CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter provides the review of related theories which are eligible to be the basic concepts as the source of the study; they are: varieties of text and cohesion.

2.1 Varieties of Text

According to Biber and Conrad (2009: 5), text is a term refers to natural language used for communication which is realized both in form of speech and writing that can be described according to its context, characteristics of the people who produced it, and the characteristics of the situations and communicative purposes connected with it. Furthermore, the general term ‘variety’ is used for a category of texts sharing the same social or situational characteristic.

In the analysis of text varieties, there are different perspectives used to describe the characteristics of texts. Biber and Conrad (2009: 2) proposed that there are three different perspectives on text varieties: register, a perspective combining an analysis of common linguistic characteristics in a text variety with the analysis of the situation of use of the variety; genre, perspective that similar to register in that consists of the description of the purposes and situational context of a text variety but focusing on the conventional structures or rhetorical organization in constructing a complete text; and style, having the same linguistic focus with register perspective and analyzing the use of core linguistic features distributed throughout text samples from a variety and also reflecting aesthetic preferences associated with particular authors or historical periods.
It needs to be emphasized that register, genre, and styles are different approaches for analyzing text varieties, not as different kinds of text or different varieties.

Furthermore, Lee (in Meyer, 2009: 93-94) classifies the major written register (text varieties) in the British National Corpus in the scheme below:
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Figure 2.1

Major Written Registers in the British National Corpus (based on Lee 2001: 57–8)

Meyer (2009: 93) states that the assumption behind the classification of written registers is that there is a difference between them. For example, the writing in the natural science will differ from the writing in the social science in terms of form and purpose. There is an attempt to cover a wide range of written registers. Therefore, national, regional and local newspapers are included as well.
as broadsheets, tabloids, and many different text varieties found in newspaper, such as reportage, headlines, and editorials.

An editorial is the special section of newspaper having particular communicative purpose aimed to express opinion overtly and persuade readers to that opinion (Biber and Conrad [2009: 110]). As the feature containing the newspaper’s official opinion on important issue which appeals readers to get involved with it and then agree, it thus should possess well-arranged structure in order to convey substantial part of the issue. In providing the series of information, properties of the text should be put into consideration. Since cohesion is one of the properties that plays important role in building connections among parts of text, it sustains the readers’ comprehension in reading the information.

It is important to notice that cohesion is one of the properties of text. Therefore, it is crucially related with the way how a text conveys its meaning properly. Taboada (2004: 156) states that a text is a structural unit that has different elements from a sentence. It means that the properties which connecting the parts of a text together are not similar with those holding a sentence together. Cohesion is one of these properties that plays important role in building connections among parts of text. Yule (2006: 125) says that the factors such as cohesion, ties, and connections which determine certain structures of a text are completely different from those determine the structure of a single sentence. In other words, the text is not established by structures that are required to form a single sentence; it is however established by several factors such as cohesion, ties, and connections which link one sentence to another. It can be concluded that a
text is larger than a sentence in means of structure and length. If we compare the sentence and text, we can see that a sentence has more simple form than a text. As stated by Meyer (2009: 236), text is a body of language that usually lengthier than a sentence consisting of both unity of structure and unity of texture.

According to Halliday and Hasan in Taboada (2004: 156), the property of being a text is known as *texture*. Texture itself is apprehended in relation existing between parts of text that contribute to the unity of text. It distinguishes a text from a non-text which derived from fact that the text functions as a unity with respects to its environment. It is indicated by the relations of meaning existing in a text.

Defined as the language in use, text could be formed both in written and spoken language such as passage, prose, verse, monologue, dialogue, etc. which establishes the defined whole units not only grammatical unit but also semantic unit. The grammatical unit can be indicated through well-structured sentences or clauses despite its length. While for the semantic unit, the text is defined as a text not based on how it is formed, but it is rather on how its symbolic systems are interconnected to each other, and in this way, texture is resulted (Meyer, 2009: 80-81).

Moreover, regarding to the notion of texture, Halliday and Hasan as mentioned in Taboada (2004: 156-157) proposed that generally, in order to form a text, all grammatical units such as sentences, clauses, groups, and words are internally ‘cohesive’ completely because they are structured and thus expressing texture.
Concerning those previously mentioned notions, text is a language in use that could be written or spoken, constructed by unity of structure and unity of texture that can be decoded through the analysis of cohesive devices and ultimately establishes texture.

2.2 Cohesion

2.2.1 Definition of Cohesion

The concept of cohesion has been widely discussed by linguists in text and discourse studies. Yule (2006: 126) mentioned that cohesion is the factors required in the structure of a text that are different from those required in the structure of a single sentence. In other words, cohesion is the markers that differentiate a text from a sentence. Cohesion elevates a random collection of sentences to the status of a text and conveys meaning, insight, and purpose to those sentences. Without cohesion, the text is considered not exist at all, since cohesion provides textual means for initiating comprehension or sense (Markels in Taboada [2004: 155])

Moreover, Tanskanen (2006: 7) stated that cohesion refers to the connections between parts of text established by markers which are known as grammatical and lexical elements. In other words, cohesion is the ties or connections that exist within a text. Meyer (2009: 223) suggested that cohesion is achieved in a text containing explicit markers indicating connections between diverse parts of the text, as shown in the example below:
My brother is a doctor. He works at a nearby hospital.

The pronoun ‘He’ in the second sentence creates a cohesive link with the first sentence because it refers back to ‘My brother’ in the first sentence. The connection can be in form of reference to the same person or things, substitutions to replace another lexical element, or conjunction signifying the relationship of what follows to what precedes.

2.2.2 Type of Cohesive Devices

The preceding part stated that cohesion refers to the connections that exist in a text that are not exclusively structural relations. These connections expressed through the lexico-grammatical system as the second stratum in levels of coding, which is between semantic system or meaning and phonological and orthographic system or sounds/writing. The lexico-grammatical system or wording consists of grammar and vocabulary. The lexicon describes the most delicate choices in the system while the grammar describes the more general meanings. Following this pattern as well, cohesion hence covers both aspects of lexicon and grammar, in which some meanings expressed through the grammatical system called as grammatical cohesion, and some through the lexical one called as lexical cohesion (Taboada, 2004: 158-160).

Therefore, based on the explanation above, cohesive devices are divided into two main parts: the grammatical cohesive devices and lexical cohesive devices.
2.2.2.1 Grammatical Cohesive Devices

The grammatical cohesive devices are the cohesive devices expressed through the grammatical system which are divided into the reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction.

a. Reference

According to Meyer (2009: 234), in linguistic, reference is the property of words used to refer to other words within or outside a text. It deals with semantic relationship. It can be explained with the example below:

The manager spoke with her employees.

Meyer (2009: 234)

The pronoun *her* refers back in the text to *The manager*. The words *manager* and *employees* refer to individuals outside the text in the external world.

Furthermore, Taboada (2004: 10) mentioned that reference items may be *exophoric* or *endophoric*. *Exophoric* refers to the condition in which the reference is identified according to the context of the text (situational), while *endophoric* refers to the condition in which the reference is identified clearly on the text (textual). *Endophoric* reference is classified into two types: anaphora, the one that refers to the preceding text, and cataphora, which refers to the text that follows. To make it clear, these terms can be manifested in the examples below:

Exophoric:

The plant that you gave me last Christmas is dying.

(Taboada, 2004:160).
The plant could be decided as rose, cactus or any other plants, but its actual referent only can be identified from the context of situation that the speaker shares in the examples above. The same thing also happened in you, me, and last Christmas.

Endophoric:

1. Anaphoric

   I can see the light. Let’s follow it.

   (It refers back to the light)

2. Cataphoric

   Let’s follow it, the light.

   (It refers to that light which is explained later).

   In addition, reference is categorized into the personal, demonstrative and comparative reference.

(i) **Personal Reference**

   Personal reference is expressed by means of function in the speech situation through the category of person (pronoun and determiners). It is considered cohesive only when it links to some other element in the text. Taboada shows the classification of personal reference through this following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal Pronouns</th>
<th>Possessive Determiners</th>
<th>Possessive Pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>I, you, she, he, it, me you, her, his, it</td>
<td>My, your, his, her, its</td>
<td>Mine, yours, hers, his, its</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>We, they, us, them</td>
<td>Our, their</td>
<td>Ours, theirs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Personal reference (Taboada, 2004: 161)
Example:

Last time we let you pay, you took me to that dump, for lunch. What’d it cost you, about, three fifty for both of us?

(Taboada, 2004: 161)

The word *it* in the sentence *what’d it cost you* refers back to *lunch* in the previous sentence.

(ii) Demonstrative Reference

Demonstrative reference uses determiners as modifiers or as heads, and also adverbs such as *this, these, that, those, here, there, then* in order to point to other items in the text, for example:

How about you come to my office around eleven? And from there we could go out for lunch and we talk about everything.

(Taboada, 2004:160)

The above example shows an adverb *there* in *and from there we could go* with the demonstrative reference referring to the presupposed item *office*.

(iii) Comparative Reference

Comparative reference creates relations of identity or similarity with the use of adjectives and adverbs: *same, identical, better, more, less*, etc. (Taboada, 2004: 161). The comparative reference provides the comparison matter within text whether it is backwards or forwards reference.

A: What do you think about that performance?

B: I have never seen a more brilliant performance than last night
The example above shows that the comparative word *more* refers to another thing in a text, which compares two different things: present performance and the last night performance.

b. **Substitution**

Meyer (2009:236) mentioned that substitution simply means the process of one word substitutes for another. Since substitution is described as the relation between language items where one item is used to substitute and point to another item, it is distinguished from reference which is, on the other hand, the relation between meanings where one item is used to point out its referent (Taboada, 2004: 162). It can be concluded that in the linguistic system, reference is a relation on the semantic level, whereas substitution is a relation on the lexico-grammatical level, the level of grammar and vocabulary, or linguistic ‘form’. As the result, depending on the item being substituted, substitution is divided into three: nominal, verbal, and clausal substitution.

(i) **Nominal Substitution**

The nominal substitution is the substitution in which one of particular noun is substituted by another lexical item. In this kind of substitution, it serves as the noun which commonly expressed through the substitute *one/ones*.

*Okay, Jules. Thanks for the meeting. Let’s start the next one.*

(Taboada, 2004:162)

The word *one* in *let’s start the next one* is a substitute term for *meeting.*
(ii) Verbal Substitution

The verbal substitution is the substitution in which one of particular verb or verb phrase is substituted by another lexical item. In this kind of substitution, it serves as the verb which commonly expressed through an auxiliary verb (do, be, have), sometimes together with another substitute term such as so and the same.

*Thursday the sixth looks pretty good, and so does Monday the tenth. How about for you?*  
(Taboada, 2004:162)

The example above shows the substitution of *looks pretty good* in the first clause with *so does* in the second one.

(iii) Clausal Substitution

The clausal substitution is the substitution in which one particular clause is substituted by a lexical item. In this kind of substitution, it is commonly expressed through the substitute *so* and *not*.

*Do you think we’ll need an hour? If so, how about the twenty sixth, three to four?*  
(Taboada, 2004:162)

The example above shows the word *so* substitutes the whole previous clause.

c. Ellipsis

According to Meyer (2009: 226), ellipsis is the omission of an element required by the grammar in a text that is considered obvious from the context and exactly repeating the existing element and thus need not to be raised. In other words, ellipsis occurs when some important elements are omitted from a sentence or a clause and can only be recovered by referring
to an element in the preceding text. It is a special type of substitution, known as substitution by zero. Instead of using lexical items mentioned for substitution, no item is used. The listener/reader is left to fill in the gap where the original item should have appeared. Because of its existence as one special type of substitution, it also shares the same subtypes, they are: nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis, and clausal ellipsis (Taboada, 2004: 163).

Nominal ellipsis is the ellipsis within the nominal group. Verbal ellipsis is the ellipsis within the verbal group. And clausal ellipsis is the ellipsis within the clausal group. These following examples will provide a better comprehension about those subtypes of ellipsis:

(C1) *Four other Oysters followed them, and yet another four.*

(Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 148)

(C2) *If we need to run over, we might both have enough time that we can spend, more than two hours if we need to. How's that sound?*

(C3) *That's great. But, I think we might have to cut a little short this time, because I have a class from two to three thirty. Otherwise, yes.*

(Taboada, 2004: 163)

The first instance C1 is the nominal ellipsis for there is something missing after the word *four*. The omitted word following the word *four* should be noun referring back to the previous clause which is oysters; hence, the complete sentence in this case should be *Four other Oysters followed them, and yet another four (oysters)*. In the next instance C2, it is called as the verbal ellipsis since it does not repeat the previous verb (and its complement). The complete sentence for this instance should be *we can spend more than two hours if we need to (spend more than two hours)*. And
the last, in instance C3 it is called as clausal ellipsis since the phrase
otherwise yes omits a full clause of agreement.

d. Conjunction

According to Meyer (2009: 224), conjunction is the type of cohesion which is functioned to connect elements such as word, phrase, clause, sentence, or even paragraph in a text. The conjunctive elements are not cohesive in and of themselves. More exactly, the meanings of conjunctive elements establish relationships among other parts of text (Taboada, 2004: 164). The types of conjunction can be seen from the example below:

For the whole day he climbed up the steep mountainside, almost without stopping.
a. And in all this time he met no one. (additive)
b. Yet he was hardly aware of being tired. (adversative)
c. So by the night time the valley was far below him. (causal)
d. Then, as dusk fell, he sat down to rest. (temporal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of conjunction</th>
<th>Additive</th>
<th>Adversative</th>
<th>Causal</th>
<th>Temporal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple: and, nor, or</td>
<td>Proper:</td>
<td>General: so,</td>
<td>Simple:</td>
<td>then, next,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive:</td>
<td>but, however,</td>
<td>because of, thus</td>
<td>afterward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex:</td>
<td>Contrastive:</td>
<td>Specifc: for this</td>
<td>Complex:</td>
<td>at once, this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moreover, in addition, besides that, additionally</td>
<td>but, on the other hand, actually, in fact, at the same time</td>
<td>reason, as a result, for this purpose</td>
<td>time, the last time, meanwhile, at this moment, until then</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative: likewise, similarly, on the other hand</td>
<td>Corrective: instead, on the contrary, at least</td>
<td>Conditional: then, under the circumstance</td>
<td>Sequential/conclusive: at first, in the end; finally, at last</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appositive: in other words, for example, thus</td>
<td>Dismissive: in any case, anyhow, at any rate</td>
<td>Respective: in this respect, with regard to this, otherwise</td>
<td>‘Here and now’/summarizing: up to now, up to this point; to sum up, briefly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Conjunction (Halliday and Hasan1976: 242)
2.2.2.2  Lexical Cohesive Devices

Lexical cohesion contributes to the cohesion of a text through the selection of vocabulary. It is divided into different types according to the relationship between terms (Taboada, 2004: 164-165). Moreover, according to Halliday and Hasan in Tanskanen (2006: 15), this kind of cohesion is divided into two main parts, they are: reiteration (repetition, synonymy, superordinate) and collocation (co-occurrence of lexical items).

a. Reiteration

Reiteration is another form of cohesive devices involving the lexical item repetition. It also uses a general word referring back to lexical item and the number of matters in between the use of synonymy or superordinate. According to Tanskanen (2006: 32), reiteration includes repetition of the same word (mushroom – mushroom), the use of synonymy (sword – brand), the use of superordinate (jaguar – car), and the use of general word (we all keep quiet. That seemed the best move). Therefore, based on the explanation above, reiteration is divided into 4 parts: (1) repetition, (2) synonym, (3) superordinate, and (4) general word.

(i) Repetition

Repetition is realized in instance that embrace the same lexical item used across the sentence:

What we lack in a newspaper is what we should get. In a word, a ‘popular’ newspaper may be the winning ticket.

(Nunan, 1993: 29)

Repetition may be distinguished into two parts: simple and complex lexical repetition. The former one occurs when a lexical item is repeated with no alteration the latter one occurs when “two lexical items
share a lexical morpheme, but are not formally identical, or when they are formally identical, but have different grammatical function. For example, *drug* – *drugging* or *humans* – *human* would refer to complex lexical repetition.

(ii) **Synonym**

According to Meyer (2009: 236), synonym is a relationship between words that are equivalent in meaning. The example of synonym can be seen as below:

*You could try reversing the car up the slope. The incline isn’t all that steep.*  
(Nunan, 1993: 29)

(iii) **Superordinate**

According to Meyer (2009: 236), superordinate is an individual higher on the power hierarchy.

*Pneumonia has arrived with cold and wet conditions. The illness is striking everyone from infants to the elderly.*  
(Nunan, 1993: 29)

(iv) **General Word**

General words can be categorized by familiarity. Many general words carry a connotation of attitude on the part of speaker. These can be general nouns, like *thing, stuff, person, woman, man,* or general verbs like *do* and *happen*. General nouns and verbs do not carry much information. They depend mostly on the co-text for their meaning, so that hearers or
readers can identify what particular word is referred to. General words are also described as superordinates of a higher level.

Example:

A: Did you try the steamed buns?
B: Yes, I didn’t like the things much.  
(Nunan, 1993: 29)

b. Collocation

According to Meyer (2009: 223), collocations are words that commonly occur together. For instance, the sentence I strongly agree contains two words, strongly and agree, that commonly co-occur in this context. Other words could certainly follow strongly, but are much less likely to do so than agree and other words, such as disagree or dislike, expressing opinions.

Moreover, according to Yule, collocation includes words which tend to occur with other words, for instance: the word hammer will be related to another word nails, and table is related to chair somehow. The way we seem to organize our knowledge of words is simply on the basis of this lexical cohesive device, which is collocation (2006:108). This notion goes in a line as what Taboada stated that the collocation is achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly co-occur (2004:165).

How about we do another lunch meeting, eleven to one. What do you want for lunch this time for food, Italian or Polish?  
(Taboaoda, 2004:165)

The example above shows that the word a lunch meeting establishes a cohesive ties with lunch and food because they are related in the same semantic field.
From the explanation above, it is summarized the types of cohesive devices in following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical</th>
<th>Lexical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R. Reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reiteration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1. Personal</td>
<td>L1. Repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2. Demonstrative</td>
<td>L2. Synonym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3. Comparative</td>
<td>L3. Superordinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. Substitution</strong></td>
<td><strong>L4. General Word</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1. Nominal</td>
<td>Collocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2. Verbal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3. Clausal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Ellipsis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1. Nominal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2. Verbal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3. Clausal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Conjunction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1. Additive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Adversative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. Causal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4. Temporal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Cohesive Devices

2.3 Previous Study on the Use of Cohesive Devices

In the previous study, Susanti (2007) conducted a study analysing the grammatical cohesion which are reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction used in texts of junior high-school textbook “Smart Steps” published by Ganeca Exact. Based on her findings, the grammatical cohesion devices are found within the texts. She figured out that there were reference (169 items or 85.5%), ellipsis (5 items or 5 %) and conjunction (26 items or 14 %).

Another study conducted by Susilo (2010) analyzing the use of cohesive devices in selected recount texts of “Look Ahead” English Textbook for Tenth
Grades by Erlangga shows that both grammatical and lexical cohesion devices were figured out in the texts. He found that the grammatical devices discovered in the texts were references (102 items or 59.85%), conjunction (37 items or 26.71%) and ellipsis (17 items or 13.42%), while the lexical devices discovered were reiteration (75 items or 65.71%), and collocation (40 items or 34.28%).

Despite of the different object of study, which is textbook, these two related studies support the use of grammatical and lexical cohesive devices in the establishment of texts.