



THE COHESIVE DEVICES IN MONOLOG DISCUSSION TEXTS

Lilia Indriani ✉

Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Program Pascasarjana, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Info Artikel

Sejarah Artikel:
Diterima Agustus 2012
Disetujui September 2012
Dipublikasikan November 2012

Keywords:
Cohesive devices
Theme-rheme
Thematic progression
And discussion text

Abstrak

Studi ini bertujuan untuk menemukan a) tipe grammatical dan kohesif device, b) bagaimana grammatical dan lexical kohesif device mendukung progress thematic, dan c) bagaimana kohesif device dan progresi thematic mengembangkan cohesi dari diskusi monolog dari mahasiswa 3 kelas speaking universitas Tidar Magelang. Penelitian ini adalah deskriptif kualitatif. Subjek terdiri dari 20 siswa tahun kedua universitas Tidar Magelang. Data didapat dengan spoken tes. Klausa dianalisa menggunakan teori Hasan dan Halliday (1976), tema dan rima oleh Gerot dan Wignell (1994) dan paten progresi tematik Paltridge (2000). Hasil menunjukkan bahwa tipe kohesif device adalah referensi (34.97%), konjungsi (13.48%), substitusi (1.06%), ellipsis (2.22%), dan lexical (48.27%). Kedua, tipe dari tema yang ditemukan adalah unmarked (42.51%), marked topical (4.63%), tekstual (49.32%), dan tema interpersonal (2.31%). Karena paten yang ditemukan adalah constant/re-iteration (28.47%), zig zag (24.80%) dan multiple theme pattern (13.08%).

Abstract

This study is meant to find out a) the type of grammatical and lexical cohesive devices, b) how grammatical and lexical cohesive devices support thematic progression, and c) how cohesive devices and thematic progression develop cohesion of monolog discussion texts produced by the students of Speaking 3 class of English Department of Magelang Tidar University. This is a descriptive qualitative study. The subject consisted of 20 students in the second year of English Department of Tidar Magelang University. The spoken test was used to collect the data. The data were monologue-like data and chunked in clauses. The clauses are then analyzed to find the cohesive devices based on Halliday and Hasan (1976), theme-rheme based on Gerot and Wignell (1994), and thematic progression pattern based on Paltridge (2000). After that, the cohesive devices and theme-rheme are analyzed in the way they give connective contribution to thematic progression of discussion text to create cohesion. The findings showed that the types of cohesive devices are reference (34.97%), conjunction (13.48%), substitution (1.06%), ellipsis (2.22%) and lexical (48.27%). Second, the types of theme found are unmarked (42.51%) and marked topical (4.63%), textual (49.32%) and interpersonal theme (2.31%). Because it is spoken language, there is 1.23% Minor Clause. Third, the thematic progression patterns found are constant / re-iteration (28.47%), zig-zag (24.80%) and multiple theme patterns (13.08%).

© 2012 Universitas Negeri Semarang

✉ Alamat korespondensi:
Kampus Unnes Bendan Ngisor, Semarang 50233
E-mail: jurnalpps@unnes.ac.id

ISSN 2087-0108

INTRODUCTION

For most people, the ability to speak a language is synonymous with knowing that language since speech is the most basic means of human communication. Nevertheless, speaking in a second or foreign language has often been viewed as the most demanding of the four skills (Bailey and Savage, 1994:7). The most difficult aspect of spoken English is that it is almost always accomplished via interaction with at least one other speaker. This means that a variety of demands are in place at once: monitoring and understanding the other speaker(s), thinking about one's own contribution, producing the contribution, monitoring its effect, and so on. This is one reason why students were shocked and disappointed when they used their second or foreign language for the first time in real interaction: they had not been prepared for spontaneous communication and could not cope with all of simultaneous demands. That is, speaking is an activity requiring the integration of many subsystems. All these factors combine to make speaking a second or foreign language a formidable task for language learners. (Bailey and Savage, 1994:6-7)

The word text is used in linguistics to refer to any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that does form a unified whole. A text may be spoken or written, prose or verse, dialogue or monologue. It may be anything from a single proverb to a whole play, from a momentary cry for help to an all-day discussion on a committee. A text is a unit of language in use. It is not a grammatical unit like a clause or a sentence; and it is not defined by its size. A text is best regarded as a semantics unit: a unit not of form but of meaning. Thus it is related to a clause or sentence not by size but by realization, the coding of one symbolic system in another. (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:1-2)

A text is not considered to be a good one if it is not cohesive. Halliday and Hasan (1989: 2) cite that a text is considered to be a good text if it fulfils two properties, namely cohesion and coherence. According to them cohesion is internal property, while coherence is contextual properties of paragraph. In addition, a cohesive text is a text to which a paragraph in the text tie together and coherence means that a group of sentences relates to the context. An essential aspect of readability is coherence. Coherence is product of many different factors, which combine to make every paragraph, every sentence, and every phrase contribute to the meaning of the whole piece. Coherence in speaking is much more difficult to

sustain than in writing simply because speakers speak directly.

Cohesion is an important aspect of discourse analysis as it creates coherence. Halliday and Hasan (1989:48) state that an important contribution to coherence comes from cohesion. Cohesion is the area of discourse competence most closely associated with linguistics competence. Cohesion is a network of lexical, grammatical and other relations which link various parts of the text. These relations or ties are organized and create a text, for instance, by requiring the reader to interpret words and expression in the surrounding sentence and paragraph. Cohesion connects together the actual words and expressions that can be seen or heard. However, lack of cohesion in a text is a problem that plagues many students. Five main cohesion devices in English are identified: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion.

Therefore, it is interested in analyzing the cohesion and coherence in a spoken text. The writer is curious in analyzing the spoken language because many studies focus on written language; in this case she chooses discussion text in speaking 3 class. She would like to have a qualitative study on the students presentation about a topic with discussion as the genre in term of the cohesive devices developed by the speaker. Thus, she would like to have the *'the Cohesive Devices in Monolog Discussion Texts' (the Case of The Speaking 3 Students of English Department of Magelang Tidar University)* as the title of this study.

In order to specify the topic, the writer formulates three problem statements of the research. First, what kinds of grammatical and lexical cohesive devices are found in the monolog discussion texts. Second, how grammatical and lexical cohesive devices support thematic progression on monolog discussion texts. Third, how cohesive devices and thematic progression develop the cohesion of monolog discussion texts produced by the students of Speaking 3 class of English Department of Magelang Tidar University

Cohesion is the area of discourse competence most closely associated with linguistic competence (Halliday and Hasan, 1989). It deals with the bottom up elements that help generate texts, accounting for how pronouns, demonstrative, articles and other markers signal textual co-reference in written and oral discourse. Cohesion also accounts for how conventions of substitution and ellipsis allow speakers / writers to indicate co-classifications and to avoid unnecessary repetition. The use of conjunctions (e.g. one, but, however) to make explicit links between proposi-

tions in discourse is another important cohesive. (Halliday and Hasan, 1989 : 15) There are five kinds of cohesive devices, they are:

The definition of cohesion precisely accounts for system of reference. Reference elements establish a semantic relationship between them, in which one of the elements provides the other with the meaning. In other words, reference items may be exophoric (retrievable from outside the text-context of situation) or endophoric (retrievable from inside the text). If they are endophoric, they may be anaphoric (referring to preceding text), or cataphoric (referring to following text). Exophoric reference is mostly used in spoken text in which reference is retrievable from the physical environment of the text. i.e the context of situation. In English endophoric reference item are personals, demonstrative, and comparative. Personal reference is reference by means of function in the speech situation, through the category of person. Demonstrative reference is the reference by means of location, on the scale of proximity. Comparison reference is indirect reference by means of identity or similarity.

Rankema (1993: 37) states a substitution is the replacement of a word (group) or sentences segment by a "dummy" word. The reader can fill in correct element based on the preceding. Substitution is the replacement of a language element into others in bigger composition in order to get clearer difference, or to explain same certain language elements it is an item or items which is / are replaced by another item or items. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 98 – 100) mention that substitution is grammatical relation of words : one word substitutes another word. Substitution is then separated into : (i) nominal substitution, (ii) verb substitution, and (iii) clausal substitution.

This research is descriptive qualitative. In this study, the qualitative approach are applied to unfold the types of grammatical and lexical cohesive devices, theme-rheme and thematic progression found in discussion text of Speaking 3 students of English Department of Magelang Tidar University. Whereas descriptive approach means a research method which uses a technique of searching, collecting, classifying, analyzing the data and finally drawing conclusion from the ana-

lysis. Simple quantification is employed in order to show some tendencies in cohesive devices and thematic progression that are used in the discussion texts by the speakers. The data are monologue-like data and chunked in clauses. The clauses are then analyzed to find the cohesive devices and theme-rheme that are used in the clause. After that, the cohesive devices and theme-rheme are analyzed in the way they give connective contribution to thematic progression of discussion text to create cohesion.

As suggested by Halliday and Hasan, to analyze the cohesive ties of the text, first of all it should be indicated how many cohesive ties instances of a cohesive element that are not resolved by presupposition within the sentence. This shows the total extent of the demands it makes on the preceding (or rather the surrounding) text. Secondly, for each of these ties it shall be specified what type of cohesion is involved, in terms of reference, substitution and so on; this can be specified up to a varying degree of delicacy, as suggested below. Finally, it should be assigned numerical values to each tie, showing the number of interesting sentence. It shows that the students in this study employed all the five types of cohesive devices. Some categories of ties are used more frequently than the others. The five types of cohesive ties used are reference, conjunction, substitution, ellipsis and lexical. Based on the percentage of ties of each cohesive category it was found that the lexical category had the highest percentage of ties (48.27%), followed by the reference (34.97%), followed by conjunction (13.48%), followed by ellipsis (2.22%) and followed by substitution (1.06%). More description of cohesive ties used is displayed in Table 2.

From theme analyses, it is found that the types of theme used by the students in their monolog discussion text are dominated by textual theme, 362 out of 734 or 49.32%. It means that the students used continuative, conjunction or conjunctive adjunct in initial position in 362 clauses. The element comes before interpersonal or topical theme. The second type of theme used by the students in their monolog discussion text is unmarked topical theme. There are 312 out of 734 or 42.51%. It means that theme used by the

Table 1. Percentage of Cohesive Ties Used

Ties	Reference	Conjunction	Substitution	Ellipses	Lexical	Total
Frequency	363	140	11	23	501	1038
Percentage based on total	34.97%	13.48%	1.06%	2.22%	48.27%	100.00%

Table 2. Types of Cohesive Ties Used

Text	Reference	Conjunction	Substitution	Ellipsis	Lexical	Total
1	28	5	0	4	39	76
2	21	15	0	7	26	69
3	39	5	0	1	38	83
4	17	8	0	0	19	44
5	35	8	0	1	31	75
6	21	6	2	2	20	51
7	26	8	0	2	16	52
8	18	4	1	0	21	44
9	8	6	0	0	15	29
10	12	11	0	0	14	37
11	13	6	1	0	20	40
12	18	1	0	0	10	29
13	6	5	1	0	13	25
14	19	4	0	0	38	61
15	8	3	1	0	27	39
16	8	6	0	0	20	34
17	18	11	2	4	55	90
18	16	4	1	0	22	43
19	17	9	0	0	33	59
20	15	15	2	2	24	58
Total	363	140	11	23	501	1038

students is subject as theme. In other words, the students put the subject in initial position in each clause. The third type of theme used by the students in their monolog discussion text is marked topical theme. There are 34 out of 734 clauses or 4.63%. It means that the students use adverbial, prepositional phrase or complement as theme. In other words, the students did not put subject in initial position. The last type of theme used by the students in their monolog discussion text is interpersonal theme. There are 17 clauses out of 734 or 2.31%. In this case, the students put either vocative, modal adjunct or mood in initial position. The students put them as thematic. The summary of the theme analysis is shown in the following table. Nine minor clauses out of 734 or 1.23% are also found. As minor clauses carry neither transitivity nor mood labels, they are not considered to have a thematic structure. Therefore, they can be left unanalyzed for theme.

From the thematic progression pattern analysis, it can be seen that the thematic progression patterns applied by the students in their monolog discussion text are various. In this research, the analysis based on Paltridge's and

Eggin's theory. There are three patterns used in this research, re-iteration/ constant, zig-zag and multiple theme patterns. Based on the data, some of the students write the clauses without applying the patterns mentioned above. There are 247 clauses out of 734 or 33.65% that do not employ the above patterns. Related to the application of the three types of thematic progression patterns mentioned above it can be seen that the first type of thematic progression pattern applied by the students is re-iteration/ constant pattern. There are 209 clauses out of 734 or 28.47%. In this pattern, the element of preceding clause is the same as the subsequent clause. The second type of thematic progression pattern used by the students is zig-zag pattern. There are 182 clauses out of 734 or 24.80%. In this pattern, the rheme of preceding clause contains an element which becomes the theme of subsequent clause. The last type of thematic progression pattern applied by the students in this research is multiple theme pattern. In this pattern, the theme of one clause introduces a number of different pieces of information, each of which is then picked up and made in subsequent clause. In this research, there are only

Table 3. Types of Theme Analysis

Text	Number of Clause	Theme				Minor Clause
		Textual	Interpersonal	Topical		
				Marked	Unmarked	
1	39	10	1	2	21	5
2	38	26	1	2	9	0
3	54	16	2	1	34	1
4	30	17	1	1	11	0
5	35	17	2	2	14	0
6	52	34	0	3	15	0
7	35	19	1	1	14	0
8	39	19	1	1	18	0
9	30	14	1	4	11	0
10	27	20	0	0	7	0
11	32	15	1	1	15	1
12	21	8	0	0	12	0
13	24	15	0	2	7	1
14	47	23	1	8	14	0
15	23	9	0	1	13	0
16	39	22	0	1	16	1
17	68	33	2	0	32	0
18	34	10	1	1	22	0
19	29	16	0	3	10	0
20	38	19	2	0	17	0
Total	734	362	17	34	312	9
Percentage	100 %	49.32%	2.31%	4.63%	42.51%	1.23%

96 clauses out of 734 or 13.08%. The summary of the thematic progression pattern analysis is shown in the following table.

CONCLUSION

Some conclusions can be drawn based on the finding and discussion. First, the types of cohesive devices in the students' monolog discussion text are reference (34.97%), conjunction (13.48%), substitution (1.06%), ellipsis (2.22%) and lexical (48.27%). Substitution and ellipsis are found in this research because the data are in the form of monolog discussion texts. Both ties are more characteristically found in spoken language. Second, the types of theme found in the students' monolog discussion text are unmarked and marked topical, textual and interpersonal theme. Among the above types of Theme, textual theme are mostly used by the students (49.32%). Textual theme connects clauses in the text to be

cohesive. The next type is unmarked topical theme (42.51%), marked topical theme (4.63%) and interpersonal theme (2.31%). In this research, there is minor clause too (1.23%) because it is monolog discussion texts. Third, the thematic progression patterns found in the students' monolog discussion texts are constant/ re-iteration (28.47%), zig-zag (24.80%) and multiple theme patterns (13.08%). The students also use patterns which are outside the 3 patterns above (33.65%). It shows some parts of the monolog discussion text are not developed from the preceding theme or rheme. It means that some parts of their monolog have separate ideas. Fourth, all the cohesive devices in the students' monolog discussion text support the thematic progression of the text by generating the theme and rheme of a clause to the next clause through reference, conjunction, substitution, ellipsis and lexical. Fifth, cohesion of the monolog discussion text by speaking 3 students is developed through all the cohesive

Table 4. The Thematic Progression Patterns

Text	Number of Clauses	Thematic Progression Pattern			
		Re-iteration	Zig-zag	Multiple	Other
1	39	9	12	4	14
2	38	13	12	8	5
3	54	16	10	11	17
4	30	13	4	0	13
5	35	18	6	2	9
6	52	12	10	9	21
7	35	15	5	6	9
8	39	9	11	7	12
9	30	8	9	3	10
10	27	8	5	9	5
11	32	8	9	0	15
12	21	12	6	0	3
13	24	5	3	8	8
14	47	7	11	11	18
15	23	5	10	0	8
16	39	11	7	0	21
17	68	12	17	6	33
18	34	10	9	3	12
19	29	10	12	0	7
20	38	8	14	9	7
Total	734	209	182	96	247
Percentage	100 %	28.47%	24.80%	13.08%	33.65%

devices that are reference, conjunction, substitution, ellipsis and lexical item. Reference creates cohesion by creating links between elements while conjunction links whole clauses. In the level of wording, substitution and ellipsis develop cohesion too by creating links between wordings. While reference, conjunction, substitution and ellipsis are cohesive resources within the grammatical zone of lexicogrammar, lexical cohesion operates within the lexis and is achieved through the choice of lexical items. Sixth, cohesion of the monolog discussion text by speaking 3 students is also developed through a thematic progression of a text. There are four kinds of thematic progression found in this research. They are constant/re-iteration theme, zig-zag theme, and multiple theme. The flow of information in those three theme pattern from theme and rheme develop cohesion in the text. Besides the above patterns, the students also use patterns which are out of three patterns above. It shows some of the students do

not develop clauses from the preceding theme or rheme so the texts are lack of cohesion.

REFERENCES

- Bailey, K.M. and L. Savage. 1994. *New Ways in Teaching Speaking*. Arlington, VA.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).
- Halliday M.A.K. and Hasan. Rugaiya. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. New York: Longman.
- Halliday M.A.K. 1985. *Spoken and Written Language*. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University.
- Halliday M.A.K and Hasan, Rugaiya. 1985. *Language: Context and Text*. Burwood, Vic; Deaken University.
- Halliday M.A.K and Hasan, Rugaiya. 1989. *Language Context and Text : Aspect of Language in Social Semiotic Perspective*. Victoria: Deakin University.
- Rankema, J. 1993. *Discourse Studies : An Introductory Textbook*. Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publisher Company.