

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

## 2.1 Discourse Analysis

## 2.2 Cohesion

7



#### 2.2.1.1. Reference

According to Hasan and Halliday (1976:31), Reference is the specific nature of the information that is signaled for retrieval. In the case of reference the information to be retrieved is the referential meaning. Identity of the particular thing or class of thing that is being referred to; and the cohesion lies in the continuity of reference, whereby the same thing enters into the discourse a second time.

Reference is divided into two parts, exophora (situational) and endophora (textual). Setyowati (2008:24) exophora is the interpretation of an element in a text by referring to a thing as identified in the context of situation (outside the text or the knowledge of the world). An example of exophoric reference is like in the personal reference such as *I, you, we, my, etc.* Endophoric reference (textual reference) is the interpretation of an element in a text by referring to a thing as identified in the surrounding text. Endophoric reference is divided into two parts; they are anaphoric (to preceding text) and cataphoric (to following text) reference. Anaphoric is when a relation presupposes something that has gone before, while cataphoric is happened when a relation presupposed by something in the following part.

Brown and Yule (1993:28) also said that reference is treated as an action on the part of the speaker or writer. According to Hasan and Halliday (1976:37) there are three types of reference such as personal, demonstrative, and comparative.







Example:

Grandma looked out over the land, remembering. “It was after the Second World War. My Isaac – your grandpa Franklin – and many **other** people thought we’d find better opportunities, better jobs closer to the cities up north.

(Chard, 2009:207)

From that example we get **other** as the example from comparative reference. It is focused in difference. It means there are additional though from many people.

#### 2.2.1.2. Substitution

According to Hasan and Halliday (1976:88-89), Substitution is a relation in the wording rather than in the meaning. It is between linguistic items, such as words, phrases, and clauses. There are three types of substitution, they are: nominal (one, ones, same), verbal (do), and clausal (so, not) substitution.

#### 2.2.1.2.1. Nominal Substitution

According to Hasan and Halliday (1976:91) The substitute one / ones in nominal always functions as a Head of a nominal group. The verbal substitute is 'do', and it functions as head of a verbal group. Example:

Would you like me to change the pictures in your room? – No, I think we'd like to keep the same **ones**.

(Hasan and Halliday, 1976:94)

From the example above the word “**ones**” is refer back to the picture – previous sentence. Here are the forms of one and related items:

Table 2.2 Nominal Substitution

Item	Class
1. One, ones	Nominal substitute
2. One (they, you, we)	Personal pronouns
3. One (two, three, . . . )	Cardinal number
4. One, some (both, other)	Cardinal numeral
5. a/an, some (any)	Determiner ('indefinite article')
6. one / some (any)	Determiner ('indefinite article')
7. one, ones (thing)	Pronoun
8. thing, person, creature, etc	General noun

(Hasan and Halliday, 1976:106)

Actually, there are six tables related from those two tables, but the researcher only took two tables from those. Because the researcher felt only those two tables related with her research.

#### 2.2.1.2.2. Verbal Substitution

According to Hasan and Halliday (1976:113) In verbal group, the lexical ‘Thing’ is substitutable by an empty substitution counter that always function of head. In the verbal group it is *do*, with the usual morphological scatter *do*, *does*, *did*, *doing*, *done*. Example:



(Hasan and Halliday, 1976:130)

Here the word “so” is substitute *there’s going to be an earthquake*.

### 2.2.1.3. Ellipsis

According to Hasan and Halliday (1976:144) ellipsis is a relation within the text, and in the great majority of instances the presupposed item is in the preceding text. Ellipsis occurs when something that is structurally necessary is left unsaid. There are three kinds of ellipsis, they are: Nominal, Clausal, and Verbal.

#### 2.2.1.3.1. Nominal Ellipsis

According to Hasan and Halliday (1976:147) by nominal ellipsis we mean ellipsis within the nominal group. On the logical dimension the structure is that of a head with optional modification; the modifying elements include some which precede the head and some which follow it, referred to here as Premodifier and Postmodifier respectively.

The modifier is combined with another structure, on the experiential dimension, which consist of elements Deictic (d), Numerative (n), Epithet (e), Classifier (c), Qualifier (q). the Deictic is normally a determiner, the Numerative a numeral or other quantifier, the Epithet an adjective and the Classifier a noun; but these correspondences are by no means exact. There maybe submodifiers at various places; these are usually adverbs like so, very, and too. The quantifier is normally a relative clause or prepositional phrase. The noun in this structure has

the function referred to as the Thing. Most elements may occur more than once, and the tendency for this to happen increased as one moves towards the later elements of the structure. Example:

Four other Oysters followed them,

And yet another four.

(Hasan and Halliday, 1976:148)

In the second line *four*, which is a Numerative and therefore normally acts as modifier, is upgraded to function as Head.

#### 2.2.1.3.2. Verbal Ellipsis

According to Hasan and Halliday (1976:192) the final element in verbal group, the lexical verb, is omitted, and preceding elements may be omitted.

Example:

- a. Have you been swimming? – Yes, I have.
- b.** What have you been doing? – Swimming

(Hasan and Halliday, 1976:167)

From those example, in *a* It should be Yes, I have been swim, and in *b* it should be I have been swimming.

#### 2.2.1.3.3. Clausal Ellipsis

According Nariswari in her thesis (2010:19) Clausal ellipsis is the omission of an item within clausal. Example:

- a. We went on the river yesterday. We had dinner too.

- b. Can you read the print without your glasses? – No, but I can look at the picture.

(Hasan and Halliday, 1976:205)

Where the second sentence in (a) also refers to ‘yesterday’ and the response in (b) refers to “without my glasses”

#### 2.2.1.4. Conjunction

According to Hasan and Halliday (1976:303) Is on the border-line of the grammatical and the lexical. There are five categories: additive, adversative, causal, temporal, and other conjunction.

#### 2.2.1.4.1. Additive Conjunction

Expressed by the words *and, and also, nor, and...not, or, or else, furthermore, in addition, besides, alternatively, incidentally, by the way, that is, I mean, in other words, for instance, thus, likewise, similarly, in the same way, on the other hand, by contrast, etc.* Example:

“To be able to see Nobody! And at that distance, too!”

(Hasan and Halliday, 1976:246)

From the example above, we got the word “and” as additive conjunction. The word “end” is a tool for connecting the first sentence and the second sentence.

#### 2.2.1.4.2. Adversative Conjunction

Relation which means contrary to expectation covers some words include *yet, though, only, but, however, nevertheless, despite this, in fact, actually, as a mater of fact, at the same time, instead, rather, on the contrary, at least, rather, I mean, in any case, in either case, which ever way it is, anyhow, at any rate, however it is, etc.* Example: An external adversative relation is expressed in its simple Form by the word *yet* occurring initially in this sentence:

All the figures were correct; they'd been checked. **Yet** the total came out wrong.

(Hasan and Halliday, 1976:250)

From the example above the word “yet” is connect between two sentences.  
It show us about the result but it does not suitable with the real.

#### 2.2.1.4.3. Causal Conjunction

Relation consists of the words *so, then, hence, therefore, consequently, because of this, for this reason, on account of this, as a result, in consequence, for this purpose, with this in mind, for, because, it follows, on this basis, arising out of this, to this end, in that case, in such an event, that being so, under the circumstances, otherwise, under other circumstances, in this respect, in this regard, with reference to this, otherwise, in the other respect, aside from this,*

Example:

The next morning she was glad and proud that she had not yielded to a scare. **For** he was most strangely and obviously better.

(Hasan and Halliday, 1976 : 258)

From the example above, the word “for” is categories as one of other words that consist in the causal conjunction. The word “for” is a result of the strangely man who make the woman feel scare but the real now is the woman feel glad and proud to him.

#### 2.2.1.4.4. Temporal conjunction

It is include *then, next, after that, just then, at the same time, previously, before that, finally, at last, first...then, at first...in the end, at once, thereupon, soon, after a time, next time, on other occasion, next day, an hour later, meanwhile, until then, at this moment, up to now*. Examples:

**Finally** we should record that the influence of the humanist contributed a good deal towards the final decay of the plainsong tradition.

(Hasan and Halliday, 1976 : 264)

From the example above, there is a word “**finally**” in this sentence. The word “**finally**” is one of temporal conjunction’s word. The word “**finally**” means the last sequence of the action that the character will do - record that the influence

### 2.3. Previous Study

While from the highest frequency of the use of cohesive devices, the writer explains why reference has the highest frequency, because it is often used in a text for giving an instruction to retrieve person or thing that has been mentioned before. The data is likely using reference because this is the way to refer to the previous person or a thing that makes the relation of the previous and the

following text can flow smoothly, be harmonious and the reader can understand clearly what the writer intended meanings. Moreover, the use of reference also to give the reader further information about the identity of some one.

Then, related to the second rank of occurrence, the writer explains that lexical cohesion is often used in a text for the reason that a word is in some way associated with another word in the preceding text, because of a direct repetition of it, or synonymous with it, or tends to occur in the same lexical environment, coheres with that words.

Moreover, conjunction is also often used in a text because in written text, one text and another must relate to each other. For that reason, it needs a tool to link part of a text to another in order to make a good relationship and coherence in a text. In this case, the additive conjunction has the function as the formal markers which relate what is said to what has been said before.

The second is by Marshalita Siri Valentine. (2013) – The Cohesion Of Reading Text “*English in Focus*” For The year Seven Junior High School Published By Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. It is about the realization of grammatical cohesion in seventeen texts that are analyzed and the realization of lexical cohesion in the same text. The result in this research are the writer found reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction as grammatical cohesion devices, while repetition and collocation as lexical cohesion devices. The dominant device of grammatical cohesion is reference 57,1%. Meanwhile the dominant device of lexical cohesion is repetition, its percentage reaches 13,2%.

The third research is done by Astri Ollivia Kuncahya. (2015) *Cohesion in Narrative Texts Presented in The Electronic Textbook on Senior High School Grade X Entitled: Developing English Competence*. This study applied qualitative method. The data were in the form of sentences and were collected by note taking. The data were analyzed using the categorization of cohesion, namely grammatical and lexical cohesion proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Bloor and Bloor (1995). Trustworthiness was achieved by employing investigator triangulation. The findings showed that reiteration appeared to be the most frequent types of all subcategories of cohesion. There were 404 instances of reiteration, or 40, 64 % of the total occurrences. Based on the findings, it could be concluded that the narrative texts analyzed in this research contain dense lexical cohesion and thus are compatible as language inputs.

Based on the findings and discussions from the previous chapter, the researcher draws conclusions as follows: the first is in the 16 narrative texts presented in the electronic textbook for senior high school grade X entitled “Developing English Competence”, reiteration appears as the first rank among all subcategories of lexical and grammatical cohesion. There are 404 instances, or 40, 64% of the total occurrences. The second rank is reference with 359 instances, or 36, 12% of the total occurrences. Conjunction appears as the third rank with 209 instances or 21, 03% of the total occurrences. Then, it is followed by collocation with 18 instances or 1, 81% and substitution and ellipsis in the last rank. Each of them appears 2 times or 0, 20 % of the total occurrences. It means that the narrative texts in the textbook mostly use vocabulary rather than structure to carry semantic relation; and the second is 16 narrative texts analyzed in this research are considered as highly cohesive texts because they contain dense lexical cohesion that make coherent discourse and facilitate comprehension. Finally, the narrative texts presented in the textbook are compatible as language inputs.

There are two implications of this research to the language teaching. The details are as follows: the first is from the findings of this research, it is implied that the analysis of cohesion can be a means of analyzing the compatibility of texts as language inputs. Thus, in order to be able to select the teaching material, the teachers should know and master the cohesion analysis. Besides selecting the texts, teachers are expected to be able to adapt the material provided in textbook using inferences analysis to explicitly show the semantic relation in the texts and the second is reading comprehension involves interactive processing that

combines top down and bottom up processing. Besides giving scaffolding about the difficult words, the teachers should be able to facilitate the students' comprehension by telling the socio-cultural background of the stories and the purposes of having the texts if it is necessary, in order to make students easily relate to their prior knowledge.

The fourth is Himmatur Rofi'ah. (2015) *Grammatical Cohesion in "The Miracle Worker" movie*. This study is to investigate the frequent of grammatical cohesion in movie script and the function. The methodology of this research is descriptive method. The result is all types of grammatical cohesion used by four main characters in this movie except nominal ellipsis. In 38 scenes are found 848 cohesive devices from grammatical cohesion. From 848 cohesion, 83% is personal references. It appears 703 times. In other word, personal reference is the mostly type used within the movie. The most frequent reference is personal reference. Additive conjunction gets a second by 7% (55) times. Followed by demonstrative reference which appears 32 times (4%). Adversative conjunction follows by 11 time appearance or (3%). Comparative reference is (11), causal conjunction is (8), and temporal conjunction is (11) or 1% of appearance. The last verbal substitution and verbal ellipsis, and clausal substitution appears twice, whereas nominal substitution and clausal ellipsis appear a time. The entire cohesive element that mention above has contributed to clarify the overall meaning of the text.

For the function of grammatical cohesion found within the movie are expressed by some divisions. First reference has three important function are to

avoid repeating the same word, to point out a scale proximity, and to compare something or situation. Second, substitution and ellipsis simplify and accurate the utterance. The last is conjunction, it has six functions are to relate the similar or identical words, to coordinate sentences which have the same context, to support previous sentence, to opposite the preceding statement, to connect between cause and effect in a sentence, and to connect chronology. Beside the function are mentioned above, the general and the basic function of grammatical cohesion is to relate words, clauses, phrases, or sentence in order to make the sentence meaningful.

Those researches have differences with the researcher's research. It is about the focus, the object, and method. First if we talk about focus, from the first until the third researches have the same focus those are grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. Then if the fourth research has the same focus that the researcher will do that is focus on grammatical cohesion only. After that the second is about object. Exactly from each researches has different object. If the first research used TV Program, the second research used Book for Junior High School, the third research used E-Book for Senior High School, the fourth research used Movie and I will use short story as my object of the study. Then the last difference is about method. If the first research used mixed qualitative and quantitative method, the second and the third researches used qualitative method, the fourth research used descriptive method and I will use descriptive qualitative method. All at all the previous researches are very different with the researcher will do.