

Enhancing Coherence and Persuasiveness in Academic Discourse through Lexical Cohesion and Critical Thinking

Alda Jashari

University of Korca Albania, Korce, Albania

Email: aldajashari@gmail.com

How to cite this paper: Jashari, A. (2026). Enhancing Coherence and Persuasiveness in Academic Discourse through Lexical Cohesion and Critical Thinking. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 14, 471-483. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2026.141028>

Received: December 30, 2025

Accepted: January 23, 2026

Published: January 26, 2026

Copyright © 2026 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

This study examines the role of lexical cohesion and critical thinking in enhancing the coherence and persuasiveness of argumentative writing, with a focus on pedagogical strategies for academic contexts. Through the analysis of three sample texts on diverse topics, the research demonstrates that cohesive devices such as connecting words, lexical chains, and academic collocations significantly improve clarity and logical progression, while stance markers strengthen evaluative authority. Original texts often exhibited limited lexical variety and implicit stance, whereas revised versions incorporated synonyms, collocations, and explicit evaluative language, resulting in more credible and academically appropriate discourse. To translate these findings into practice, structured lesson plans were developed, integrating text annotation, collaborative discussion, and guided rewriting to foster both linguistic precision and cognitive engagement. The results underscore the need for writing instruction that aligns cohesion-focused strategies with reasoning-based tasks, ensuring learners acquire the linguistic resources and analytical skills essential for effective academic communication. Implications for teaching and future research directions are discussed.

Keywords

Lexical Cohesion, Persuasive Argumentation, Argumentative Discourse, Connecting Words, Collocations, Critical Thinking

1. Introduction

Argumentative discourse is a cornerstone of academic communication, requiring

writers to construct logically coherent and persuasive texts. While research has extensively examined argument structure and rhetorical strategies, the linguistic mechanisms that underpin textual cohesion particularly lexical cohesion remain underexplored in pedagogical contexts. Lexical cohesion, achieved through devices such as repetition, synonymy, collocations, and connecting words, plays a critical role in ensuring clarity, coherence, and persuasive impact. Without these cohesive elements, even well-reasoned arguments risk appearing fragmented and less convincing. Recent discourse studies emphasize that cohesive devices do more than link ideas; they shape readers' perception of logical progression and strengthen the writer's stance. Collocational patterns contribute to fluency and naturalness, while linking expressions signal relationships between propositions, guiding readers through complex reasoning. Despite their importance, explicit instruction in lexical cohesion is often overlooked in academic writing curricula, leaving learners with limited strategies for achieving coherence and persuasion. This study addresses this gap by investigating the interrelationship between lexical cohesion, persuasive effectiveness, and critical thinking in argumentative discourse. It explores how connecting words and collocations function as linguistic tools for constructing coherent arguments and examines whether targeted instruction in these devices enhances learners' ability to engage in higher-order reasoning. Lexical cohesion operates through semantic relationships among words such as repetition, synonymy, and collocation that knit ideas together across sentences and discourse segments. Synonymy and near-synonymy maintain cohesion while avoiding monotony, collocations create predictable lexical patterns that anchor meaning, and lexical chains link concepts throughout the text. These cohesive links make reasoning steps more visible, supporting critical thinking by enabling readers to evaluate arguments effectively. Conversely, weak cohesion obscures logical progression and hinders comprehension, creating barriers to critical engagement. By integrating discourse analysis with pedagogical experimentation, this research aims to provide empirical evidence on the role of lexical cohesion in fostering both textual quality and cognitive engagement in academic writing.

2. Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

Argumentation and critical thinking are widely recognized as interconnected processes that extend beyond linguistic expression to encompass cognitive, dialogic, and social dimensions. Toulmin's (1958) model of argumentation comprising claim, data, warrant, and rebuttal remains a foundational framework for analysing reasoning, while Andrews (2010) emphasizes its disciplinary role in fostering critical engagement in higher education. Ennis's (1996) definition of critical thinking as "reasonable, reflective thinking focused on deciding what to believe or do" continues to be influential, though recent perspectives situate it within collaborative and multimodal contexts. Kuhn (2019) reconceptualizes critical thinking as discourse, highlighting its inherently dialogic nature, while Ding et al. (2024) demon-

strate that integrating argument segmentation with cohesion analysis enhances automated feedback in student writing, underscoring the interplay between reasoning structures and textual clarity.

Recent studies further highlight the importance of cohesion and coherence in argumentative writing. Sun (2020) underscores their role in fostering critical engagement, while Zhang (2023) shows that explicit instruction in cohesion significantly improves writing quality among EFL learners. Mir Recio (2023) finds that secondary students often struggle with coherence, particularly in the use of connectives, suggesting the need for targeted pedagogical interventions. Similarly, Zhang (2023) confirms that lexical cohesion and logical coherence strongly predict L2 writing quality, and Xie & Lv (2022) report that planning instruction and content support significantly improve discourse connection in EFL argumentative writing.

Writing itself is increasingly understood as a complex problem-solving and knowledge-transforming activity rather than mere transcription. Bereiter and Scardamalia's (1987) distinction between knowledge-telling and knowledge-transforming remains central, highlighting the importance of rhetorical planning and conceptual restructuring. From a discourse perspective, cohesion and coherence are essential to text quality. De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) distinguish cohesion as surface-level ties from coherence as conceptual unity, while Halliday and Hasan (1976) classify cohesive devices into reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. Lexical cohesion achieved through repetition, synonymy, and collocation has been extensively studied since Firth's (1957) principle that "you shall know a word by the company it keeps", later expanded by Sinclair (1991) and Hoey's (2005) lexical priming theory.

Pedagogically, teaching lexical bundles and discourse markers has been shown to enhance fluency and rhetorical clarity. Nattinger and De Carrico (1992) advocate for lexical phrases as a means of improving coherence, while empirical studies (Nesselhauf, 2005; Granger & Paquot, 2008) confirm that collocational competence predicts writing quality in L2 learners. More recent work, such as Ding et al. (2024), demonstrates that discourse markers improve argumentative clarity when integrated into computational feedback systems. Genre-based approaches (Swales, 1990; Hyland, 2004) continue to frame writing as socially situated action, emphasizing meta discourse and stance as persuasive strategies. Meanwhile, corpus linguistics (Biber et al., 1998; O'Keeffe et al., 2007) and computational tools (McNamara et al., 2010) provide empirical and automated insights into cohesion and text quality.

Collectively, these theoretical and empirical perspectives converge on the importance of integrating explicit instruction in cohesion, argument structure, and reasoning-based activities. As Graham and Perin (2007) and Ferris (2003) argue, such practices foster both linguistic accuracy and rhetorical sophistication in academic writing, a view reinforced by recent studies that highlight the predictive role of cohesion and coherence in writing quality.

3. Integrating Lexical Cohesion and Critical Thinking into Writing Instruction Requires Explicit Teaching of Cohesive Devices Alongside Tasks That Promote Analytical Reasoning

Incorporating lexical cohesion and critical thinking into argumentative writing instruction requires deliberate and well-structured strategies. Effective lesson plans often begin with explicit modelling of cohesive devices such as conjunctions, transitional phrases, and collocations within authentic argumentative texts to illustrate how these elements create logical flow and clarity. Guided practice activities, including sentence-combining exercises and lexical chains, help learners internalize the role of cohesion in constructing coherent arguments. To foster critical thinking, tasks such as evaluating the strength of claims, identifying logical fallacies, and reconstructing arguments using cohesive devices encourage students to engage deeply with content while improving textual organization. Collaborative peer-review sessions and reflective writing further integrate these skills, enabling learners to analyse both linguistic and cognitive dimensions of argumentation. By combining linguistic scaffolding with reasoning-based activities, these strategies aim to enhance students' ability to produce persuasive, well-structured academic discourse.

4. Activities

The sources used in this analysis consist primarily of author-generated conceptual models designed to frame and interpret the relationship among argumentation, critical thinking, and academic writing. The review is grounded in theoretical constructs, and the lesson plans included in this study function as conceptual proposals rather than empirically tested interventions. Their purpose is to illustrate how argumentation, lexical cohesion, and critical thinking could be integrated into instructional practice. Although theoretical at this stage, these models are intended for future classroom implementation and empirical evaluation. Such application will enable systematic assessment of their pedagogical value and generate evidence-based insights into how these approaches can support student learning and the development of academic writing skills.

The analysis that follows demonstrate how lexical cohesion and critical thinking strategies can be applied to the analysis and improvement of argumentative sample texts across different topics.

4.1. Sample Argumentative Texts

1) 1st Sample Argumentative Text

Topic: *Should renewable energy replace fossil fuels?*

Transitioning to renewable energy is essential for sustainable development because fossil fuels contribute significantly to environmental degradation. For example, burning coal and oil releases greenhouse gases, which accelerate climate change and threaten ecosystems. In addition, reliance on non-renewable re-

sources creates economic vulnerability as supplies diminish and prices fluctuate. Critics argue that renewable technologies are costly and unreliable, however, it is crucial to recognize that investment in clean energy fosters innovation and long-term stability. Therefore, prioritizing solar, wind, and other sustainable sources is not only environmentally responsible but also economically prudent.

2) 2nd Sample Text Analysis

Topic: *Should schools ban smartphones?*

Smartphone bans in schools are necessary to improve learning outcomes because excessive phone use distracts students and reduces academic performance. For instance, research shows that constant notifications interrupt concentration and limit deep engagement with lessons. Moreover, unrestricted access to social media fosters anxiety and cyberbullying, undermining students' well-being. Opponents argue that smartphones support learning through educational apps; however, it is essential to recognize that structured digital tools can be provided without allowing unrestricted phone use. Therefore, implementing smartphone bans during school hours promotes focus, mental health, and equitable learning environments.

3) 3rd Sample Text Analysis

Topic: *Should homework be banned in schools?*

Homework should not be banned because it reinforces classroom learning and promotes independent study habits. For example, completing assignments outside school hours helps students consolidate knowledge and develop time-management skills. Additionally, homework provides teachers with valuable feedback on student progress, enabling targeted support. Critics argue that homework increases stress and limits leisure time; however, it is essential to recognize that balanced and meaningful assignments can enhance academic achievement without overwhelming students. Therefore, maintaining homework as part of the curriculum is both educationally beneficial and developmentally appropriate.

4.2. Synthesized Pedagogical Framework for Teaching Argumentative Writing Using Lexical Cohesion and Critical Stance

Level:

Upper-intermediate to Advanced (EFL/ESL or Academic Writing)

Duration:

60 - 75 minutes per lesson (adaptable for multi-lesson use)

Overall Purposes:

To strengthen students' ability to analyse and produce persuasive argumentative writing through the explicit teaching of claims and evidence, lexical cohesion, and critical stance.

Learning Objectives:

By the end of the lesson, students will be able to:

1) Argument Structure

- Identify main claims and supporting evidence in an argumentative text.

2) Lexical Cohesion

Recognize and use:

- Linking words (e.g., *however, therefore, moreover*)
- Collocations (e.g., *academic achievement, economic resilience*)
- Lexical chains and synonyms that maintain topic focus

3) Critical Stance

- Identify stance markers in texts
- Use stance phrases (e.g., *it is crucial to acknowledge*) to express evaluation

4) Applied Writing

- Rewrite a paragraph to improve cohesion, stance, and persuasiveness
- Produce an original paragraph that integrates cohesive devices independently

Lesson Sequence

Stage 1 Warm-Up (10 minutes)

Purpose: Activate prior knowledge, surface argumentative reasoning, and introduce the importance of language choices.

Activities:

- Short discussion prompted by a general controversial question (e.g., “*Why do some arguments sounds more convincing than others?*”).
- Students brainstorm factors such as clarity, evidence, logic, cohesion, and academic tone.
- Teacher introduces lexical cohesion and stance as key features of strong argumentative writing.

Stage 2 Input— Guided Text Analysis (15 minutes)

Purpose: Build awareness of argument structure and cohesive linguistic features.

Tasks:

Students annotate a sample argumentative paragraph by identifying:

1) Claim and Evidence

- Main argument
- Supporting points

2) Connecting Words

- *because, for example, in addition, however, therefore*

3) Collocations

- *Sustainable development, environmental degradation, economic vulnerability, clean energy*
- Learning outcomes, academic performance, mental health
- Classroom learning, academic achievement, time-management skills
- Student well-being, educational applications
- *Economic resilience, environmental security*

4) Lexical Chains

- *Renewable energy* → *clean energy* → *sustainable sources*
- *Fossil fuels* → *coal and oil* → *non-renewable resources*
- *Environmental degradation* → *climate change* → *threaten ecosystems*

- Smartphone bans → phone restrictions → limited access
- Academic performance → learning outcomes → engagement
- Anxiety → mental health → well-being
- Homework → assignments → tasks
- Learning → knowledge → achievement
- Stress → overwhelming → limits leisure time

5) Synonyms

- Renewable energy → clean energy → sustainable sources
- Homework → assignments → tasks
- Anxiety → mental health → well-being
- *Costly* → *high costs*, *unreliable* → *inconsistent performance*
- Support → facilitate; unrestricted → controlled
- Increases → contributes to; limits → restricts

Teacher highlights how these features contribute to clarity and persuasiveness.

Stage 3 Guided Practice—Paragraph Rewriting (15 minutes)

Purpose: Practice applying cohesive devices and academic stance in a structured way.

Goal:

Produce a paragraph that is more cohesive, academically credible, and persuasive

Procedure:

Students revise a provided paragraph by:

- Replacing informal words with precise synonyms
- Introducing lexical chains to reinforce cohesion
- Adding stance markers to express evaluation
- Strengthening logical flow using linking words
- Including academic collocations to improve tone

Samples:

1) Rewrite the paragraph:

Original:

Critics argue that renewable technologies are costly and unreliable, however, it is crucial to recognize that investment in clean energy fosters innovation and long-term stability.

Improved Version:

Although opponents claim that renewable technologies entail high costs and inconsistent performance, it is essential to acknowledge that strategic investment in sustainable energy not only drives technological advancement but also ensures economic resilience and environmental security.

2) Original:

Opponents argue that smartphones support learning through educational apps; however, it is essential to recognize that structured digital tools can be provided without allowing unrestricted phone use.

Improved Version:

Although critics contend that smartphones facilitate learning via educational

applications, it is crucial to acknowledge that controlled digital resources can achieve similar benefits while minimizing distractions and safeguarding student well-being.

3) Original Paragraph:

Critics argue that homework increases stress and limits leisure time, however, it is essential to recognize that balanced and meaningful assignments can enhance academic achievement without overwhelming students.

Improved Version:

Although opponents claim that homework contributes to stress and restricts personal time, it is crucial to acknowledge that well-structured assignments foster academic success while supporting healthy work-life balance for students.

Stage 4 Extension Activity (Homework or Additional 15 minutes)

Purpose: Encourage transfer of skills to new writing contexts.

Task:

Write a 150-word argumentative paragraph on a new topic including:

- At least 3 connecting words
- 2 academic collocations
- 1 stance marker (e.g., *it is essential to note that, this highlights the need for*)

Examples

Write a short argumentative paragraph (150 words) on topics “*Should schools ban smartphones*”; “*Should homework be banned in schools*”; “*Should schools implement a four-day week*”

Assessment

Formative Assessment

- Quality of text annotations
- Participation in group discussion
- Accuracy in identifying cohesive devices

Summative Assessment

- **Rewritten paragraph**, evaluated on:
 - Lexical cohesion
 - Stance
 - Logical clarity
 - Academic tone
- **Homework paragraph**, assessed for:
 - Appropriate use of linking words
 - Collocations
 - Lexical chains
 - Stance markers
 - Persuasiveness and coherence

Pedagogical Rationale

This unified framework is grounded in the following principles:

1) Lexical Cohesion Enhances Understanding

Lexical chains, synonyms, linking words, and collocations create a clear, connected argument that readers can follow easily.

2) *Stance Markers Strengthen Authority*

Explicit evaluative language signals critical thinking and strengthens the writer's argumentative voice.

3) *Scaffolding Supports Skill Development*

- Warm-up activates thinking
- Annotation builds awareness
- Discussion reinforces concepts
- Guided rewriting supports practice
- Extension task develops independent mastery

4) *Transferable Writing Skills*

Students apply cohesive devices and stance across multiple topics, preparing them for academic writing contexts.

5. Key Findings

- All three texts effectively use connecting words (e.g., *however, therefore, moreover*) to signal logical relationships.
- Lexical chains (e.g., *renewable energy* → *clean energy* → *sustainable sources*) maintain topic focus and avoid repetition.
- Academic collocations (e.g., *economic resilience, mental health, academic achievement*) add credibility and formal tone.

Critical Stance Improves Argument Strength

- Stance markers such as "*it is crucial to acknowledge*" and "*it is essential to recognize*" consistently signal evaluation and strengthen the writer's position.
- Rewritten paragraphs in all examples demonstrate how **stance + cohesion** creates more authoritative and persuasive arguments.

Pedagogical Strategies Are Consistent and Effective

- Each lesson plan follows a structured approach:
- Warm-up discussion to activate prior knowledge.
- Text annotation to identify claims, evidence, and cohesive devices.
- Group discussion to link linguistic features with argument quality.
- Guided rewrite task to apply cohesion and stance markers.
- Extension activity for independent practice.
- This sequence promotes both linguistic awareness and critical thinking.

Common Patterns Across Topics

- Original texts often lacked nuanced synonyms and advanced collocations.
- Improved versions introduced synonym substitution, stance markers, and academic collocations, resulting in clearer, more persuasive arguments.

Instructional Implications

- Teaching lexical cohesion should be integrated with reasoning tasks, not isolated as grammar drills.
- Explicit modelling and collaborative rewriting are key to helping learners internalize these strategies.
- Homework or extension tasks encourage transfer of skills to new topics

To summarize the comparative analysis of the three sample argumentative texts, on renewable energy, smartphone bans, and homework policies reveals that lexical cohesion and critical stance are essential components of persuasive academic writing. Across all examples, cohesive devices such as connecting words, lexical chains, and academic collocations significantly contributed to clarity and logical flow, while stance markers strengthened evaluative authority. Original texts tended to rely on basic connectors and repetitive vocabulary, whereas improved versions demonstrated how synonym substitution, collocational variety, and strategic stance markers enhance coherence and persuasiveness. Pedagogically, the lesson plans consistently employed a structured approach combining text annotation, collaborative discussion, and guided rewriting, which effectively integrated linguistic awareness with reasoning skills. This dual focus not only improved students' ability to construct cohesive arguments but also fostered critical thinking by encouraging evaluation and nuanced expression. These findings underscore the need for explicit instruction that aligns lexical cohesion with cognitive engagement, ensuring that learners develop both linguistic precision and argumentative depth in academic discourse.

6. Discussion

Research Questions:

- 1) How do connecting words and collocations contribute to lexical cohesion in argumentative discourse?
- 2) What is the relationship between lexical cohesion and the effectiveness of persuasive argumentation?
- 3) To what extent does explicit instruction in cohesive devices enhance critical thinking in argumentative writing?
- 4) How can teaching lexical cohesion improve learners' ability to construct coherent and convincing arguments?
- 5) What pedagogical strategies are most effective for integrating lexical cohesion and critical thinking in academic writing instruction?

The analysis of three sample argumentative texts, addressing renewable energy, smartphone bans, and homework policies, highlights the critical role of lexical cohesion and stance in constructing persuasive academic discourse. Across all examples, cohesive devices such as connecting words, lexical chains, and academic collocations were found to significantly enhance clarity, logical flow, and overall persuasiveness. Original versions of the texts demonstrated a tendency toward repetitive vocabulary and limited use of advanced connectors, which often weakened argument structure. In contrast, improved versions incorporated synonym substitution, varied collocations, and stance markers, resulting in more coherent and authoritative arguments. These findings confirm that lexical cohesion is not merely a stylistic feature but a functional tool for maintaining topic focus and signalling logical relationships within complex reasoning.

Equally important is the integration of critical stance markers, such as "*it is*

crucial to acknowledge” or “*it is essential to recognize*”, which consistently strengthened evaluative authority and positioned the writer as an informed participant in academic debate. The presence of these markers in revised paragraphs illustrates how explicit signalling of evaluation contributes to argumentative depth and credibility. This interplay between cohesion and stance underscores the need for writing instruction that moves beyond surface-level grammar drills to emphasize rhetorical and cognitive dimensions of argumentation.

Pedagogically, the lesson plans developed for each text reveal effective strategies for fostering both linguistic and critical thinking skills. A structured sequence, beginning with warm-up discussions, followed by text annotation, collaborative analysis, guided rewriting, and independent practice proved particularly valuable. This approach not only raised learners’ awareness of cohesive devices but also encouraged metacognitive engagement through tasks requiring evaluation and reconstruction of arguments. By embedding lexical cohesion instruction within reasoning-based activities, these lessons promote a dual focus on linguistic precision and analytical rigor, which is essential for success in academic writing contexts.

Overall, the findings suggest that explicit instruction in cohesive devices, combined with opportunities for critical engagement, can significantly improve learners’ ability to produce coherent and persuasive arguments. Future research might explore the long-term impact of such integrated approaches on students’ writing proficiency and their ability to transfer these skills across genres and disciplines. These insights reinforce the pedagogical imperative to align language-focused instruction with cognitive development, ensuring that learners acquire both the linguistic resources and the reasoning strategies necessary for effective academic communication.

7. Conclusions and Practical Recommendations

The findings from this study underscore the pivotal role of lexical cohesion and critical thinking in producing coherent and persuasive argumentative writing. Analysis of three sample texts revealed that cohesive devices such as connecting words, lexical chains, and academic collocations significantly enhance clarity and logical flow, while stance markers strengthen evaluative authority and argumentative depth. Original texts often lacked lexical variety and explicit stance, whereas revised versions demonstrated how strategic use of synonyms, collocations, and evaluative language transforms arguments into more credible and academically appropriate discourse. Pedagogically, the lesson plans developed for each text confirm that integrating linguistic instruction with reasoning-based activities fosters both language proficiency and cognitive engagement. Explicit modelling, collaborative analysis, and guided rewriting emerged as effective strategies for helping learners internalize these skills. Ultimately, this study highlights the need for writing instruction that aligns lexical cohesion with critical thinking objectives, ensuring that students acquire the linguistic resources and analytical strategies necessary for success in academic contexts. Future research should explore the long-

term impact of such integrated approaches and their applicability across diverse genres and disciplines.

This study emphasises the importance of embedding cohesion instruction within authentic argumentative texts rather than teaching cohesive devices in isolation. Teachers should model and annotate examples to demonstrate how lexical chains, collocations, and stance markers function in real contexts. Guided rewriting activities are essential for encouraging students to revise paragraphs by incorporating synonyms, collocations, and evaluative language, thereby improving both cohesion and critical stance. Additionally, metacognitive reflection should be promoted through discussion tasks that link linguistic choices to argument strength. To foster deeper reasoning, cohesion-focused activities should be paired with critical thinking tasks such as evaluating claims and evidence. Extension activities, including short argumentative writing exercises that require specific cohesive devices and stance markers, can reinforce learning beyond the classroom. Finally, assessment practices should address both linguistic and logical dimensions by evaluating coherence, lexical variety, and the quality of reasoning in student writing.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- Andrews, R. (2010). *Argumentation in Higher Education*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203872710>
- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The Psychology of Written Composition*. Routledge.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus Linguistics. Investigating Language Structure and Use*. Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511804489>
- De Beaugrande, R., & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. Routledge.
- Ding, Y., Kashefi, O., Somasundaran, S., & Horbach, A. (2024). *When Argumentation Meets Cohesion: Enhancing Automatic Feedback in Student Writing*. ACL Anthology.
- Ennis, R. (1996). *Critical Thinking*. Prentice Hall.
- Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to Student Writing*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410607201>
- Firth, J. (1957). *Papers in Linguistics*. Taylor and Francis Group.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing Next*. Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Granger, S., & Paquot, M. (2008). Lexical Bundles and L2 Academic Writing. In S. Granger, & F. Meunier (Eds.), *Phraseology: An Interdisciplinary Perspective* (pp. 127-150). John Benjamins Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.139>
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
- Hoey, M. (2005). *Lexical Priming*. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0694>
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and Second Language Writing*. University of Michigan Press.

- <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.23927>
- Kuhn, D. (2019). *Critical Thinking as Discourse*. *Human Development*, 62, 146-164.
<https://doi.org/10.1159/000500171>
- McNamara, D. S., Crossley, S. A., & McCarthy, P. M. (2010). Computational Assessment of Text Readability and Cohesion. *Written Communication*, 27, 57-86.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088309351547>
- Mir Recio, C. (2023). *Argumentative Writing in Secondary Education: Enhancing Coherence and Cohesion in EFL Contexts*. Master's Thesis, University of the Balearic Islands.
<http://hdl.handle.net/11201/169901>
- Nattinger, J., & De Carrico, J. (1992). *Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Nesselhauf, N. (2005). *Collocations in a Learner Corpus*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- O'Keeffe, A., McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2007). *From Corpus to Classroom*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511497650>
- Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford University Press.
- Sun, Y. (2020). *Cohesion and Coherence Studies: Development, Chaos and Application*. *Social Sciences*, 9, 113-120. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ss.20200904.15>
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Toulmin, S. (1958). *The Uses of Argument*. Cambridge University Press.
- Xie, Y., & Lv, X. (2022). *Effects of Content Support and Planning Instruction on Discourse Connection in EFL Argumentative Writing*. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.912311>
- Zhang, Y. (2023). *Cohesion and Coherence for English Writing—A Case Study of Argumentation*. *Frontiers in Educational Research*, 6, 129-133.
<https://doi.org/10.25236/FER.2023.060921>