

Grammatical Cohesion in Jo March's Utterances in Little Women: A Textual Analysis

Tastrid Nur Al-Fath¹, Hajjah Zulianti², Febriyanti³

^{1,2,3}STKIP PGRI Bandar Lampung

Email: tastridnuralfath@gmail.com¹, hazaulie@gmail.com², febriyanti.pascaunila@gmail.com⁴

Keywords:

Discourse analysis, grammatical cohesion, Little Women Movie

DOI: [10.35719/jlic.v7i2.651](https://doi.org/10.35719/jlic.v7i2.651)

Journal History

Submitted: October 2025

Revised: November 2025

Published: December 2025

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the use of grammatical cohesion in Jo March's dialogues of the Little Women movie, focusing on how frequent the types can occur as well as its function to convey meaning. This study addresses the gap by focusing how cohesive devices are used to shape Jo March's way of speaking and the way she expresses her character. The data were collected from Jo's utterances from the script, while the content analysis by Ary et al., was employed to analyze the data. The writer checks the data validity using peer debriefing and theory triangulation using Paltridge's and Halliday's theory. Several types the writer found from the script are reference, conjunction, substitution, and ellipsis. The results indicate that conjunctions were the most frequent types from the script, with 46%. Followed by reference with 26%, ellipsis 17%, and substitution 11%. These numbers show that Jo tends to speak quickly and connect her ideas closely together. The references help her link one idea to another, while ellipsis and substitution reveal her natural, informal way of talking. In other words, the function of each grammatical cohesion types is to create unity and clarity in a text by linking its elements, avoiding unnecessary repetition, and making the flow of contents easier to follow.

How to cite: Grammatical Cohesion in Jo March's Utterances in Little Women: A Textual Analysis. (2025). *Journal of Language Intelligence and Culture*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.35719/jlic.v7i2.651>



Copyright: © The author (s) 2025

This work is licensed under a Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0).

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the film industry has grown rapidly, providing not only entertainment but also serving as a medium for education and inspiration (Johnson, 2015; Restianty et al., 2024). Unlike novels, movie scripts depend heavily on dialogue with minimal narration, making linguistic analysis essential for understanding the storyline and the speaker's intentions (Ni'mah & Rosyidah, 2023). Cohesion describes the relationship between items in a text, showing how words and structures in a sentence work together to create unity. Furthermore, one important aspect of discourse analysis is grammatical cohesion, which, according to (Halliday & Hasan, 1976), refers to the use of linguistic elements such as reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction to create logical links within a text (Afrianto, 2017; Cahya et al., 2025; Paltridge, 2012). Some of the types of grammatical cohesion are reference, conjunction, substitution, and ellipsis. Reference involves the use of pronouns or determiners to point to other elements in the discourse, focusing on clarity and avoiding repetition (Aqmarina, 2020; Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Substitution replaces one linguistic item with another to avoid redundancy and maintain textual flow (Cui, 2024; Shet, 2021). Ellipsis omits words or phrases that can be understood from the context, allowing sentences to remain concise yet coherent (Diep & Le, 2024; Li, 2024). Meanwhile, conjunction functions to link clauses or sentences logically through additive, adversative, causal, or temporal relations (Abdi & Johnson, 2023).

Without grammatical cohesion, a text may become unclear and difficult to follow (Abdi & Johnson, 2023; Aqmarina, 2020; Cui, 2024). However, non-native speakers may often face difficulties in understanding movie scripts due to limited grammar, unfamiliar vocabulary, and cultural aspects, which may lead to misinterpretation (Berardo, 2006; Lee, 2022; Sudiansyah, 2021). Although many linguistic analyses have focused on cohesion in written texts, few have studied its application in film dialogues, where emotional tone and interaction matter most (Maulana et al., 2025; Putri et al., 2025). This study added to the field by showing how grammatical cohesion can be used to convey character behaviors, emotions, and ideas (Wibowo & Arifin, 2024).

Aside from that, this study focuses on the 2019 film *Little Women*, adapted from Louisa May Alcott's 1868 novel (Alcott, 1868). The film shows not only their struggle for creative freedom but also their effort to make their voices heard in a world mostly controlled by men (Fauziah & Elissa, 2022; Sudiansyah, 2021). Among all characters, Jo March is selected as the focus of this study because her dialogue provides linguistically rich data for analyzing grammatical cohesion. As an aspiring writer who challenges social norms and gender expectations of her time, Jo

frequently engages in complex conversations that contain her interest in reading and writing, which eventually shapes the way she speaks, she often uses extended, connected sentences, and relies on implied meanings rather than explicit statements. These make her utterances particularly suitable for analyzing cohesive devices such as reference, conjunction, ellipsis, and substitution.

In conducting this study, the writer reviewed several related studies on grammatical cohesion and movie analysis. Astri and Sri (2022) analyzed grammatical cohesion in the short story *The Princess and The Pea*, focusing only on references, where demonstrative reference was the most frequent type. Maldy (2024) examined both grammatical and lexical cohesion in the *Brave* movie script, identifying 283 grammatical and 113 lexical aspects, but without discussing their functions in depth. Afrianto (2017) investigated students' writing at Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia, finding that reference was the most dominant cohesive device in 122 instances across three essays. Meanwhile, Meirinda (2024) studied lexical cohesion in *The Help* movie script, reflecting the reiteration and collocation. These previous studies focus on the use of cohesion in different texts, whether short stories, movie scripts, or student essays (Afrianto, 2017; Afriliani & Cahyati, 2022; Maldy, 2024; Meirinda, 2024).

This study differs from previous research by focusing exclusively on Jo March's dialogues in *Little Women* (2019) movie script and analyzing not only the types but also the frequency and communicative functions of grammatical cohesion within spoken film discourse. Unlike earlier studies that conducted cohesion in short stories or student essays, this research provides a new perspective on how grammatical cohesion operates in audiovisual narrative texts, linking linguistic patterns with character portrayal and meaning construction. Austin (1962) explains that communication requires both the language and the situation to be understood, which is why this study focuses on grammatical cohesion in the *Little Women* movie script (Austin, 1962). As a form of literary communication, films reflect not only spoken interactions but also the social and cultural realities of their time, since every era carries distinct social issues and challenges (Lee, 2022; Sánchez-Auñón et al., 2023; Sudiansyah, 2021). In the case of *Little Women* movie, these struggles reflect around women's rights and identity, making it relevant to examine how grammatical cohesion conveys feminist ideas through language and dialogue (Ainurisanti, 2023; Monteverdi, 2024; S. A. Putri et al., 2024).

Since a movie script is different from other texts, the functions of cohesion may vary (Lee, 2022; Sudiansyah, 2021). For this reason, the writer used discourse analysis to identify the types of grammatical cohesion used, find the frequency of each type, and explain their special functions in the script.

METHODS

This study used descriptive qualitative research with a content analysis approach to examine grammatical cohesion in the *Little Women* movie script (Ary et al., 2010; Creswell, 2009). Content analysis is used to focus the analysis on the written dialogues taken directly from the *Little Women's* script. The trustworthiness of the findings was strengthened through triangulation. The writer used peer debriefing and theory triangulation. Peer debriefing was carried out by discussing the data analysis and interpretation of grammatical cohesion with peers and the research supervisor to check the accuracy of the analysis and minimize personal bias. In addition, theory triangulation was applied by interpreting the data using more than one theoretical perspective on grammatical cohesion (Denzin, 1978; Patton, 2002).

A descriptive approach was applied to explain the types and functions of grammatical cohesion devices found in Jo March's dialogues based on Paltridge's discourse analysis framework (Amoret & Wardoyo, 2025; Nurani et al., 2024; Samad & Paris, 2024). Supporting tools such as a laptop, the Internet, Grammarly, and AI-based text checkers were used to help identify grammatical cohesion devices and reduce possible errors (Cui, 2024; Halimah et al., 2024). The Internet also provided access to theoretical references, online resources, and previous studies that supported the research framework.

Since the movie script was taken directly from the script, the film itself was also used to cross-check the accuracy, tone, and context of Jo March's utterances (Monteverdi, 2024; Sutrisno et al., 2023; Wen, 2025). This study followed the stages of data analysis proposed by Creswell (2007), cited in Ary et al. (2010). The steps included organizing and preparing the movie script, reading the script to become familiar with the content, coding specific utterances that contained grammatical cohesion devices, categorizing the data into each type of cohesion, interpreting the meaning and function of the identified utterances, and presenting the findings (Ary et al., 2010; Creswell, 2009). Each device was marked distinctly: references were italicized, conjunctions underlined, substitutions bold and underlined, and ellipses marked with "[...]". The frequency of each grammatical cohesion type was then calculated and presented in tables as percentages to show the distribution.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

After analyzing the Little Women script that has dialogues of Jo March. The writer found a total of 44 Jo March’s scenes that contain grammatical cohesion, out of 116 scenes in total. In terms of the types, the frequency is presented below.

Table 1. Percentage of Grammatical Cohesion Occurrence

Grammatical Cohesion Types	Occurrence	Percentage
Reference		
Personal	66	21%
Demonstrative	2	1%
Comparative	14	4%
Conjunction		
Additive	72	23%
Comparative	31	10%
Time	6	2%
Consequence	35	11%
Substitution		
Nominal	4	1%
Verbal	10	3%
Clausal	21	7%
Ellipsis		
Nominal	1	1%
Verbal	19	6%
Clausal	30	10%
Total	311	100%

Based on the data presented in the tables above, out of a total of 116 scenes, 42 scenes contained dialogues spoken by Jo March. Among these, reference appeared most frequently, particularly the personal type, followed by conjunction, with addition being the most common, then ellipsis, and finally substitution. After presenting the data table, the writer then calculated the frequency of occurrence for each type of grammatical cohesion in percentage.

The analysis revealed four types of grammatical cohesion in Jo March’s dialogues: reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. Out of 311 data, a total of 44 utterances were identified to contain cohesive devices. Conjunctions were the most dominant type, occurring 144 times (46%), with additive conjunctions appearing most frequently. Reference followed with 82 occurrences (27%), consisting mainly of personal references (66 instances), while demonstrative and comparative references appeared less frequently (2 and 14 instances respectively). Ellipsis appeared 50 times (16%), dominated by clausal ellipsis (30 instances), followed by verbal (19) and nominal (1). Substitution was the least used type, found

35 times (11%), with clausal substitution occurring most frequently (21 instances), followed by verbal (10) and nominal (4).

1. Reference

According to George Yule, reference is the use of a linguistic form such as a name, phrase, or pronoun to identify something or someone that the speaker or writer intends to mention (Brown & Yule, 1983). In this study, out of 69 instances of reference, personal reference was the most dominant with 51 occurrences, followed by comparative reference with 15 occurrences, and demonstrative reference with only 3 occurrences.

Act 13 INT. GARDINER'S NEW YEAR'S PARTY. CONCORD. NIGHT. 1861.

Laurie : Says who?

Jo : Meg. **She's** my older sister.

In this dialogue, the form of grammatical cohesion that appears is **personal reference**. Jo answers by mentioning “*she*” as the pronoun that refer back to Meg. Instead of repeating “*Meg is my older sister*,” Jo uses the pronoun “*she*” to avoid redundancy. This is because the pronoun “*she*” refers back to “*Meg*,” which is explicitly mentioned earlier in the same utterance. Since the referent appears before the pronoun, the reference is considered anaphoric (Amoret & Wardoyo, 2025; S. A. Putri & Simatupang, 2024).

This utterance occurs in a ballroom scene where Laurie and Jo are away from the dance floor, remains inside the ballroom. During their conversation, Jo points to Meg, who is currently on the dance floor, and identifies her as her older sister. In this case, the pronoun “*she*” is used alongside a physical gesture, which relies on the shared information they had, making the reference clear without verbal repetition. This indicates the close and informal relationship between Laurie and Jo, as Jo assumes Laurie can easily identify the referent.

Act 35 INT. LAURENCE HOUSE. LIBRARY. DAY. 1862.

Marmee : You are not to attend that school any more.

Jo : Good, **that** man has always been an idiot.

In this dialogue, the **demonstrative reference** appears in Jo's utterance “*that man*”. The demonstrative “*that*” is used to identify a person previously mentioned in the conversation (Maulida et al., 2018; S. A. Putri & Simatupang, 2024). In this context, “*that man*” contains a demonstrative personal reference in the form of “*that man*,” which refers anaphorically to Mr. Davis, who has been mentioned earlier in the conversation.

In everyday conversation, the use of “that” can carry a sarcastic tone, especially when speakers avoid mentioning someone’s name directly. While Jo’s use of “that,” whom she delivered with slightly raised intonation, carries a strong evaluative meaning and signals Jo’s emotional distance and irritation toward Mr. Davis. Rather than merely identifying the referent, the demonstrative also functions to express Jo’s negative judgment of him. This response indicates Jo’s agreement with Marmee’s statement, as she implicitly validates her mother’s decision by portraying Mr. Davis do not deserve respect.

Act 1 INT. NEW YORK. PUBLISHING OFFICE. 1868.

Jo : Should I tell my, my friend that you’ll take another story if she had one **better than** this?

Mr. Dashwood : We’ll look at it. Tell her to make it short...

In Jo’s dialogue, the phrase “*better than*” functions as a **comparative reference**. The word “*better*” explicitly compares one with “*this*”, which points to “*another story*” already mentioned in the same line (S. A. Putri & Simatupang, 2024; Sutrisno et al., 2023). The utterance occurs in a scene where Jo is attempting to publish her story and Mr. Dashwood agrees to accept it under certain conditions.

In this context, Jo is pointing out that the friend might have a different choice that is better to the one she already showed to Mr. Dashwood. In this scene, Jo is actually presenting her own work but deliberately refers to it as her friend’s story. This strategy reflects Jo’s cautious and self-protective attitude, as she feels uncertain about claiming authorship of her writing . This can show Jo’s hope of her work being accepted, as she seeks validation while trying to avoid possible rejection.

2. Conjunction

Conjunctions are grammatical devices that connect clauses or sentences, show relationships between the texts, such as “and,” “but,” “so,” and “because,” therefore the cohesion flow clearly (Brown & Yule, 1983). Conjunctions are classified into four types, specifically addition, comparison, time, and consequence (Rose & Martin, 2012). In this study, the writer found that conjunctions appeared frequently across the movie script as uttered by Jo March. Out of a total of 144 conjunction items, addition occurred 72 times, comparison 31 times, temporal 6 times, and consequence 35 times.

Act 11 THE PAST. INT. CONCORD. MARCH HOUSE. JO & MEG'S ROOM. 1861.

Beth : I don't want to go but I wish I could hear all the music.

Jo : I'll keep it all in my head **and** try to sing it for you when I get home.

In the dialogue, the conjunction "and" is identified as an **addition conjunction**. It connects two related actions between "*keeping it all (the music) in her head*" and "*try to sing it for you (Beth)*" later. The scene takes place when Beth is ill and unable to attend the concert. She attempts to comfort Beth by offering an alternative way for her to experience the music. The use of the additive conjunction "and" strategically presents these actions as a continuous and caring effort. In the movie, her voice that shows empathy and affection, reflects how Jo is so much close to Beth, her sister.

Act 23 THE PAST. INT. ATTIC OF THE MARCH HOUSE. MORNING. 1861.

Beth : At least we have father and mother and each other.

Jo : We haven't got father. And we won't have him for **as long as** this war drags on.

In Jo dialogue above, the word "as ... as" is identified as **comparative conjunction**, which refer to time span (Brown & Yule, 1983). The phrase "as long as" in "*We haven't got father. And we won't have him for as long as this war drags on.*" functions as a comparative conjunction (Afriliani & Cahyati, 2022). It compares the duration of their current situation to the ongoing war, linking this idea to her previous statement about not having their father up to the war.

The dialogue occurs during a period of war, when men from lower social classes, including the March sisters' father, are required to volunteer for military service. In this context, Jo disagrees with Beth's attempt to find comfort, expressing frustration and emotional pain rather than reassurance. The use of "as long as" conveys Jo's disappointment and sense of loss, as it shows that their father will not return home until the war ends, that can remain uncertain. Strategically, this comparative reference allows Jo to frame their situation as an extended absence, making their emotional state resemble that of being fatherless for the entire duration of the war.

Act 23 THE PAST. INT. ATTIC OF THE MARCH HOUSE. MORNING. 1861.

Jo : Meg, wait **until** you see this /new speech!

Beth : I don't see how you can write such splendid things, Jo!

From Jo's utterance above, the word "until" functions as a time conjunction (Ni'mah & Rosyidah, 2023). It indicates that Meg's action of waiting must continue up to the point when she sees Jo's new speech. The use of "until"

in this context make a boundary of time, connecting the act of “wait until you see this new speech.” This shows how Jo creates anticipation and builds excitement for what she has written.

This scene takes place in the attic of the March house, where Jo is enthusiastically sharing her writing with her sisters. The use of “until” functions as a persuasive strategy, as Jo motivates Meg to engage with the new speech by creating anticipation rather than giving a direct command.

Act 64 EXT. BEACH. DAY. 1862. KITES! BADMINTON! OCEAN!

Jo : We could never have loved the earth so well **if** we had had no childhood in it...

According to the word “if” functions as a **consequence conjunction** of condition (Rose & Martin, 2012). The condition clause “if we had had no childhood in it” presents the cause, while the main clause “We could never have loved the earth so well” expresses the consequence (Cahya et al., 2025).

The scene takes place at the shore, where Jo is walking with Beth, who is seriously ill, while they observe children flying kites, running freely, and the vast ocean landscape. Jo compares the joy of childhood with Beth’s fragile state, while the conditional “if” functions as her response to express it in an imaginative way.

3. Substitution

According to George Yule (1996), substitution is a type of grammatical cohesion used to replace a linguistic element with another in order to make the sentence shorter, but still keep the meaning clear (Brown & Yule, 1983). Substitution can be divided into three types, those are nominal, verbal, and clausal (Paltridge, 2012). The writer found that substitution appeared very infrequently in the movie script as uttered by Jo March. Out of a total of 35 substitution items, nominal substitution occurred 4 times, verbal substitution 10 times, and clausal substitution 21 times, indicating that substitution was rarely used compared to other cohesion devices.

Act 1 INT. NEW YORK. PUBLISHING OFFICE. 1868.

Jo hands over the story, Mr. Dashwood hands over the money, business done.

Jo : Should I tell my, my friend that you’ll take **another** if she had one better than this?

In this dialogue, Jo uses the word “*another*” as a form of **nominal substitution** (Afriliani & Cahyati, 2022). The item another substitutes for the noun phrase “*the story*”, which was already mentioned in the previous context . The meaning of Jo’s utterance can be understood as “*you will take another story if she had one better than this story.*”

The scene occurs during a business exchange in which Jo hands over her story and Mr. Dashwood pays her, showing that her work has been accepted. Jo's utterance expresses excitement and growing confidence, as this success motivates her to consider future opportunities (Monteverdi, 2024). By using "another," Jo subtly suggests the possibility of submitting an additional story without appearing demanding or overly confident. Before the dialogue, Jo is more hesitant that her story would not be accepted, but transition to one who begins to see herself as capable of producing more work.

Act 113 THE PRESENT. INT. PUBLISHING HOUSE. NEW YORK CITY. DAY. 1870.
Dashwood : Doesn't your family need the money more immediately?
Jo : They do, which is why I wanted upfront payment.

From the dialogue above, in Jo's response the word use "do" is applied as **verbal substitution** (Paltridge, 2012). That auxiliary verb "do" replace the verb phrase "...need the money more immediately" from Dashwood's previous question. The full statement Jo could have said, without substitution would be "They need the money more immediately, which is why I wanted upfront payment."

This exchange takes place near the end of the story, when Jo's work is being prepared for publication, marking an important stage in her development as a writer (Ainurisanti, 2023). While the use of verbal substitution allows Jo to respond efficiently, stating her point without repeating the entire clause. In this scene, Jo is pictured as a more mature and pragmatic character, as shown through her use of the verbal substitution "do."

Act 32 INT. AUNT MARCH'S HOUSE. CONTINUOUS. 1862.
Aunt March : It is possible to be right and foolish.
Jo : I don't think so.

From the dialogue above, Jo's response using "so" demonstrates **clausal substitution**. In that phrase, Jo conveyed her disagreement to Aunt March's statement. The word "so" replaces the entire clause from Aunt March's statement, which is "I don't think it is possible to be right and foolish." This exchange reflects a moment of ideological contrast between Aunt March's conventional mindset and Jo's more idealistic way of thinking. Strategically, the use of clausal substitution shows Jo's disagreement in a concise way, while referring back to the aunt March's clause. As stated by Martin & Rose (2007), the word "so" is included as substitution.

4. Ellipsis

Ellipsis is a form of grammatical cohesion in which part of a linguistic structure is omitted when it is understood from the context (Brown & Yule, 1983; Paltridge, 2012). The writer divided the types of ellipsis into three, such as nominal, verbal, and clausal, which have distinct function (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). For ellipsis, a total of 50 occurrences were identified throughout the dialogues. These consist of 1 nominal ellipsis, 19 verbal ellipsis, and 30 clausal ellipses.

Act 65 THE PRESENT. EXT. SEASHORE. DAY. 1869.

Jo : I don't have any new stories.

Beth : Why not?

Jo : Haven't written any [**new stories**].

In the dialogue, when Beth asks, "*Why not?*" Jo responds with the utterance, "*Haven't written any.*" The complete form of this statement would be, "*I haven't written any new stories.*" In this case, the noun phrase "*any*" is omitted from "*new stories.*" This omission represents a **nominal ellipsis** (Maulida et al., 2018). Linguistically, this utterance exemplifies nominal ellipsis, as the subject (I), auxiliary (have), and the full noun phrase (new stories) are omitted and understood from the preceding context (Diep & Le, 2024).

The dialogue takes place at a moment when Jo is close to giving up her ambition of becoming a well-known writer after experiencing a series of personal difficulties, including the loss of her manuscripts, financial problems, and Beth's illness. This ellipsis functions as a discourse strategy to avoid repeating the full clause, which would require Jo to explicitly restate the painful idea of her creative stagnation.

Act 67 INT. MARCH FAMILY HOME. EVENING. 1862.

Marmee : Twenty-five dollars! That isn't like Aunt March to be so generous.

Jo : I didn't go to Aunt March, [**I**] couldn't bear to [**go**].

In this case, Jo's dialogue contains **verbal ellipsis**, since the subject "I" and the verb "go" are omitted but understood from the context (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). The full construction would be "*I couldn't bear to go,*" yet Jo shortens it by dropping the repeated elements. In the clause "[I] couldn't bear to [go]," the meaning is incomplete without the verb "go," because "couldn't bear to" requires a following verb to express an action (Cui, 2024).

The dialogue occurs in a situation of financial hardship, when Jo is expected to seek help from Aunt March, who is known for her harsh and judgmental attitude. Instead of going to Aunt March, Jo chooses to cut and sell her hair in order to buy medicine for Beth. This ellipsis serves not only a grammatical function but

also an emotional one. In other words, Jo is avoiding the explicit repetition, and minimizing the direct reference to an action that would involve her reluctant.

Act 30 THE PAST. EXT. CONCORD TOWN ROAD. MORNING. JANUARY, 1862.

Jo : Beth, after your shopping, I need you to work your way through the new sums and [I need to work your way to the new] spelling and I'll check it all when I get home.

The utterance above demonstrates a case of **clausal ellipsis**, since the second clause omits the repeated predicate “*I need you work your way through the new.*” Instead of repeating the entire clause, Jo simply leaves the verb phrase “*spelling.*” This ellipsis involves the omission of the subject (I), the predicator (need), the complement (you), and part of the verbal group (to work your way through), leaving only the noun “*spelling*” as the remaining element (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Because some components of the clause are ellipped and the listener must reconstruct the full clause structure from the preceding context, then the omission is classified as clausal ellipsis (Shet, 2021).

The utterance occurs in a situation where Beth does not attend school, and Jo takes responsibility for teaching her at home. This strategy reflects Jo’s role as a caregiver and informal teacher: the ellipsis allows her speech to sound firm and instructional, similar to classroom discourse.

CONCLUSION

Grammatical cohesion makes communication smoother, that is the reason this analysis was conducted by the writer on Little Women movie script. Jo March’s dialogues particularly reveals that each type of grammatical cohesion carries a different function in shaping meaning and maintaining clarity within interaction.

Based on the conducted analysis, the occurrences of reference, conjunction, ellipsis, and substitution varied across the 44 scenes. The analysis shows that among the types of grammatical cohesion, reference was dominated by the personal subtype with 21%, followed by comparative reference at 4% and demonstrative reference at 1%. In substitution, verbal substitution appeared most frequently with 7%, while clausal substitution reached 3% and nominal substitution only 1%. Ellipsis was also found, where clausal ellipsis occurred most often at 10%, followed by verbal ellipsis at 6%, and nominal ellipsis at 1%. In terms of conjunctions, addition was the most dominant with 23%, followed by comparison at 10%, consequence at 11%, and temporal relations at 2%. These percentages indicate that conjunctions, particularly addition, were the most frequently used devices, while demonstrative and nominal ellipsis were the least used.

According to Halliday and Hasan's framework of grammatical cohesion, the findings indicate that cohesive devices in dialogue function as meaning-making resources rather than mere grammatical structures. Jo March's frequent use of reference, conjunction, and ellipsis contributes to her portrayal as an articulate and emotionally engaged character. Thus, this research shows that grammatical cohesion functions in shaping character identity while maintaining coherence and natural discourse continuity in film dialogue.

The use of reference, conjunction, ellipsis, and substitution demonstrates how meaning in discourse is built not only through complete sentences but also through shared context and interaction between characters. In the film dialogue, the findings suggest that cohesion contributes to character development, as the choice of cohesive devices reflects interactional style, emotional involvement, and interpersonal relationships. Therefore, grammatical cohesion should be viewed as a functional discourse resource that supports both narrative flow and character identity in cinematic texts.

REFERENCES

- Abdi, T. M., & Johnson, M. D. (2023). Exploring new insights into the role of cohesive devices in written academic genres. *Assessing Writing*, 57, 100749. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100749>
- Afrianto, A. (2017). Grammatical Cohesion In Students' Writing: A Case At Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia. *Leksema: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 2(2), 97–112. <https://doi.org/10.22515/ljbs.v2i2.899>
- Afriliani, A., & Cahyati, S. S. (2022). An Analysis of Grammatical Cohesion of Reference in a Short Story Entitled "The Princess and The Pea." *PROJECT*, 5(6), 1144–1149.
- Ainurisanti, R. D. (2023). Women's Language Features in Jo March's Dialogues from Little Women Movie. *JoLLA: Journal of Language, Literature, and Arts*, 3(10), 1462–1473. <https://doi.org/10.17977/umo64v3i102023p1462-1473>
- Alcott, L. M. (1868). Little Women. *Robert Brothers*.
- Amoret, Z., & Wardoyo, C. (2025). Analysis of Polysemy in Little Women (2019) Movie. *LITERA: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 11(1), 27–32. <https://doi.org/10.36002/litera.viii.3725>
- Aqmarina, A. (2020). The Exploration Of Cohesive Devices In Synopsis Writings Produced By English Study Program Students Of Universitas Gadjah Mada. *SALEE: Study of Applied Linguistics and English Education*, 1(01), 51–66. <https://doi.org/10.35961/salee.vi0i1.73>

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Razavieh, A., & Sorensen, C. K. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th ed.). Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How To Do Things with Words*. Clarendon Press.
- Berardo, S. A. (2006). The Use of Authentic Materials in The Teaching of Reading. *The Reading Matrix*, 6(2), 60–69.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cahya, M. Y., Agry, P., & Cipto, W. (2025). Grammatical Cohesion in Oral Narration: An Analysis of Podcast UR Cristiano Playlist. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 12(2), 2458–2478. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v12i2.5803>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage Publications.
- Cui, Y. (2024). The Application of Cohesion and Coherence Theory in College English Reading Instruction from the Perspective of Discourse Analysis. *Open Access Library Journal*, 11(1), 1–12.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Diep, G. L., & Le, T. N. D. (2024). An Analysis of Coherence and Cohesion in English Majors' Academic Essays. *International Journal of Language Instruction*, 3(3), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijli.24331>
- Fauziah, N., & Elissa, E. T. (2022). Language and Communication. *International Journal of Community Service (IJCS)*, 1(1), 01–10. <https://doi.org/10.55299/ijcs.v1i1.86>
- Halimah, M., Hidayat, D. N., Alek, A., & Baker, S. (2024). Discourse Analysis on the Cohesive Devices in the Graduate Student Thesis. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 4(2), 484–495. <https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v4i2.1766>
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
- Johnson, B. C. (2015). Introduction: Movies as Edutainment. *Counterpoints*, 474, 1–10.
- Lee, Y. J. J. (2022). Using Films in Second-Language Learning: Perspectives Through the Lens of Transmedia and Cultural Learning. *STEM Journal*, 23(4), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.16875/stem.2022.23.4.1>
- Li, Q. (2024). Error Analysis of College English Writing Based on the Cohesion and Coherence Theory. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 14(2), 73. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v14n2p73>
- Maldi, R. (2024). *An Analysis of Grammatical and Lexical Aspects in The Movie Script Brave*. Universitas Ahmad Dahlan.

- Meirinda, D. P. (2024). An analysis of lexical cohesion in The Help movie script. *Journal of English Language and Literature (JELL)*, 9(1), 45–46.
- Monteverdi, E. C. (2024). The Role of Visual Narratives in Representing Female Identity and Emotions in Little Women (2019). *Art and Society*, 3(6), 60–67. <https://doi.org/10.56397/AS.2024.12.08>
- Ni'mah, E. K., & Rosyidah, A. Al. (2023). Enola Holmes 2020 Movie: Revealing Grammatical Cohesion. *SUSASTRA: Jurnal Ilmu Susastra Dan Budaya*, 10(2), 92–100. <https://doi.org/10.51817/susastra.v10i2.107>
- Nurani, P., Rara, P., & Nugroho, A. (2024). An Analysis Of Feminist Thoughts Of Life's Struggle Presented In The Movie "Little Woman (2019)." *Eduvest - Journal of Universal Studies*, 4(4), 2126–2139. <https://doi.org/10.59188/eduvest.v4i4.1221>
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Bloomsbury.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Putri, I. G. A. V. W., Widiadnya, I. G. N. B. Y., & Irwandika, G. (2025). Female Representation In English Learning Book : Critical Discourse Analyses. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 13(1), 257–268. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v13i1.11307>
- Putri, S. A., Rohmani, Apriza, B., & Elizar. (2024). Effectiveness of Using Animation Videos in Science Learning in Elementary Schools: A Systematic Literature Reviews. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Research and Review*, 7(3), 667–678. <https://doi.org/10.23887/ijerr.v7i3.82242>
- Restianty, A., Khang, N. T., & Mahameruaji, J. N. (2024). The intersection of film, teaching, and inclusive education. *ProTVF*, 8(2), 217–235. <https://doi.org/10.24198/ptvf.v8i2.55183>
- Rose, D., & Martin, J. R. (2012). *Learning to Write, Reading to Learn: Genre, Knowledge and Pedagogy of the Sydney School*. Univeristy of Toronto Press.
- Samad, P., & Paris, N. (2024). Feminist Perspective of Life's Struggle: A Literature Review of the Movie Little Woman (2019). *Innovations in Language Education and Literature*, 1(1), 30–34. <https://doi.org/10.31605/ilere.viii.3929>
- Sánchez-Auñón, E., Férez-Mora, P. A., & Monroy-Hernández, F. (2023). The use of films in the teaching of English as a foreign language: a systematic literature review. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 8(1), 10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-022-00183-0>
- Shet, J. P. (2021). Identification of substitution and Ellipsis in Leo Tolstoy's short story by English Language major students. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(2), 1075–1085. <https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.75>

- Sudiansyah. (2021). The Analysis of Formal Equivalence and Dynamic Equivalence in Translated Subtitle in Little Women Movie. *MEDIOVA: Journal of Islamic Media Studies*, 1(2), 125–137. <https://doi.org/10.32923/medio.vii2.1916>
- Sutrisno, B., Nurhasanah, N. P., & Rachmawati, B. (2023). An Analysis Of How Women’s Struggle Portrayed From The Main Character In The Movie “Little Women (2019).” *JELL (Journal of English Language and Literature) STIBA-IEC Jakarta*, 8(01), 97–110. <https://doi.org/10.37110/jell.v8i01.174>
- Wen, W. (2025). *Freedom of Women in Language and Behavior* (pp. 681–686). https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-440-2_77
- Wibowo, J., & Arifin, Z. (2024). An Analysis Of The National Character Building Ofsongslyrics: Stand Out Fit In, A Milions Dreams And By My Side. *Interling: International Journal of English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 1(1), 23–38. <https://doi.org/10.55210/interling.viii.1208>