



## Rhetorical Structure Appearances in Memoir-Type Text

Çağrı KAYGISIZ<sup>a\*</sup> (ORCID ID - 0000-0002-9650-3889)

Nermin YAZICI<sup>b</sup> (ORCID ID - 0000-0003-0145-9772)

<sup>a</sup>University of Turkish Aeronautical Association, Rectorate, Ankara/Turkey

<sup>b</sup>Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education, Ankara/Turkey



### Article Info

DOI: 10.14812/cufej.1077758

#### Article history:

Received 23.02.2022

Revised 08.11.2022

Accepted 20.12.2022

#### Keywords:

Writing Education,  
Rhetorical Structure Theory,  
Discourse,  
Text Type,  
Memoir.

#### Research Article

### Abstract

Writing skill, which includes many factors and complex processes, is the linguistic skill that receives the lowest amount of support in the out-of-school social context among learning areas. Therefore, practices conducted at schools for the development of writing skills are significant. Such practices are aimed toward students gaining awareness of the functioning of the language system and producing texts that are compatible with discourse features developed in line with communicative purposes. Therefore, theories and approaches that describe how to make choices that match specific text types are an important component of writing education. This study aims to determine the appearance of the units in memoir-type texts that allow tracking the coherence relations on the text surface with the establishment of rhetorical relations between sections of text using the tools of the rhetorical structure theory and review and discuss at an academic level why these tools should be taken into account in the processes of writing education.

## Anı Türü Metinlerde Retorik Yapı Görünümleri

### Makale Bilgisi

DOI: 10.14812/cufej.1077758

#### Makale Geçmişi:

Geliş 23.02.2022

Düzeltilme 08.11.2022

Kabul 20.12.2022

#### Anahtar Kelimeler:

Yazma Öğretimi,  
Retorik Yapı Kuramı,  
Söylem,  
Metin Türü,  
Anı.

#### Araştırma Makalesi

### Öz

Birçok faktörün etkili olduğu ve karmaşık süreçler içeren yazma becerisi, diğer öğrenme alanlarıyla karşılaştırıldığında okul dışı toplumsal bağlamda en az desteklenen dilsel beceri konumundadır. Bu nedenle yazma becerisinin gelişiminde okulda yapılan uygulamalar önemlidir. Bu uygulamalar yoluyla öğrencilerin, dil sisteminin işleyişine ilişkin farkındalık kazanması ve iletişimsel amaçlar doğrultusunda şekillenen söylem özellikleriyle uyumlu metinler üretmesi hedeflenmektedir. Bu nedenle, metin türüyle uyumlu seçimlerin nasıl yapılacağına dair betimlemeler yapan kuram ve yaklaşımlar, yazma öğretiminin önemli bileşenlerinden birisidir. Bu bağlamda çalışmanın amacı metin katmanları arasındaki retorik ilişkilerin kurulumu ile tutarlılık izlerinin metin yüzeyinde izlenebilir olmasına olanak tanıyan birimlerin, anı türü metinlerdeki görünümünün Retorik Yapı Kuramının sağladığı araçlar ile belirlenmesi ve kuramın sağladığı araçların yazma öğretimine dönük süreçlerde neden dikkate alınması gerektiğinin akademik düzeyde ele alınıp tartışılmasıdır.

## Introduction

The act of writing includes gradual mental processes; first, planning occurs; then, ideas are produced in relation to plans; and decisions are made regarding the organization of these thoughts. The next stage is the text production process, which is defined as the placement of thoughts into words, sentences, and discourse structures formed in line with communicative purposes (Trapman et al., 2018). Therefore, it is significant to determine how the projections of the discourse features formed for communicative purposes and the variables belonging to these features in the macro and micro structures of the text are reviewed. Therefore, writing education should include procedural information about how text is structured and declarative information about the subject and the target audience of the text (Pressley & Haris, 2006).

Text production necessitates establishing a multidimensional and multidirectional relationship between text layers; that is, there is a need for interaction between words, syntactic features, and the discourse structure of the text (Kaygısız, 2018). Accordingly, it is expected that text producers make simultaneous linguistic/grammatical choices in the ideational, lexical, syntactic, textual, and presentational layers of the text (Kellog, 2008). However, these choices between text layers are not just mechanical choices regarding the text's surface structure accuracy or spelling (Myhill et al., 2016). They are analytical choices that ensure that the presentation of thought, attitude, and content is coherent with the rhetorical structure determined per the communicative purposes of the text and are an integral part of the text production process.

The methods and practices involved in developing writing skills are more complex than the knowledge and skills required to participate in daily conversations. Writing skills include the teaching and management of complex information resources required for text production. Therefore, practices should be designed to teach how to notice and follow transitions between different types of information in the text. Apart from grammatical structure that defines how to organize language as a system, it is necessary to clarify the differences between grammatical knowledge structures—that is, metalinguistic knowledge—in the writing education process (Carther & McCarthy, 2006). In the context of writing education, metalinguistic competence includes two separate elements: information analysis, which is defined as the construction of a clear and conscious presentation of linguistic knowledge, and process control, which is the ability to selectively adhere to and apply information (Bialystok, 1987, 2001).

Writing skill is affected by several factors, and its development involves complex cognitive processes; however, it receives the lowest amount of support in the out-of-school context compared to other linguistic learning areas. Therefore, activities and practices in schools pertaining to the internal dynamics of writing are essential in the development of writing skills. In this regard, students are taught how to establish relationship networks between the deep and surface structures of texts and to provide logical interactions between words, syntactic features, and the discourse structure of the text. Additionally, studies indicate that educational practices that present the operating system of the text contribute to the development of knowledge and skills necessary for the production of a text appropriate to the genre (Garnham et al., 2015).

In the framework of the abovementioned literature review, this study aims to investigate how the views related to the discourse features of the memoirs, which are determined in line with their communicative purpose, shape the surface text. Accordingly, how the rhetorical relations between text layers are established and the manner in which coherence networks between discourse segments shape the surface text will be investigated through the descriptions provided by the Rhetorical Structure Theory. Also, by drawing on the communicative purposes of the types of rhetorical relationships in the sections that make up such narrative texts, the way in which prospective Turkish teachers establish genre-specific text patterns will be evaluated based on the parameters laid out in the theory. In addition, why the tools offered by the theory should be heeded in teaching writing will be discussed. The following research questions are to be answered in this respect:

1. In terms of genre, which rhetorical relations are used prominently in memoir-type texts?
2. How are the types of rhetorical relations distributed?
3. Which rhetorical relations are used prominently in the sections of the text that make up the narrative text?

### Text Discourse Relation

The conditions that make a text are not only linguistic–grammatical and semantic-based integrity. It is necessary also to determine the communicative purposes of the text. Therefore, it is imperative to consider textual strategies for communicative purposes in the production process. Communicative strategies of texts are discourse-based. Discourse is related to the fact that language is a communicative phenomenon, and accepting language as a communicative phenomenon means examining ways to research language as an utterance or text produced within a certain time–space level between the producer and the recipient (Ruhi, 2009).

Discourse refers to trans-sentence and inter-sentence language, linguistic structures, and pattern forms (Turan et al., 2012) and is related to the use of both written and spoken language. Additionally, even with a simple observation, it can be seen that sentences are arranged in a certain order to form meaningful unity in discourse (Turan et al., 2012).

The use of discourse in the sense of “language unit” beyond the sentence level causes it to be confused with the concept of text (van Dijk, 1985, p. 4). However, the concepts of text and discourse, which are different phenomena, have complementary functions at the language and communication level. Because the text is accepted as a structural and productive process, the building blocks that form the discourse have dynamic effects on both the text production processes and stages of perception and analysis (Virtanen, 1990).

The use of discourse in the sense of “language unit” beyond the sentence level causes it to be confused with the concept of text (van Dijk, 1985). However, the concepts of text and discourse, which are different phenomena, have complementary functions at the language and communication level. Because the text is accepted as a structural and productive process, the building blocks that form the discourse have dynamic effects on both the text production processes and stages of perception and analysis (Virtanen, 1990).

Discourse structure is brought into view by the logical networks established between discourse segments. Knowledge of the coherent discourse structure is significant in understanding the text and the discourse condition to which it belongs (Groz & Sidner, 1986; Moore & Pollac, 1992) because interpreting referential expressions, determining the temporal order of the events described, and defining the plans and goals of discourse participants require discourse structure knowledge (Moore & Wiemer-Hastings, 2003). Perceiving information about the discourse structure requires the determination of reference relations; understanding of correlation–coherence relations; interpretation of implications and inferences; and analysis of information regarding inter-sentence tense, modality, and aspect categories. There is a consensus that at least three types of discourse structures are required in a text (Moore & Wiemer-Hastings, 2003). The structures in question are as follows:

**i. Intentional Structure:** It is the effect that the producer wants to form in the mind of the recipient based on their communicative background. The intentional structure includes the final encodings of the communicative goals that the producer wants to achieve in the discourse text. It also plays a role in the regulation of coherence relations. Reading comprehension processes are based on the perception and analysis of intentional structures (Moore & Wiemer-Hastings, 2003).

Intentional structures consist of the dominance of communicative intentions throughout the discourse and satisfaction precedence relations<sup>1</sup>. The informational structure of discourse in turn determines linguistic structure (Moser & Moore, 1996).

**ii. Informational Structure:** It consists of the semantic relations between the information conveyed by successive utterances (Moore & Pollack, 1992). Causal relations are typical examples of the informational structure, and these relations are inferred during reading.

**iii. Attentional Structure:** It models the focus of attention of the discourse participants at any point in the discourse. Changes in the attentional situation depend on the intentional structure and the characteristics of linguistic expressions (Grosz et al. 1995). Natural language generation systems track the focus of attention as the discourse as a whole progresses and during the construction of individual responses to influence choices on what to say next (Kibble, 1999).

**iv. Information Structure:** It consists of two sub-components. The first component forms the theme by a part of the first utterance connecting to the rest of the discourse or new information connecting to the already existing theme. The second is the component that the producer creates in contrast to the information that the recipient pays attention to or might notice. The information structure can be conveyed by syntactic, prosodic, or morphological means (Moore & Wiemer-Hastings, 2003).

Information structure is also known as presentational structure. Presentational features organize the information in a sentence, usually into topic and comment and focus and background. Presentational information depends on syntactic surface structure and the linear and grammatical position of phrases (Smith, 2003: 13).

**v. Rhetorical Structure:** There have been several proposals defining the set of rhetorical relations that can hold between adjacent discourse elements. Researchers have attempted to explain the inferences that arise when a particular relation holds between two discourse entities, even if that relation is not explicitly signaled in the text (Moore & Wiemer-Hastings, 2003). Defining rhetorical relations is significant in explaining discourse coherence, analyzing anaphora, and calculating communication implications (Hobbs, 1983; Mann & Thompson, 1988; Lascardies & Asher, 1993).

### Discourse Segment

Texts are series of sentences that have thematic unity and are connected, and in each sentence sequence, there are segments of discourse that carry the value of the primary proposition. The main purpose of the rhetorical structure theory is to analyze texts by dividing them into units with propositional values. In this theory, the concept of text is accepted as a set of coherent sentences intertwined with different rhetorical relations by different discourse segments, and each grammatical sentence is seen as a discourse segment (Mann & Thompson, 1988). Therefore, segments of discourse are determined according to the rhetorical functions of propositions, and every linguistic unit with propositional structures is considered a segment of discourse.

Access to the surface structure of discourse segments depends on reference relations and the use of conjunctions. Although paragraph boundaries are also determiners in selecting reference type (Tomlin, 1987), the boundary markers of the discourse segment depend on the use of referential expressions (Grosz & Sinder, 1986).

### Rhetorical Structure Theory

The main goal of the natural language production system is to produce coherent texts. Producing coherent texts depends on the establishment of functioning rhetorical relations based on the continuity of reference relations. However, coherence relations may be visible in the surface structure, and

---

<sup>1</sup> **Satisfaction Precedence:** The order of occurrence of the contents that the producer puts forward in the intention structure.

sentences or propositions in the discourse may come together implicitly with other sentence or propositional arrangements of the text to form a coherent discourse structure. In other words, one can observe the appearance of coherence in the propositional structures of different discourse segments clearly in the surface structure of the text and through the network of implicit relations in the deep structure of the text. Moreover, the discourse structure and features of natural language are rather implicit, unlike structured discourse (van Dijk, 1992). Therefore, information on ensuring text consistency is essential to ensure optimal information flow and achieve the communicative purposes of the text. The following steps are required for coherent text production (Reither, 1994).

**i. Text Planning/Content Determination:** This refers to determining the content of the message and bringing together propositions to organize the text structure in line with the content.

**ii. Sentence Planning<sup>2</sup>:** This refers to collecting propositions in sentence units and choosing the vocabulary items corresponding to the concepts in the knowledge base.

**iii. Linguistic Realization:** This refers to the realization of surface structure arrangements.

In relation to all the process steps related to the arrangement of the text, the rhetorical structure theory was developed to model how segments of discourse come together to form larger segments of text. In this context, the structural relations between different text segments form a basis. The rhetorical structure theory aims to explain the operation dynamics of coherence networks in the deep and surface structures related to the organization of the text. The theory aims to explain each sequence in the organization of the discourse (Taboada & Mann, 2006). The theory also includes assumptions about how words, sentences, and other grammatical units affect the operation principles of the text (Taboada & Mann, 2006). The theory accepts a sentence as the lowest level unit for analysis (discourse segment), but it states that one can also view clauses as discourse units (Mann & Thompson, 1988).

The rhetorical structure theory accepts coherence as a hierarchically connected concept based on the assumption that each text segment has a role relative to other segments in the text (Taboada & Mann, 2006). The relation networks between the different text segments that form the text are essential, and these networks are conceptualized as a symmetrical pattern based on the concept of nuclearity (Matthiessen, 1995). Also, it is stated that discourse structures are connected with a propositional network that enables the perception of the producer/recipient, coherence relations of the text, and communicative content. These are called relational propositions.

Relational propositions are types of inferential propositions in the deep text structure that one can access by linking different text segments in the discourse organization. Relational propositions are divided into two sub-proposition types: nucleus and satellite. Nucleus propositions are central to rhetorical relations and serve the realization of the producer/recipient's basic communicative goals. The satellite propositions' text-oriented rhetorical function, however, derives from their relationship with nucleus propositions. Therefore, without nucleus propositions, access to satellite propositions is not possible. In other words, nucleus propositions are more significant than satellite propositions in terms of communicative purpose, and even if one takes out satellite propositions from the text surface, nucleus propositions are sufficient to access the desired content (Mann & Thompson, 1988; Taboada & Mann, 2006). This situation is important in terms of summarizing the text (Moore & Wiemer-Hastings, 2003).

The theory also defines sub-propositional structures that make up relational propositions. In this regard, rhetorical relations are divided into two categories as single-nuclear (asymmetric) and multinuclear (symmetrical) relations in terms of the effect intended by the producer/recipient when bringing text segments together.

**i. Nucleus–Satellite (asymmetric) Relationship:** Knowledge that has a more significant position in terms of communicative purpose is called the “nucleus,” and additional information to support this

---

<sup>2</sup> This step in the process refers to the selection of the expressions to be produced.

information is called a “satellite.” There is an asymmetrical relationship between these two types of knowledge.

**ii. Multinuclear (symmetric) Relationship:** This type of relationship is multinuclear, and there is no asymmetric dependency. In multinuclear relations, no unit is more central than the other in terms of the purposes of the producer. Therefore, there is a symmetrical relationship between the units produced.

Rhetorical structure theory defines the rhetorical relations of text and text segments through four paradigms. These definitions are not based on morphological syntactic criteria but are defined through relations based on functional and semantic criteria. Further, these relations are defined to hold between two non-overlapping text spans, here called the nucleus and satellite (Mann & Thompson, 1988: 245). The rhetorical relations defined in terms of the four domains are as follows (Taboada & Mann, 2066):

- (i.) Constraints on the nucleus,
- (ii.) Constraints on the satellite,
- (iii.) Constraints on the combination of nucleus and satellite,
- (iv.) The effect<sup>3</sup>.

In establishing rhetorical relations, the communicative intention of the text producer is determinative. Nicholas (1994) divides rhetorical relations into two categories as subject matter or knowledge-oriented semantic relations and presentational relations. If rhetorical relations include the text recipient defining the ideational meaning relations between the links in the pattern, there is a subject matter or knowledge-oriented semantic relation. This relationship is not intended to create an illocutionary effect, meaning to make the recipient of the text perform an action, but it is formed based on descriptions of the authenticity values of the events or situations conveyed by the propositions. The established relationship creates an unintended illocutionary effect.

**Table 1.**  
*Subject Matter or Knowledge-Oriented Semantic Relation*

Semantic Relations	
i. Elaboration Relation	vii. Interpretation Relation
ii. Circumstance Relation	viii. Evaluation Relation
iii. Cause Relation	ix. Restatement Relation
iv. Purpose Relation	x. Summary Relation
v. Solutionhood Relation	xi. Sequence Relation
vi. Condition Relation	xii. Contrast Relation

**i. Elaboration Relation:** These are rhetorical relations consisting of two linked structures. While there is a transfer of a situation/event in the nucleus, the satellite contains additional information about the event/situation in question. In the elaboration relation, the sentences in the position of nucleus and satellite are connected with each other through four different semantic relations: Set + member, abstraction + instance, whole + part, and process + step.

**Example:** The advancements in technology automobiles provide drivers with the opportunity to enjoy technology and comfort together (**Nucleus**). With their ergonomic interior and exterior design features, they offer both an eye-catching elegance and ease of use (**Satellite**). The newly designed engine provides maximum driving performance with minimum fuel consumption (**Satellite**).

<sup>3</sup> Achieved on the text receiver.

\*All examples selected from the database.

**ii. Circumstance Relation:** While this rhetorical relation conveys information about a situation/event in the nucleus, the satellite sentence contains information about the event/situation's interpretation in the sentence positioned as the nucleus in terms of time and place.

**Example:** When I read and write (*Satellite*), I understand the meaning of life (*Nucleus*).

**iii. Cause Cluster Relation:** There are reasons for the occurrence of an event/situation in the sentence. Four types of rhetorical relations constitute the cause cluster relation: volitional cause, non-volitional cause, volitional result, and non-volitional result.

**Example:** I had to take my car to the service (*Nucleus*). Because there was a sound coming from the engine, and it was almost impossible to move in that state (*Satellite*).

**iv. Purpose Relation:** The establishment of the purpose relation is possible by transferring an unrealized event/situation in the satellite. With the realization of the event/situation in the nucleus sentence, the event/situation in the satellite sentence can occur.

**Example:** To learn about investment opportunities suitable for you (*Satellite*), you should visit our branch office (*Nucleus*).

**v. Solutionhood Relation:** This is the rhetorical relation that occurs when the solution of the situation or event in the satellite sentence is expressed in the nucleus sentence.

**Example:** Lower back and neck pain are among the health problems that office workers complain about (*Satellite*). The most effective way to get rid of these pains is to take a break and do sports (*Nucleus*).

**vi. Condition Relation:** This is a rhetorical relation based on a hypothetical or future situation or event in the nucleus and satellite. The occurrence of the event/situation in the nucleus depends on the realization of the event/situation in the satellite.

**Example:** If the weather conditions are suitable (*Satellite*), it has been reported that the rocket can be launched (*Nucleus*).

**vii. Interpretation Relation:** This relation includes the attitude of the producer regarding the situation or event in the nucleus. The most important feature of this relation is accessing the connection networks between the nucleus and the satellite inferentially. There is no semantic connection between the nucleus and satellite clauses.

**Example:** When his works are compared, it is seen that his creativity has decreased (*Nucleus*). Looks like he is not as productive as before (*Satellite*).

**viii. Evaluation Relation:** This is the relation that occurs when the producer's attitude toward the informational content in the satellite is accessible via the nucleus clause.

**Example:** Hosting different civilizations (*Satellite*). That is where the secret of the cultural wealth of Anatolian lands hides (*Nucleus*).

**ix. Restatement Relation:** The informational content in the nucleus sentence is preserved and repeated differently in the satellite sentence.

**Example:** Your way of speaking reflects your worldview (*Nucleus*), meaning it reflects your mental state (*Satellite*).

**x. Summary Relation:** This refers to the rhetorical relation that occurs when the informational content in the nucleus sentence is abbreviated and retransmitted in the satellite.

**Example:** Many events were planned for this year's spring festivities (*Nucleus*). Many famous names will give concerts (*Satellite*). There will be competitions (*Satellite*). There will be giveaways (*Satellite*).

**xi. Sequence Relation:** Here, all sentences have nucleus characteristics. Therefore, there is a multinuclear structure. The sequence relation between the sentences is based on the primacy–recency relationship between the event/situation in the nucleus.

**Example:** The man walked in without a care (**Nucleus**). He sat in the chair (**Nucleus**). He started watching TV (**Nucleus**).

**xii. Contrast Relation:** In this relation, there is a multinuclear structure; however, the number of nucleus sentences cannot exceed two. This structure, which does not include the sentences with the satellite feature, compares the content in the two core structures in terms of similar and different features.

**Example:** People think they can do whatever they want (**Nucleus**). However, there are rules that prevent them from making arbitrary decisions (**Nucleus**).

Presentational relations aim to create a disposition or increase the effect of certain tendencies and are based on the intention of the producer.

**Table 2.**

*Presentational (Pragmatic) Rhetorical Relations*

Pragmatic Relations	
i. Background Relation	v. Concession Relation
ii. Enablement Relation	vi. Evidence Relationü
iii. Motivation Relation	vii. Justify Relation
iv. Antithesis Relation	

**i. Background Relation:** The information in the nucleus is accessed through the information in the satellite.

**Example:** The government spokesperson stated that the curfew is going to continue (**Satellite**). According to the information received, the increase in the number of cases was effective in this decision (**Nucleus**).

**ii. Enablement Relation:** The event/situation in the nucleus is presented as a competence level that the text recipient has to reach. Also, the satellite contains information structures that the recipient must be aware of to access the competence level.

**Example:** Listening to the lesson and studying regularly is essential for the development of mathematical knowledge (**Nucleus**). The improvement of mathematical knowledge supports development in other learning areas (**Satellite**).

**iii. Motivation Relation:** This relation aims for the recipient to realize the situation/event in the nucleus structure. In this regard, the purpose of the satellite is to ensure the realization of the event/situation in the nucleus.

**Example:** We are preparing many activities for this year's spring festivities (**Nucleus**). The spring festivities, which will have many artists and activities, will be a lot of fun (**Satellite**). I definitely recommend you to participate in the festivities (**Satellite**).

**iv. Antithesis Relation:** This is the type of rhetorical relation that emerges based on the similarities and differences in the nucleus and the satellite. By nature, the producer has a positive/negative attitude toward the propositional content in the nucleus.

**Example:** He is not failing his classes because his teachers do not like him (**Satellite**). In fact, it is because he does not care about his lessons and does not study enough (**Nucleus**).

**v. Concession Relation:** The text producer has a positive attitude toward the propositional content in the nucleus sentence and accepts the validity of the propositional content in the satellite.



**Example:** Although there is evidence that the vaccine prevents the spread of the disease (*Satellite*), its use did not get approval because of insufficient research (*Nucleus*).

**vi. Evidence Relation:** The satellite demonstrates and supports the assertion in the nucleus sentence.

**Example:** I think that he has no fault in this case (*Nucleus*). There is evidence and eyewitnesses that he was not present at the time of the incident (*Satellite*). Moreover, there is no reason for them to perform the event in question (*Satellite*).

**vii. Justify Relation:** The producer has the authority to provide information in the satellite regarding the informational content transmitted in the nucleus while the nucleus supplies information about any subject or situation/event.

**Example:** You will be informed about the exam in the coming days (*Nucleus*). Details are not clear yet (*Satellite*). However, I can say that the exam includes the subjects we covered until the midterms (*Nucleus*).

The theory also has descriptions of the parts that make up the text (the rhetorical scheme). The rhetorical scheme reflects choices regarding the arrangement of the text and is an abstract construct that contains sections of the text spans. Identifying these structures means also identifying the relationships between propositional structures (Mann & Thompson, 1988, p. 247). Otherwise, readers have to not only remember details about the content of a text but also retain some knowledge of how a text was worded (Emmott, 1999). For this reason, one should structure the text to activate the state model and mental representations and the knowledge of the rhetorical scheme.

#### Narrative Texts

Narrative is a phenomenon that is considered to have the foundations of human life at its center with the notions of the creation, redesign, and interpretation of personal and social realities (Georgakopoulou, 2011, p. 190). When we look at the definitions related to narrative, it is seen that the most emphasized elements is the chronological structure. The chronological logic structure, which includes the description of the temporal transition from one state of affairs to another (Chatman, 1990), is the main feature of narrative texts. As the foundational form of discourse, narrative is the semiotic presentation of a series of events that are linked temporally and causally and is organized around dynamic events that progress through time (Berman, 2009). Therefore, the most significant feature of narrative texts is that the events indicated by the action create temporal gaps in the discourse and present the sequence and cause-effect relations necessary for meaning (Hopper, 1997; Smith, 2003). However, the sequencing in the narration of events is not linear.

Labov (1972) has the most accepted definition of narrative. This study is based on Labov's work for two reasons: first, Labov's work described the rhetorical scheme of narrative and its prototypical view, and second, the work was based on real narrative texts based on personal experience. The written text samples that constitute data for our study were obtained from memoir-type narratives. Memoir-type texts carry reality reference and establish truth value within the framework of "authenticity" reference. Compared to fictional narratives, they naturally exclude many potential genres (e.g., fantasy, science-fiction, and mythology). In memoir-type texts, one cannot expect the narrator to directly and always be the most important character of the narrative world. There may also be texts in which someone else presents information about a person of social, historical, or field-specific importance, so the narrator is not the main character. Within the scope of this study, students were asked for a narrative about their own memories, and in this context, these texts bear a strong resemblance to narratives of personal experience. In other words, the narrator is also the main character of the narrative.

Texts do not consist of a single part. In narrative texts, schematic sections are brought together to describe events/situations around a certain theme, and each part has specific tasks in the production and perception of the text. Narrative texts introduce events/situations to the universe of discourse, and the text progresses as the narrative time progresses, depending on the dynamics of events/situations. In other words, there are some principles in terms of the progression of the text regarding the modes of discourse.

The mode of discourse consists of the relations between entities and events that the discourse evokes. Depending on the mode of discourse, the recipients create multilevel representations of the transmitted information, forming situation or mental models of the text. The mode of discourse is closely connected to the rhetorical scheme. The emphasis in rhetoric is on strategy and effect rather than linguistic features, but some of the main insights are the same (Smith, 2003, p. 40). Upon examining oral narratives of personal experience, Labov (1972) states that narrative contains the following six functional parts that make up its rhetorical scheme.

**i. Abstract:** The narrator presents a brief summary of the situation/event in the story. This section contains information about the topic of the narrative and its narration reason, and it is located right at the beginning of the narrative.

**ii. Orientation:** This section contains information about space, time, and people. Because of its structure, this section includes durational time and aspect suffixes and duration adverbials.

**iii. Complicating Action:** The sequential narration of the situations/events in the story takes place in this section.

**iv. Evaluation:** It is the most significant part of narrative texts in terms of function. It emphasizes why the narrative is worth telling.

**v. Result or Resolution:** This section describes the resulting circumstances of the narrated situations/events.

**vi. Coda:** This section states that the narrative has ended. The main events that form the narrative are over.

These six sections that constitute the structure of the narrative text essentially form the rhetorical scheme of narrative texts in terms of function. Like the rhetorical structure, the rhetorical scheme is a reader-centered linguistic arrangement and is relevant in perceiving the transferred content.

## Method

### Research Model

Qualitative research enables exploring a problem or issue or examining the identified issues in depth in terms of detail, scope, and differences (Creswell, 2020). In this context, content analysis method, one of the qualitative research methods, was used in line with the purpose and research questions determined. Content analysis is a flexible research method that can be applied to any form of communication that focuses on the content of the text (Cavanagh, 1997) and allows the content to be dealt with in an objective and systematic way. This method is used to identify the existing words, concepts, themes, experiences, characters, or sentences in the text and digitize them.

### Study Group

The study group consisted of 229 students (132 female and 97 male) from the Department of Turkish Education at Hacettepe University's Faculty of Education. They voluntarily participated in this research.

This study was carried out with the approval of Hacettepe University Ethics Board date 12.11.2021 and number E-35853172-200-00001842318.

### Data Analysis

In line with the purpose of the study and identified research questions, the participants were asked to write memoirs. To increase the data quality and ensure text naturalness, the participants were not given a specific text subject and length and time flexibility was provided. According to the parameters defined in the rhetorical structure theory, the data obtained from the content analysis method were analyzed using the SPSS 20.0 package program.

Subjecting the obtained data to content analysis is the process of naming and coding meaningful parts from the analyzed data. This process entails segmenting, examining, comparing, conceptualizing, and associating the obtained data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Therefore, researchers need to form the same categories. Another crucial point in qualitative research is the precision when coding the data obtained. Precision is relevant because it prevents volatility and the changes caused by the design (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). However, the large amount of analyzed data and the data analysis process spanning over a long period cause inconsistencies in the data collection process. Both researchers analyzed the data obtained for the validity and reliability of the study twice at different times. Additionally, three researchers who are experts in the field examined the data obtained, and the inter-rater concordance was calculated as 0.92. This rate proves that the inter-rater concordance is high (Miles & Huberman, 1994) and that the evaluation is based on reliable results.

### Findings

The study determined the types of rhetorical relations that are used prominently in memoir-type texts. The research conducted found that semantic relations were used more prominently in memoir-type texts compared to pragmatic relations when it comes to text-specific structuring.

**Table 3**

*Distribution of Rhetorical Relation Types*

Rhetorical Relation	F	%
Semantic Relation	864	66
Pragmatic Relation	462	34
<b>Total</b>	<b>1326</b>	<b>100</b>

Upon considering the distribution of semantic relations within themselves, the frequency of use of rhetorical relations of elaboration, summary, circumstance, sequence, interpretation, and evaluation is high and close to each other. The main feature of the memoir genre is the temporal transitions from one situation to another chronologically. On evaluating the results obtained, the distribution of rhetorical relations was used in the text as a structure specific to the memoir genre.

**Table 4**

*Distribution of Semantic Relations*

Semantic Rhetorical Relation	F	%
Elaboration Relation	115	13.31
Summary Relation	113	13.08
Circumstance Relation	110	12.73
Sequence Relation	106	12.27
Interpretation Relation	103	11.92
Evaluation Relation	95	11
Cause Cluster Relation	52	6.02
Purpose Relation	44	5.09
Solutionhood Relation	42	4.86
Contrast Relation	41	4.75
Restatement Relation	23	2.66
Condition Relation	20	2.31
<b>Total</b>	<b>864</b>	<b>100</b>

When the use of pragmatic relations is examined, the motivation, justifying, orientation or background, and concession relations come to the fore in terms of frequency of use. Producers use these rhetorical relations in texts to create an effect or tendency on the recipient when considered in terms of function.

**Table 5.**  
*Distribution of Pragmatic Relations*

<b>Pragmatic Rhetorical Relation</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>%</b>
Motivation Relation	140	30.3
Justify Relation	114	24.67
Background Relation	65	14.07
Concession Relation	57	12.34
Antithesis Relation	35	7.58
Evidence Relation	30	6.49
Enablement Relation	21	4.55
<b>Total</b>	<b>462</b>	<b>100</b>

When the distribution of rhetorical relations in the text sections that make up the narrative text in table 6 is examined, there are no rhetorical relations for the abstract and conclusion (coda) sections. In the orientation section, the rhetorical relations of circumstance, motivation, summary, and justification are at the forefront in terms of use. In a complex series of events, there is a high frequency of use with regard to the rhetorical relations of motivation, justification, sequence, and evaluation. In the evaluation section, the rhetorical relations of elaboration, evaluation, interpretation, and summary come to the fore in the resolution sections, the rhetorical relations of motivation, sequence, and concession were dominant.

**Table 6.**  
Appearance of Rhetorical Relations in Narrative Text Sections

Rhetorical Relations		Narrative Text Sections												
		Abstract		Orientation		Complicating Action		Evaluation		Resul or Resolution		Coda		
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Semantic Relations	Elaboration Relation	-	-	27	8.65	26	7.54	46	10.80	16	6.58	-	-	
	Circumstance Relation	-	-	44	14.10	21	6.09	34	7.98	11	4.53	-	-	
	Cause Cluster Relation	-	-	12	3.85	12	3.48	23	5.40	5	2.06	-	-	
	Purpose Relation	-	-	9	2.88	10	2.90	11	2.58	14	5.76	-	-	
	Solutionhood Relation	-	-	7	2.24	7	2.03	18	4.23	10	4.12	-	-	
	Condition Relation	-	-	6	1.92	5	1.45	5	1.17	4	1.65	-	-	
	Interpretation Relation	-	-	20	6.41	26	7.54	44	10.33	13	5.35	-	-	
	Evaluation Relation	-	-	14	4.49	29	8.41	45	10.56	7	2.88	-	-	
	Restatement Relation	-	-	5	1.60	8	2.32	9	2.11	1	0.41	-	-	
	Summary Relation	-	-	32	10.26	21	6.09	38	8.92	22	9.05	-	-	
	Sequence Relation	-	-	23	7.37	34	9.86	20	4.69	29	11.93	-	-	
	Contrast Relation	-	-	12	3.85	9	2.61	16	3.76	4	1.65	-	-	
	Pragmatic Relations	Background Relation	-	-	19	6.09	11	3.19	21	4.93	14	5.76	-	-
		Enablement Relation	-	-	9	2.88	8	2.32	4	0.94	-	-	-	-
		Antithesis Relation	-	-	7	2.24	13	3.77	9	2.11	6	2.47	-	-
Concession Relation		-	-	-	-	24	6.96	9	2.11	24	9.88	-	-	
Evidence Relation		-	-	-	-	7	2.03	14	3.29	9	3.70	-	-	
Justify Relation		-	-	30	9.62	35	10.14	28	6.57	21	8.64	-	-	
Motivation Relation		-	-	36	11.54	39	11.30	32	7.51	33	13.58	-	-	
<b>Total</b>	-	-	<b>312</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>426</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>100.00</b>	-	-		

### Discussion & Conclusion

Memoirs are one of the basic text types that focus on individuals, aiming to make inferences from a wide range of expressions, colloquial and fictional, describe possible patterns and variances, and develop various linguistic competences related to the skills of reading and writing. One of the distinguishing features of these narrative texts is their mosaic nature, that is, the schematic (rhetorical) structures making up the text are responsible for telling events and situations that are built around a specific theme, and each structure actively contributes to the production and interpretation of such texts. These rhetorical structures also play an important role in the establishment of the mental models necessary for making sense of the text. Mental models are mental representations that provide information about the events and situations, as well as the entities, in the text, and are crucial for both writing and reading. Therefore, the Rhetorical Structure Theory is important as it helps to identify of the rhetorical structures in a given text and their communicative and discursive functions.

This study found that rhetorical relations with semantic content exhibited a significant frequency compared to rhetorical relations with pragmatic relations in written memoir-type texts. Upon evaluating this aspect in terms of discourse features, the intense use of semantic rhetorical content was because memoir-type texts convey an event or situation experienced by the producers. The fact that memoirs carry reality reference and the recipient's evaluation of the transferred information within the framework of reality reference accordingly can be associated with the accumulation in this type of rhetorical relation. Because information-oriented semantic relations are not aimed at enabling the text recipient to perform an action, they are established to refer to the authenticity values of the events or situations in the propositional content.

Considering the distribution of semantic relations within themselves, the frequency of use of rhetorical relations such as elaboration, summary, circumstance, sequence, interpretation, and evaluation is high and close to each other. The first 6 of the 12 knowledge-oriented rhetorical relations, which are under the semantic rhetorical relations, constitute 74.31%—that is, almost three-quarters—of the general distribution. With the analysis made on sentence segments, the finding regarding the type and distribution of semantic rhetorical relations bears a strong resemblance to the order in the macro-structured rhetorical scheme/sections of narrative texts. Therefore, the rhetorical appearance in sentence segments is viewed as a small mechanism that represents the rhetorical scheme of the narrative.

When we look at the distribution of semantic or pragmatic rhetorical relations in the sections that form the narrative text, there are no rhetorical relations for the sections of the abstract and conclusion (coda). As mentioned before, this study used a theoretical approach developed based on oral experience narratives. The examples that form the database of the study were collected through written expressions. The functional part that the narrative discourse in this framework, which includes a fully formed prototype, has to have is “complicating actions.” Other rhetorical spans may be omitted. This section, which is located right at the beginning of the narrative text, especially based on the difference in oral and written expression, introduces what the narrative is about and why it is told, is observed in natural speech environments. After the verbal instruction for the students to write a memoir without any subject limitation for data collection, the text producers excluded this part in their writing, motivated by the non-text context. Another excluded part observed based on oral and written language was the conclusion (coda). While oral narratives need linguistic markers and expressions showing the end of the act of narration, the completion of the text appears directly on the paper of written narratives.

Upon examining the use of pragmatic rhetorical relations, the researchers observed that the motivation, justification, orientation or background, and concession relations, respectively, came to the forefront in terms of frequency of use. When considered in terms of their function in texts, these rhetorical relations exhibit a genre-specific structuring to create an effect or tendency on the text recipient.

Considering the rhetorical relations observed under the rhetorical sections of the narrative, the relations with the highest frequency in the orientation section are circumstance, motivation, summary, and justification. The orientation section at the beginning of the narrative mostly creates a reference point for the complex series of events that follow. By establishing the structure of the text, it provides a framework for the holistic design of the text. It provides prior knowledge that enables the understanding of the events to be presented in the complicating action section. This functional feature in the orientation section is also compatible with the relations that have a frequent use in this section. Notably, circumstance relation has the highest frequency (14.10%), and this relation type does not have the same frequency in other rhetorical parts of the narrative. As stated before, narrative is a genre that is established by the temporal sequencing of events. It is regular for these establishments to occur in this section, which includes forming the foundational background of the narrative. Circumstance and summary, which are types of rhetorical relations that contain semantic relations, basically include the introduction of narrative elements (e.g., time, place, person, and event-situation). Also under this section, the highest values in the pragmatic relation type are in the motivation and justifying relations. The relations of motivation and justification provide guidance to the recipient about the text producer's goals, limiting the recipient's possible expectations of the information presented.

Considering the relations under the complicating actions series of events—which is another rhetorical section of the narrative—motivation, justifying, sequence, and evaluation have high frequency of use. In terms of the sequencing of complex events, the relation is typical under this section. The evaluation relation conveys attitudes about the event or situation described. Considering the memoir-type texts, one can see the meaning that the text producer attributes to the event they experience and the value they give to it through this relationship.

Under evaluation, which is regarded as the most important part of the narrative in terms of narrative theory, the following relations come to the fore with very close rates: elaboration, evaluation, interpretation, and summary. The evaluation section includes utterances explaining why complex events are being expressed, their importance, and their unusual features for the person. The evaluation section is functionally the most significant part of the narrative (Yazıcı, 2004, p. 109). Uzun (2011, p. 185) emphasizes the feature of the evaluation section, which makes the communicative meaning clear, as the part that implicates the communicative intention that one tries to convey through the narrative. Notably, however, the rhetorical relations with the highest frequency in this section are semantic knowledge-oriented relations. It is possible to interpret this aspect as a reflection of the narrator's aim to give narrative value and credibility to the event(s) they narrate. Additionally, the fact that the highest number of sentence segments in the narrative sections are here seems to be in line with this observation.

The rhetorical relations exhibited in the conclusion section of the narrative are motivation, sequencing, concession, and summary. The conclusion part of the narrative may include only the last action, event, or situation, just as it can present the situation after the last action or include the situation that emerged after all complicating action events. Therefore, such relation aspects are regular in the conclusion part.

The text at the discourse level is processed in the form of segmentation of sentences based on semantic and pragmatic functions. Therefore, examining how the segment boundaries are determined essentially means examining how the units that make up the discourse structure are marked by the producer–recipient (Bestgen, 1998), and it is an important topic in discourse-related studies. Furthermore, knowledge of the discourse structure of the text is based on the discourse coherence relations established between different rhetorical sections since rhetorical relations are relevant in accessing discourse segments. Therefore, knowledge of the rhetorical parts of the text is crucial in understanding both written and spoken language (Zacks et al., 2017). In this context the findings from the analysis of the sentence segment level are mostly coherent with the functional features of the sections seen in the rhetorical scheme of the narrative. As the most basic and earliest acquired form of discourse, narratives and the knowledge about structuring narratives have a role in the text production processes. Also, the descriptions laid out in the theory helped to determine that students are aware of the differences

in written and oral narratives. Further, students were aware of the differences between written and oral narratives.

In the communication process, individuals produce meaningful content with the resources provided by the language system. The production of semantic content and the analysis of the produced content are divided into two stages of structure and integration. In the structure phase, the recipients make inferences about the propositional and conceptual content produced, while the content transferred from the integration phase is examined in terms of its coherence with the discourse structure formed in line with the communicative purpose. Metalinguistic knowledge on constructing discourse features in line with the communicative purpose and combining propositional networks between different text segments to form a coherent whole is essential in writing.

In the context of writing, metalinguistic knowledge refers to how transferred information is reflected in the discourse features of a text. Therefore, approaches and theories that model how to build connections between text segments are significant in terms of writing skills. The tools identified in the rhetorical structure theory, which describe the internal organization of the text and model how different discourse segments come together to form a coherent text structure, are relevant for teaching writing. Moreover, Garnham et al. (2015) reveal that the knowledge of structuring texts according to genre-specific features plays a crucial role in developing writing skills.

As stated before, teaching writing skills is a process where the information sources required for text production and how to utilize the different types of information in the surface text are taught. Therefore, the integration of theories such as the Rhetorical Structure Theory that provide information on writing methodology into didactic processes aiming at the development of writing skills is important in terms of reaching the target outcomes. Indeed, the methodology of writing and descriptions regarding the process of text production also contribute to the planning of didactic processes such as curricula and teaching materials.

#### **Author Contribution Rates**

The authors contributed equally to the study.

#### **Ethical Declaration**

All rules included in the “Directive for Scientific Research and Publication Ethics in Higher Education Institutions” have been adhered to, and none of the “Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics” included in the second section of the Directive have been implemented.

#### **Conflict Statements**

The author declares no competing interests.

#### **References**

- Bestgen, Y. (1998). Segmentation markers as trace and signal of discourse structure. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 29(6), 753–763. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(97\)00082-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(97)00082-9)
- Berman, R. A. (2009) Language development in narrative context. In D. I. Slobin (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of child language* (pp. 368–388). Cambridge University Press.
- Bialystok, E. (1987). Influences of bilingualism on metalinguistic development. *Second Language Research*, 3(2), 154–166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026765838700300205>
- Bialystok, E. (2001). Metalinguistic aspect of bilingual processing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 169–182. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000101>
- Cavanagh, S. (1997). Content analysis: Concepts, methods, and applications. *Nurse Research*, 4(3), 5–16. <https://doi.org/10.7748/nr.4.3.5.s2>



- Carther, R., & McCarth, M. (2006). *Cambridge grammar of English*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chatman, S. (1990). *Coming to terms: The rhetoric of narrative in fiction and films*. Cornell University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2020). *Nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. (M. Bütün, & S. B. Demir, Çev.; 5 bs.). Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Emmott, C. (1999). *Narrative comprehension a discourse perspectives*. Oxford University Press.
- Gergakopoulou, A. (2011). Narrative. In Z. Jan, Ö. Jan-Ola, & V. Jef (Eds.), *Discursive pragmatics* (pp. 190–207). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Graham, S., Hebert, M., & Harris, K. R. (2015). Research-based writing practices and the common core: Meta-analysis and meta-synthesis. *The Elementary School Journal*, 115(4), 498–522. <https://doi.org/10.1086/681964>
- Grosz, B. J., & Sidner, C. L. (1986). Attention, intention, and the structure of discourse. *Computational Discourse*, 12(3), 175–204.
- Grosz, B.J., A., & Weinstain, S. (1995). Centering: A framework for modeling the local coherence of discourse. *Computational Linguistics*, 21(2), 203–225. <https://doi.org/10.21236/ada324949>
- Hobbs, J. R. (1983). Why is discourse coherent? In F. Neubauer (Ed.), *Coherence in natural language texts* (pp. 26–69). Helmut Buske.
- Hopper, P. J. (1997). When 'grammar' and discourse clash: The problem of source conflict. In J. H. Bybee (Ed.), *Essays on language function and language types* (pp. 231–247). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kaygısız, Ç. (2018). Okuma eğitiminde metinsel yapı farkındalığı: Bilgilendirici metin örneği. *Turkish Studies International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 13(4), 823–840. <https://doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.12868>
- Kellog, R. (2008). Training writing skills: A cognitive deveelopment perspective. *Journal of Writing Research*, 1(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.17239/JOWR-2008.01.01.1>
- Kibble, R. (1999, Jan, 1). *Cb or not Cb? Centering Applied to NLG* [Paper presentation]. ACL'99 Workshop on Discourse and Reference, College Park, United States of America.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the Inner City*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1981). Persuasive discourse and ordinary conversation. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Georgetown University Table on Languages and Linguistics (GURT) analyzing discourse: Text and talk* (pp. 25–42). Georgetown University Press.
- Lascardies, A., & Asher, N. (1993). Temporal interpretation, discourse relations and commonsense entailment. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 19(1), 1–89. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00986208>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publishing Inc.
- Mann, W. C., & Thompson, S. A. (1988). Rhetorical structure theory: Towards a functional theory of text organization. *TEXT*, 8(3), 243–281. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1.1988.8.3.243>
- Matthiessen, C. (1995). *Lexicogrammatical cartography: English system*. International Language Sciences.
- Miles, M., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. SAGE Publication Inc.
- Moore, J. D., & Pollack, M. E. (1992). A problem for RST: The need for multi-level discourse analysis. *Computational Linguistics*, 18(4), 537–544.

- Moore, J. D., & Wiemer-Hastings, P. (2003). Discourse in computational linguistics and artificial intelligence. In A. C. Graesser, M. A. Gernsbacher, & S. R. Goldman (Eds.), *Handbook of discourse process* (pp. 439–487). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Moser, M., & Moore, J. D. (1996). Toward a synthesis of two accounts of discourse structure. *Computational Linguistics*, 22(3), 409–419.
- Myhill, D., Jones, S., & Wilson, A. (2016). Writing conversation: Fostering metalinguistic discussion about writing. *Research Papers in Education*, 31(1), 23–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2016.1106694>
- Nicholas, N. (1994). *Problems in the application of rhetoric structure theory to text generation* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Melbourne.
- Presley, M., & Harris, R. K. (2006). Cognitive strategies instruction: From basic research to classroom instruction. In P. A. Alexander, & H. W. Philip (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 287–305). Routledge.
- Reither, E. (1994). Has a consensus NL Generation Architecture appeared, and is it psycholinguistically plausible? *Seventh International Natural Language Generation Workshop*. Kennebunkport.
- Ruhi, Ş. (2009). Söylem ve birey. In A. Kocaman (Ed.), *Söylem üzerine* (3th. ed., pp. 16–26). ODTÜ Yayıncılık.
- Smith, C. S. (1997). *The parameter of aspect*. Kluwer Academic Publisher.
- Smith, C. S. (2003). *Modes of discourse the local structure of texts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. SAGE Publications Inc.
- Taboada, M., & Mann, W. C. (2006). Rhetoric Structure Theory: Looking back and moving ahead. *Discourse Studies*, 8(3), 423–459. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445606061881>
- Tannen, D. (1982). Oral and literate strategies in spoken and written narratives. *Language*, 1(58), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.2307/413530>
- Tomlin, R. S. (1987). Linguistic reflection of cognitive events. In R. S. Tomlin (Ed.), *Coherence and grounding in discourse* (pp. 455–479). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Trapman, M., Gelderen, A., Schooten, E., & Hulstijn, J. (2018). Writing proficiency level and writing development of low-achieving adolescent: The role of linguistic knowledge, fluency and metacognitive knowledge. *Reading and Writing*, 31, 893–926. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-018-9818-9>
- Turan, Ü. D., Zeyrek, D., & Bozşahin, C. (2012). Söylem ve bağdaşıklık ilişkileri. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, 2, 41–65.
- Uzun, L. (2011). *Genel dilbilim II*. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1985). *Handbook of discourse analysis* (Vol. 1). Academic Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1992). *Text and context explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse* (6th ed.). Longman Group.
- Virtanen, T. (1990). On the definition of text and discourse. *Folia Linguistica*, 3-4(24), 447–455.
- Yazıcı, N. (2004). *Anlatı metinlerinde ön ve arka planı belirginleştiren dilsel görünümler: Türkçe üzerine gözlemler* [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. Ankara Üniversitesi.

Zacks, J. M. (1998). The cognitive neuroscience of discourse: Covered grounded and new directions. In M. Schober, D. N. Rapp, & M. A. Britt (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of discourse processes* (pp. 269–294). Routledge.