed inductively. Findings show that Nandi speakers deploy a wide repertoire of cohesive strategies: lexical cohesion dominated by same-item repetition; grammatical cohesion realised mainly through pronominal and demonstrative reference and additive and causal conjunctions, with restrained substitution and an almost exclusive reliance on nominal ellipsis; discourse-pragmatic strategies such as topical management, enumeration, code-switching and contrastive pairs; and prosodic devices including lexical tone, intonation, tempo and pause. The study concludes that cohesion in spoken Nandi broadcast discourse is multidimensional and extends beyond Halliday and Hasan's original model. It recommends that broadcasters and agricultural extension officers deliberately deploy these strategies to strengthen clarity and audience engagement.

Keywords: *Cohesion, spoken discourse, Nandi, KASS TV, discourse-pragmatic strategies, prosody, agricultural broadcasting*

1. INTRODUCTION

Effective communication of agricultural knowledge depends on how speakers link ideas so that listeners can follow, retain and act upon them. While cohesion the set of linguistic resources that bind stretches of discourse into a unified, interpretable whole has been extensively studied in written texts and major global languages, comparatively little is known about how it operates in orally delivered, community-based broadcast discourse in indigenous African languages. This gap is notable in the case of Nandi, a Nilotic language spoken in Kenya's North Rift region, whose media discourse has not previously been examined for its cohesive structuring.

This paper is drawn from a Master of Arts thesis titled "Cohesion as a Meaning-Making Resource in Selected Nandi KASS TV Interviews on Agriculture in Kenya," submitted to the Department of Linguistics, Literature, Film Studies and Foreign Languages at Moi University. The broader study pursued three objectives; this paper focuses specifically on the first: to analyse the cohesive strategies used to construct thematic and interactional meaning in selected Nandi KASS TV interviews on agriculture. Correspondingly, it addresses the research question: what cohesive strategies are used to construct thematic and interactional meaning in selected Nandi KASS TV interviews on agriculture?

KASS TV is a leading vernacular broadcaster in Nandi County and a key platform for disseminating agricultural information to rural, Nandi-speaking audiences. Understanding how presenters, agricultural experts and farmers construct cohesive, intelligible discourse in this setting has both theoretical and practical value: theoretically, it tests the applicability of Halliday

and Hasan's (1976) cohesion model, developed from written English, to spontaneous spoken discourse in an under-documented Nilotic language; practically, it can inform how broadcasters and extension officers structure agricultural communication to maximise clarity, comprehension and audience engagement, thereby supporting food security and rural development goals. The study also contributes to the documentation of Nandi, a language whose cohesive resources have not previously been systematically catalogued.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 reviews the literature on cohesion generally and in spoken discourse, and outlines the theoretical framework. Section 3 details the interpretive qualitative methodology used to identify cohesive strategies. Section 4 presents the findings on the cohesive strategies identified in the data, organised into lexical, grammatical, discourse-pragmatic and prosodic categories. Section 5 discusses these findings in relation to the literature, and Section 6 concludes with recommendations for broadcasters, extension practitioners and future researchers.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Cohesion in Discourse

Halliday and Hasan's (1976) seminal work conceptualizes cohesion as the semantic ties that connect elements within a text, ensuring its unity and comprehensibility. They distinguish grammatical cohesion reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction from lexical cohesion, realised through reiteration and collocation. This taxonomy remains foundational in discourse analysis and provides the descriptive starting point for the present study, though, as detailed below, it was applied inductively rather than as a predetermined coding scheme.

Subsequent scholarship has extended this framework. Widdowson (1978) cautions that cohesion alone does not guarantee coherence: cohesive ties must interact with contextual and pragmatic factors for communication to be meaningful. Hoey (1991) shows that lexical patterning can predict discourse structure more reliably than syntactic rules alone, while De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) situate cohesion as one of several standards of textuality. Tanskanen (2006) further shows that cohesion is dynamically constructed through interpersonal engagement rather than being a static textual property. Studies of cohesion in specific text types and languages Hameed (2008) on news articles, and African-language studies such as Wachera (2009), Okoth (2015) and Saddimbah (2011) reinforce the need for context-specific, data-driven investigation, a need this study addresses for spoken Nandi.

2.2 Cohesion in Spoken Discourse

Spoken discourse presents distinctive challenges for cohesion analysis because of its spontaneity, real-time production and interactive character. Stubbs (1983) and Bublitz (1999) observe that cohesion in speech often arises through repetition, pronouns, discourse markers and prosodic cues such as intonation and pause, rather than through the more elaborate grammatical ties typical of written English. Schiffrin's (1987) inductive treatment of discourse markers, and Tanskanen's (2006) demonstration that cohesive patterning varies by genre and communicative setting, both inform the present study's approach of allowing cohesive categories to emerge from the data rather than imposing them in advance. Studies of African languages (Gisesa, 2022;

Saddimbah, 2011) demonstrate the value of exploratory approaches to under-documented languages a gap this study fills for Nandi, made more acute by the interactive, multi-party nature of the KASS TV interviews.

2.3 Theoretical Framework: Halliday and Hasan's Model of Cohesion

The study adopts a primarily inductive, data-driven approach: patterns of cohesion were allowed to emerge from five naturally occurring KASS TV interviews before being related to established theory. Halliday and Hasan (1976) identify five categories of cohesive device — reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion — which together create the semantic ties that unify a text. Grammatical cohesion comprises reference (personal, demonstrative and comparative), substitution (nominal, verbal and clausal), ellipsis (nominal, verbal and clausal) and conjunction (additive, adversative, causal and temporal). Lexical cohesion comprises reiteration (repetition, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy and meronymy) and collocation.

Although developed from written English, this taxonomy is used in the present study as a flexible descriptive vocabulary rather than a fixed analytical grid, consistent with its adaptation in earlier African-language studies. Its limitations are nonetheless well documented: Baker (2006) and Taboada and Mann (2006) note that its reliance on the structural patterns of written English limits applicability to languages with flexible word order and rich verbal morphology, such as Nandi; Widdowson (1978) and Hoey (1991) observe that it privileges surface-level ties over the pragmatic and contextual mechanisms that also produce coherence; and the model presents ambiguous boundaries for instance between substitution and reference that complicate consistent coding in less-documented languages. These limitations are especially pronounced in spontaneous spoken discourse, where intonation, tempo, rhythm, hesitation and audience interaction shape continuity in ways the model does not capture. Accordingly, the framework is critically adapted in this study and extended to include discourse-pragmatic and prosodic features.

2.4 Discourse-Pragmatic and Prosodic Extensions

Because grammatical and lexical cohesion alone cannot fully account for how coherence is achieved in spontaneous, interactive speech, the study draws on complementary literature on discourse-pragmatic strategies and prosody. Discourse-pragmatic strategies are the interactional tools speakers use to manage topic, stance and turn (Fraser, 1999; Auer, 2007). Topical management sustains coherence through explicit topic markers and summarising devices (Brown & Yule, 1983; Eggins & Slade, 1997) and, in African settings, through culturally salient discourse markers (Angogo, 1983). Enumeration structures complex information for real-time processing (Gumperz, 1982) and is common in African advisory and instructional radio discourse (Kembo-Sure, 2000). Code-switching and lexical borrowing, described by Myers-Scotton's (1993) Markedness Model, allow speakers to signal identity, authority or emphasis, and are well documented in East African media discourse (Mazrui & Mazrui, 1998; Ndiso, 2016). Contrastive pairs (Halliday & Hasan, 1976), turn-taking and floor management (Schegloff, 1982), proverbs and figurative language (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Finnegan, 1970; Angogo, 1983), and discourse markers (Schiffrin, 1987) complete the set of pragmatic resources reviewed.

Prosody pitch, intonation, tempo, rhythm and pause is treated as a further cohesive resource rather than mere ornamentation (Crystal, 2003; Couper-Kuhlen, 2004). In tonal languages such as Nandi, lexical tone is phonemic and thus directly implicated in cohesion, since tonal contrasts prevent referential ambiguity (Yip, 2002; Odden, 1995; Angogo, 1983). Intonation shapes discourse meaning by signalling incompleteness, closure, attitude and turn-taking (Brazil, 1997; Couper-Kuhlen & Selting, 1996), while tempo varies with cognitive load, slowing for complex explanation and quickening for familiar material (Goldman-Eisler, 1968; Chafe, 1980). Pauses segment speech into interpretable units and serve rhetorical as well as cognitive functions in broadcast talk (Halliday, 1985; Scannell, 1996). Taken together, this literature establishes that cohesion in spoken discourse is multimodal, combining grammar, lexis, pragmatics and prosody the expanded framework within which the cohesive strategies identified in this study are analysed.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The study adopted an interpretive qualitative research design grounded in discourse analysis, appropriate for providing a rich, detailed account of linguistic phenomena as they occur naturally in context. In pursuit of the first objective, the analysis was guided by an inductive approach that allowed patterns of cohesion to emerge directly from the linguistic evidence, before being related to Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model and complementary discourse-pragmatic and prosodic literature. The unit of analysis was the cohesive tie, with attention to how ties are realised lexically, grammatically, pragmatically and prosodically.

3.2 Population, Sampling and Sample Size

The study's population comprised Nandi-language spoken texts broadcast on KASS TV that focus on agriculture, food security and community development. From this population, five interviews broadcast between August 2023 and March 2025 were purposively selected, a non-probability technique chosen to deliberately target information-rich data directly relevant to the study's objectives. Selection criteria included the presence of spontaneous, unscripted Nandi speech, thematic relevance to agriculture and community development, and clarity and completeness of recordings. A sample of five interviews falls within the qualitative research guideline of five to fifty cases (Creswell & Creswell, 2018) and was judged sufficient once thematic saturation was reached, that is, once continued analysis no longer yielded new cohesive patterns.

3.3 Data Collection

Audio recordings of the five interviews were transcribed orthographically, with careful attention to pauses and intonation contours. The Jefferson transcription system (Jefferson, 1974, 2004) was used to mark interactional and prosodic features such as pauses, overlaps and emphasis, while standard intonational notations rising (↑), falling (↓) and level (→) were integrated to capture pitch and tonal variation appropriate to Nandi as a tone language (Ladd, 2008; Yip, 2002). Transcripts were translated into English while retaining the original discourse structure, and cohesive features were then identified and annotated. To ensure reliability, transcripts were

checked against the recordings, and peer debriefing with Nandi language experts verified transcription and coding accuracy.

3.4 Data Analysis

Consistent with the study's inductive orientation, cohesive patterns were allowed to surface from the data rather than being coded into predetermined categories. Analysis proceeded along two dimensions relevant to the first objective: verbal cohesion (lexical, grammatical and discourse-pragmatic) and prosodic cohesion (tone, intonation, tempo and pause). Features were identified and coded repeatedly, with initial codes drawn from the transcripts and refined through continuous comparison across the five interviews, and their functions were then interpreted contextually. Frequency observations supported the qualitative analysis by highlighting the most recurrent devices, without displacing the primary interpretive orientation of the study. Analysis continued until theoretical saturation was reached.

3.5 Ethical Considerations and Limitations

Research authorisation was obtained from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) prior to data collection. Because the data comprise interviews already publicly broadcast on KASS TV, individual consent was not separately sought, a position considered ethically justified given the public nature of the material and the impracticality of retrospective consent; participants' names as aired were retained to preserve contextual integrity, and no additional personal information was disclosed. All transcripts were used exclusively for scholarly purposes, with KASS TV duly acknowledged as the data source. The main limitations bearing on this objective are that the five purposively selected interviews may not generalise to the wider range of Nandi discourse genres, and that transcription and translation relied on the researcher's own bilingual competence, which may not have captured every prosodic or culturally embedded nuance.

4. Findings: Cohesive Strategies in Nandi Agricultural Interviews

Analysis of the five KASS TV interviews shows that Nandi speakers draw on an extensive and layered repertoire of cohesive strategies operating at four interacting levels: lexical, grammatical, discourse-pragmatic and prosodic. These findings directly answer the study's first objective and research question by identifying and characterising the specific strategies speakers use to construct thematic and interactional meaning.

4.1 Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion achieved through the repetition of lexical items and the use of semantically related words emerged as the dominant strategy in the data.

Same-item repetition was the single most frequent lexical strategy identified. Speakers repeatedly returned to key terms rather than varying their vocabulary, particularly when introducing or reinforcing central concepts. In discussions of dairy farming, for instance, terms for cattle breeds *Friesian*, *Ayrshire* and *keswek* ("breeds") recur across successive utterances, sustaining thematic focus and reinforcing farmers' retention of technical vocabulary. This pattern

was especially prominent in the dairy-farming interviews, and is consistent with the communicative demands of an oral, public-facing genre in which clarity and immediacy take precedence over lexical variety.

Synonyms or near-synonyms occurred far less frequently, appearing mainly where speakers alternated between closely related terms to preserve reference while introducing subtle variation for example, the alternation between *biikab Kalenjin* (“Kalenjin people”) and *kootab Kalenjin* (“Kalenjin community”) in the food-security interview, or between *kasit* (“task”) and *boisonik* (“work”) in the dairy interview.

General items were rare, with only one clear instance identified across all five texts: the term *kiyakik* (“livestock”), used to generalise from a specific reference to “cow” (*teta*) to the broader category of livestock as a herd grows. No instances of superordinate terms or other lexical substitutes were found. This scarcity of general and superordinate items, relative to Halliday and Hasan's (1976) account of English, points to a strong preference in Nandi broadcast discourse for concrete, specific terminology over abstraction.

4.2 Grammatical Cohesion

Grammatical cohesion in the data was realised through reference, conjunction, substitution and ellipsis, though these four categories were not used with equal frequency.

Reference was pervasive, expressed mainly through pronominals, demonstratives and, less often, comparatives. Pronominal forms such as *kei* (“myself”) and *a* (“I”) recurred as speakers narrated personal farming experiences, maintaining participant continuity without repeating full noun phrases. Demonstratives such as *ni* (“this”), *ne* (“that”) and *chu* (“these”) anchored evaluative statements and tracked previously introduced referents for example, *ni* in *ko kasit ni kokasit ne kararan* (“this is a good job”) ties the evaluation directly back to dairy farming as the established topic. Comparatives, though the least frequent reference type, appeared through markers such as *kerkei* (“similar”) and *kaikai* (“better”), used to draw evaluative comparisons between dairy farming and other livelihoods, or between labour roles in tea farming.

Conjunctions were used to organise ideas logically. Additive conjunctions, realised chiefly through *ak* (“and”), were the most frequent conjunctive type, linking complementary ideas such as a speaker's name and occupation. Causal conjunctions were the next most common, followed by temporal conjunctions, while adversative conjunctions were the least frequent, indicating a comparatively low incidence of overt contrastive relations in the data.

Substitution occurred but was markedly less frequent than reference or conjunction. Nominal substitution, the most common subtype, was realised through forms such as *ne* (“that”) and *age* (“another”) — for example, *iyachi age* (“work for another”). A single instance each of verbal substitution (*notok*, “that,” standing in for the action of “adding value”) and clausal substitution (*notok/kiyotok*, substituting for an entire prior proposition) were identified.

Ellipsis was the least productive grammatical device. Only nominal ellipsis was attested for instance, the omission of *tuga* (“cows”) in the second half of *eng World kealdei keswek chebo tuga chebo chego ak chebo banyek* (“worldwide we sell semen of dairy cows and those of beef”). No instances of verbal or clausal ellipsis were found anywhere in the corpus, a notable divergence from Halliday and Hasan's (1976) account of English, in which both are described as

productive. This absence is attributable to the explanatory, instructional character of the broadcasts, in which speakers favour explicitness for a heterogeneous audience over the economy that ellipsis affords.

4.3 Discourse-Pragmatic Strategies

Beyond grammar and lexis, speakers relied heavily on discourse-pragmatic strategies to organise talk and sustain coherence. Five such strategies were most salient in the data.

Topical management was achieved through explicit topic introduction (each interview opens with an unambiguous statement of theme, such as *boishetab musoknatet eng baetab kiyagik*, “genetic improvement in dairy cattle”), sequential elaboration (ideas developed progressively, for example from AI technology to the Nairobi Veterinary Centre to semen sourcing to procedure), and question-answer structuring, in which interviewer prompts directly cue structured, credential-establishing responses from interviewees.

Enumeration and repetition organised procedural information into ordered, listener-friendly sequences, typically delivered with slowed tempo and short pauses between items, and repetition often patterned in threes echoed conventions of Nandi oral storytelling, as in *kitinye keswek chebo tuga chebo chego ak chebo banyek* (“we have breeds of cows, both dairy and beef”).

Code-switching and borrowing were used strategically wherever discourse moved into technical, scientific or institutional territory: English terms such as “progeny testing,” “quality control,” “agripreneurs” and “value addition,” and Kiswahili institutional terms such as “chairman” and “AFA,” were inserted into otherwise Nandi utterances to mark topic shifts and index expertise.

Contrastive pairs and oppositions helped speakers frame practical choices for the audience, as in the contrast between *chebo chego* (“dairy cows”) and *chebo banyek* (“beef cattle”), or between “Hass” and “Fuerte” avocado varieties, where Hass is positioned as the preferred, market-ready option.

4.4 Prosodic Cohesive Devices

Prosody constituted a further, distinct layer of cohesive resource operating alongside the verbal strategies above.

Lexical tone was found to be phonemic and cohesively consequential: minimal tonal pairs such as *béek* (high tone, “water”) versus *bèek* (low tone, “cereals”), and *yóo* (high tone, temporal conjunction “when”) versus *yòo* (low tone, demonstrative “there”), carry distinct meanings that speakers must control precisely to avoid misleading a listening audience, for example in the advisory statement *machei Avocado béek che machang mising* (“avocado does not need a lot of water”).

Intonation contours performed structural and interactional work: rising intonation (↑) marked incomplete units, invitations to attend, or requests for engagement, while falling intonation (↓) marked assertive, evaluative closure, as in statements about the economic benefits of dairy farming.

Tempo and pause were deployed jointly for cognitive and rhetorical effect. Speakers slowed down and inserted measured pauses when enumerating locations or comparing options for

example, the paced listing of branch locations (*kitinye branch neo eng Nairobi... (1.0) ak ketinye branch nemi Nakuru...*) and when introducing evaluatively weighted or technically complex information, as in the discussion of semen quality and fertility. Strategic pauses, such as a 1.2-second silence before a moral appeal in the food-security interview, also signalled reflective transitions in persuasive, morally framed talk.

5. Discussion

The strategies identified above show that cohesion in spoken Nandi agricultural broadcasts is achieved through the convergence of four interacting resource types rather than through any single mechanism, directly answering the study's first objective. This finding both confirms and extends Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model. Confirmation is evident in the clear presence, in the Nandi data, of all five of their core categories reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion realised through language-specific forms such as *ni*, *ne* and *chu* for reference, *ak* for additive conjunction, and *ne* and *age* for nominal substitution. This supports earlier applications of the model beyond English (Wachera, 2009; Okoth, 2015; Saddimbah, 2011) and indicates that its core descriptive categories retain cross-linguistic utility as an organising vocabulary, even for a Nilotic tone language with markedly different morphosyntax from English.

At the same time, the data reveal three points of divergence. First, the relative weighting of devices differs from the classical English-based account: same-item repetition dominates lexical cohesion to a degree not emphasised in Halliday and Hasan's original examples, while general items, superordinates, verbal and clausal substitution, and especially verbal and clausal ellipsis, are rare or entirely absent. This is best explained not as a deficiency of the language but as a genre effect: the explanatory, pedagogical, public-facing character of agricultural broadcasts favours explicitness and directness over the economy that ellipsis and substitution afford in more formal registers consistent with observations that cohesive devices are genre-dependent (Feng & Liu, 2010) and that spoken registers rely more on repetition, pronouns and discourse markers than on the substitutive devices typical of writing (Stubbs, 1983; Bublitz, 1999).

Second, the data confirm Widdowson's (1978) and Hoey's (1991) critique that grammatical and lexical cohesion alone are insufficient to account for coherence in naturally occurring talk. Discourse-pragmatic strategies topical management, enumeration, code-switching and contrastive pairing performed cohesive work that lies outside Halliday and Hasan's original taxonomy altogether, aligning this study with earlier calls to extend cohesion analysis to interactional and pragmatic resources (Schiffrin, 1987; Fraser, 1999; Auer, 2007) and with African-context findings on topic marking (Angogo, 1983), enumeration in advisory discourse (Kembo-Sure, 2000), and code-switching as an index of authority and inclusion in East African media discourse (Ndiso, 2016; Mazrui & Mazrui, 1998).

Third, and most distinctively, prosody emerged as an indispensable, independently cohesive layer rather than a mere accompaniment to verbal structure. Because Nandi is a tone language, lexical tone is directly implicated in referential clarity in a way that has no parallel in the English-based model: mispronouncing a tone (as in *béek/bèek*) risks a genuine communicative failure with practical consequences for an agricultural audience. This finding substantiates the theoretical claim that suprasegmental features are integral, not peripheral, to meaning-making in

tone languages (Yip, 2002; Odden, 1995; Angogo, 1983), and extends Couper-Kuhlen's (2004) and Crystal's (2003) accounts of prosody as an interactional resource to a previously undocumented Nilotic broadcast context. Tempo and pause, in turn, functioned much as Goldman-Eisler (1968) and Scannell (1996) describe slowing for cognitively demanding or evaluatively weighted material and pausing to segment discourse but did so in ways bound up with culturally specific values of respect, inclusivity and pedagogical care for a rural farming audience of mixed literacy and expertise.

Taken together, these findings suggest that Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model, while a useful point of departure, requires deliberate extension along the lines proposed by Brown and Yule (1983) and pursued here to adequately describe cohesion in spontaneous, tonal, multilingual spoken discourse of the kind found on indigenous-language broadcast media. The cohesive strategies identified for this first objective thus establish the empirical basis on which the wider thesis subsequently examines how these strategies function to construct meaning, and what their implications are for interviewer–audience communication.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

This paper set out to analyse the cohesive strategies used to construct thematic and interactional meaning in selected Nandi KASS TV interviews on agriculture. The findings show that Nandi speakers draw on a broad and layered repertoire of resources: lexical cohesion dominated by same-item repetition; grammatical cohesion realised primarily through pronominal and demonstrative reference and additive and causal conjunction, with comparatively restrained substitution and an almost exclusive reliance on nominal, rather than verbal or clausal, ellipsis; discourse-pragmatic strategies including topical management, enumeration, code-switching and contrastive pairing; and prosodic devices — lexical tone, intonation, tempo and pause that carry cohesive and interactional weight not captured by Halliday and Hasan's (1976) original model.

The study concludes that cohesion in spoken Nandi broadcast discourse is multidimensional, arising from the coordinated interaction of verbal and prosodic resources rather than from grammatical and lexical ties alone. While Halliday and Hasan's framework remains a useful descriptive starting point, its categories must be extended with discourse-pragmatic and prosodic resources to adequately capture how coherence is achieved in spontaneous, tonal, multilingual broadcast talk. These findings underscore the communicative sophistication of Nandi as a medium for technical, agricultural and developmental content, and demonstrate that indigenous Nilotic languages are fully capable of sustaining complex, cohesive public discourse.

On the basis of these findings, the study recommends, first, that broadcasters and interviewers on indigenous-language stations such as KASS TV deliberately structure discourse using clear referential chains and repeated key terms to prevent topic fragmentation and reinforce comprehension among rural audiences. Second, agricultural communicators and extension officers should adopt structured enumeration for step-by-step guidance and use code-switching selectively and purposefully, to clarify technical terms rather than to exclude less-educated listeners. Third, broadcasters and extension officers should treat prosody as a communicative resource in its own right, deliberately using pause, controlled tempo and emphatic intonation to highlight key advice, while attending carefully to tonal accuracy given its phonemic role in

Nandi. Media training programmes for vernacular broadcasters would benefit from incorporating awareness of these cohesive strategies as part of effective communication practice.

Future research building on this objective could usefully extend the analysis comparatively to other Kalenjin varieties such as Keiyo, Kipsigis, Marakwet and Tugen, to other discourse genres beyond agricultural interviews, and could combine qualitative discourse analysis with quantitative measures of the frequency and distribution of cohesive devices to strengthen the empirical grounding of the patterns identified here.

REFERENCES

- Angogo, R. M. (1983). Unity in diversity: A linguistic survey of the Kenya sociolinguistic situation. In I. R. Dihoff (Ed.), *Current approaches to African linguistics* (Vol. 2, pp. 1–20). Foris Publications.
- Auer, P. (2007). Style and social identities. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Style and social identities: Alternative approaches to linguistic heterogeneity* (pp. 1–24). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and conflict: A narrative account*. Routledge.
- Brazil, D. (1997). *The communicative value of intonation in English* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Blublitz, W. (1999). *English conversation: Corpus analysed, genre based, ethnographically interpreted*. Niemeyer.
- Chafe, W. L. (1980). *The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production*. Ablex Publishing.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2004). *Prosody and grammar in conversation: Interactional studies*. John Benjamins.
- Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Selting, M. (1996). *Prosody in conversation: Interactional studies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed method approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (5th ed.). Blackwell.
- De Beaugrande, R., & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*. Longman.
- Eggins, S., & Slade, D. (1997). *Analysing casual conversation*. Cassell.
- Feng, Z., & Liu, Y. (2010). Analysis of cohesive devices in English writing by Chinese EFL learners. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 33(2), 114–126.
- Finnegan, R. (1970). *Oral literature in Africa*. Oxford University Press.
- Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(7), 931–952.
- Gisesa, J. M. (2022). *Cohesive devices in speech by students of Ichuni Girls' and Moi Gesusu Boys' in Kisii County* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Kenyatta University.

- Goldman-Eisler, F. (1968). *Psycholinguistics: Experiments in spontaneous speech*. Academic Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *Spoken and written language*. Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
- Hameed, H. T. (2008). *Cohesion in texts: A discourse analysis of news articles in a magazine* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Deyala.
- Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of lexis in text*. Oxford University Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society*, 3(2), 181–199.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). John Benjamins.
- Kembo-Sure. (2000). Discourse patterns in East African English: The role of cohesion. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 18(3), 45–62.
- Ladd, D. R. (2008). *Intonational phonology* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- Mazrui, A. M., & Mazrui, A. A. (1998). *The power of Babel: Language and governance in the African experience*. University of Chicago Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford University Press.
- Ndiso, J. S. (2016). *Discourse markers in Kenyan Sign Language* [Master's thesis]. University of Nairobi.
- Odden, D. (1995). Tone: African languages. In J. A. Goldsmith (Ed.), *The handbook of phonological theory* (pp. 444–475). Blackwell.
- Okoth, B. Q. (2015). *A cognitive approach to cohesion and coherence in Dholuo narratives* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Nairobi.
- Saddimbah, C. R. (2011). *Cohesive devices in Dholuo sermons: A textual analysis* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Kenyatta University.
- Scannell, P. (1996). *Radio, television and modern life: A phenomenological approach*. Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of “uh huh” and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analysing discourse: Text and talk* (pp. 71–93). Georgetown University Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. Blackwell.

- Taboada, M., & Mann, W. C. (2006). Rhetorical structure theory: Looking back and moving ahead. *Discourse Studies*, 8(3), 423–459.
- Tanskanen, S. (2006). *Collaborative dialogue in multilingual settings: A study of the discourse of international students*. John Benjamins.
- Wachera, A. C. (2009). *Cohesion in selected Gikuyu texts* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Kenyatta University.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford University Press.
- Yip, M. (2002). *Tone*. Cambridge University Press.