

Chapter 2

The Review of the Related Literature

This chapter focuses on the review of some related literature associated with this specific study, discourse analysis, which is discussed in the first part and comprehending written discourse in the second part, followed by the concept of cohesion and coherence which are related to the study. Halliday and Hasan's conceptual framework is explained in the fifth part. Finally, the literature on cohesion as proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) is reviewed in relevant context.

Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is a vast and ambiguous field. The study of discourse began around 1970; several disciplines in humanities and social sciences have shown an increasing in the study of discourse. McCarthy (1991 : 5-6) claims that Harris (1952) began to study the distribution of linguistic elements in extended text, and links between text and its social situation. Also Austin (1962), Searle (1976) and Grice (1975) were also influential in the study of language as social action, reflected in speech-act theory and the formulation of conversational maxims, and pragmatics, which is the study of meaning of context. As Coulthard (1975) developed a model for the description of teacher-pupil talk, based on a hierarchy of discourse units. In 1973, M.A.K Halliday took a primary of discourse analysis approach to language analysis. His work emphasized the social functions of language and the thematic and informational structure of speech and writing. The development of discourse analysis as a whole was the work of text grammarians with written language. They saw texts as language elements strung together in relationships with one another. Van Dijk (1972), De Beaugrande (1980), Halliday and Hasan (1976) had made a significant impact on this area.

Discourse analysis, according to Stubbs (1983 : 1), is very ambiguous. He defines it as attempts to study the organization of language above the sentence, clause, and linguistic units such as conversational exchanges or written texts. Also it is concerned with language use in social contexts and interaction or dialogue between speakers. Stubbs sees discourse analysis

from the realization that language, action, and knowledge are inseparable. He studies how language is used in social interaction. He concludes that communication is shared knowledge and assumptions between speakers and hearers.

A similar view of discourse analysis is described by Brown and Yule (1983 : viii), they state that discourse analysis is used with a wide range of meanings which cover a wide range of activities. It is used to describe activities at the intersection of disciplines as diverse as sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, linguistics and computational linguistics. These tend to concentrate on different aspects of discourse. Brown and Yule take a primary approach to the analysis of discourse and examine how humans use language to communicate, and how addressers construct linguistic messages for addressees and how addressees work on linguistic messages in order to interpret them. They view that the speaker/ writer is the center of the process of communication, people who communicate and people who interpret. It is speakers/ writers who have topics, presuppositions, who assign information structure and who make inference. On the other hand, it is hearers/ readers who interpret and who draw inferences. (p.ix).

Discourse analysis is both an old and a new discipline. This statement is discussed by van Dijk. (1985 : 1). The old studies of language, public speech and literature, comparative linguistic and structural analysis of language is focused. The new discipline studies semiotic or linguistic methods of texts and communicative events. Also it studies the publication of the first monographs, collections completely dealing with systematic discourse analysis of research within and across several disciplines. (p.4). Van Dijk (1977) studies semantics and pragmatics of discourse, the various textual structures, such as local and global coherence, macrostructures, and superstructures. In 1983, van Dijk and Kintsch integrate memory model and textual as a new direction in the cognitive modeling of discourse processing.

McCarthy (1991 : 5) sees that discourse analysis is concerned with the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used. Discourse analysis has grown into a wide-ranging and diverse discipline which finds its unity in the contexts and cultural influences which affect language in use. (p. 7). McCarthy also studies spoken and written interaction. His aim is to come to a much better understanding of exactly how natural spoken and written discourse looks and sounds. (p.12).

Fairclough (1995 : 187-188) studies discourse analysis for linguistic and intertextual analysis. He claims that one cannot properly analyze content without simultaneously analyzing form, because contents is always necessarily realized in form, and different contents involve different forms . Form is a part of content. He regards textual analysis as subsuming with two complementary types of analysis : linguistic analysis and intertextual analysis. He views that linguistic analysis covers not only the traditional levels of analysis within linguistic but also analysis of the textual organization above the sentence, including intersentential cohesion and various aspects of structure of texts whereas intertextual analysis draws attention to the dependence of text upon society and history in the form of the resources made available with the order of discourse. Fairclough studies the nature and value of textual analysis in the interdisciplinary project which discourse and society is notably associated with. He argues that textual analysis will always strengthen discourse analysis.

Gee (1999 : 85-86) looks at discourse analysis as the thread of language. He uses it in the situational network. He explains that language always contains clues that are used in six types of building tasks. These building tasks involve people in using language to construe the situation network in a certain way and not others. They carry out in negotiation and collaboration with others in interaction, with related oral and written texts and situation we have encountered before. The six building tasks are semiotic building, world building, activity building, socioculturally-situate identity and relationship building, political building, and connection building. These building tasks can be seen simultaneously as cognitive achievement, interactional achievement, and inter- textual achievement.

Barker and Galasinski (2001 : 63) note that discourse analysis is the investigation of language. And it was required to go beyond the boundaries of the syntactic or semantic from the utterance. Moreover, Barker and Galasinski review the principles of discourse analysis and offer the most importance of it. They view that discourse analysis is interested in naturally occurring text (written) and talk (verbal) within its global and local context. Also discourse analysis is studied in levels of discourse and relations. These levels of discourse represent distinct types of construction units and also different dimensions of discourse operation. Naturally occurring discourse is a form of social practice within a socio-cultural context and the accomplishment of discourse is layer and sequential. This means that units of discourse are to be explained in

relation to those that precede them. It can also mean that later elements may have particular functions with respect to previous ones.

Jorgensen and Phillips (2001 : 1) view that discourse analysis is not just one approach, but a series of interdisciplinary approaches that can be used to explore many different social domains in many different types of studies. They suggest that discourse analysis is the general idea that language is structured according to different pattern. Jorgensen and Phillips study three different approaches : discourse theory, critical discourse analysis and discursive psychology.

Discourse analysis has been used to answer many different kinds of questions. This similar view is discussed by Johnston (2002 : 5). She states that some of these questions have to do with the process of language itself. What is linguistic competence? How do words, sentences and utterances have meanings? How does language change? How do people learn language? Johnston explains that discourse analysis has moved the description of structure up a level, looking at actual stretches of connected text or transcript and providing descriptions of the structure of paragraphs, stories, and conversation. It shows how meaning can be signaled across sentences or how a conversationalist takes up and responds to what has just been said. Thus, Johnston concludes that discourse analysis concerns with how speakers indicate their semantic intentions and how hearers interpret what they hear, and on cognitive abilities that associate human symbol use. (p.6).

Norris and Jones (2005 : 4) study the relationship between discourse and action, taking mediated discourse analysis as its theoretical and methodological framework. They refer to R. Scollon (2001) who described mediated discourse analysis that was developed as an alternative to approaches to discourse that see social action as secondary, and approaches to social analysis that see discourse as secondary. Norris and Jones also see discourse as one of many available tools with which people take action. Mediated discourse analysis tries to preserve the complexity of the social situation. It provides a way of understanding how all the objects and all of language and all of actions taken with these various mediational means intersect at a connection of multiple social practices and the route of multiple histories and storylines that reproduce social identities and social groups.

In short, discourse analysis is the investigation of language. It is used to approach analyzing a written, spoken or signed language use. Discourse analysis is also used in diverse perspectives, and purposes in a variety of disciplines including linguistics, sociology, psychology, and communication study. The objects of the study are concerned with text, talk, conversation and communication events. Thus, discourse analysis can be used as a methodology to answer many kinds of questions of language use and its effects.

Comprehending Written Discourse

“Reading is the most commonly characterized as an exercise in linguistic analysis, an activity whereby information is extracted from written text which signals it. The information is thought to be there, statically residing in the text and in principle recoverable in its entirety”. This statement is defined by Widdowson (1984 : 39). He points out that comprehending written discourse is much more than simply decoding the symbols which appear on the page. The reader brings information to the text and makes inference based on schematic knowledge. It is a matter of acknowledging the already known, and integrating the new into one’s existing knowledge base.

According to Nunan (1987 : 45), discourse comprehension is a complex process. It integrates textual cues and background knowledge. It is suggested that comprehension is a bottom-up or top-down process because both language and non- language sources are important and interact with each other in comprehension process. Furthermore, Nunan refers to Pearson and Johnson (1972) who saw the essence of comprehension was captured in one simple principle. Comprehension was building bridges between the new and the known. It required a great deal of inference making. And it was a dialogue between writer and reader. The readers interpreted statement according to their perception of what the writer tried to do, inform, persuade and direct them.

Halliday and Hasan (1976 : 5) view comprehension in written text dealing with cohesion and register. They state that cohesion is part of the system of a language. Cohesion is expressed partly through the vocabulary. Cohesive relations are not concerned with structure, they may be found just as well within a sentence as between sentences. Cohesive relations have in principle nothing to do with boundaries. “Cohesion is a semantic relation between an element

in the text and some other element that is crucial to the interpretation of it. This other element is also to be found in the text". (p.8). The concept of cohesion is useful for supplement by a register, because cohesion and register effectively define a text. Halliday and Hasan define a text as a passage of discourse which is coherent in these two regards : it is coherent with respect to the context of situation and consistent in register and it is coherent with respect to itself, and therefore cohesive. Halliday and Hasan view the two conditions are necessary in comprehension and give the importance of cohesion and register as follow :

"Just one can construct passages which hang together in the situational-semantic sense, but fail as texts because the lack of cohesion, one can construct passages which are beautifully cohesive but which fail as texts because they lack consistency of register. There is no continuity of meaning in relation to the situation which the hearer or reader reacts to both for judgment of texture" (p.23).

De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981 : 3) define a text as an occurrence which meets seven standards of textuality : cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality, and intertextuality. Cohesion, the first standard, is defined as a function of syntax in communication and concern the ways in which the component of the surface text. Coherence, the second standard, is a continuity of senses among the knowledge activated by the expressions of text. The continuity of senses consists of concepts and relation. (p.48). Intentionality concerns the text producer's attitude that the set of occurrences should constitute a cohesive and coherent text instrumental in fulfilling the producer's intentions. Acceptability associates the text receiver's attitude that the set of occurrences should constitute a cohesive and coherent text having some use or relevance for the receiver. (p.7). Informativity relates the extent to which a presentation is new or unexpected for the receiver. (p.139). Situation, the sixth standard of textuality, concerns the factors which make a text relevant to a situation of occurrence. Finally, intertextuality concerns the factor which makes the utilization of one text dependent upon knowledge of one or more previously encountered the texts. (p.10). De Beaugrande and Dressler advocate that the communicative success of the text is based on seven standards of textuality but cohesion and coherence received the greatest attention in textual studies.

Irwin (1986 : 3) states that one important finding of research related to comprehension is cohesion. Cohesive relations that bind individual sentences together help the reader to establish

a coherent memory. The reader can get semantic relationships in the text depend on cohesion. Additionally, Irwin sees that comprehension is usually an automatic process and makes low demands on the reader's cognitive resources for fluent reader. When the reader cannot establish coherence from the text, the reader will stop normal cognitive process to search long term memory and make linking inferences. The comprehension might break down because of unclear cohesive relationships. Irwin suggests that the evidence of cohesion helps the reader achieve coherence and therefore facilitates comprehension (p.6-7).

A parallel view is given by Horning (1993 : 4). He explains that a further kind of understanding is needed by readers and writers to make a connection in readable writing. This understanding is cross- culture and incorporates of individual variation. The cross- culture variables have to do with how members of different cultural backgrounds create and understand texts. Horning views that the two essential psycholinguistic features of cohesion and redundancy cross all cultural and individual boundaries in a way that permits a deep understanding and appreciation of readable writing. The features of cohesion and redundancy are the major characteristics that make possible the connection of reader expectation and writer intention.

Klangchanee (1986 : 175) points out that schema theory and discourse analysis plays an important role in the comprehension process among ESL and EFL readers. She explains that if the reader combines an appropriate background knowledge in terms of formal or content schemata and a rich source of cohesion to interact with the text, the reader should have full comprehension. Furthermore, she created a model of reading comprehension for advanced EFL students in Thailand. The model shows that the two kinds of text quality, cohesion and coherence, interact with the reader's schemata which hierarchically store information at two levels-- the macrostructure and the microstructure.

In brief, the understanding is needed by the reader and writer to make a connection in readable writing. Text comprehension concerns construction of an integrated and coherent representation of text's meaning. Cohesion is one important element related to comprehension. Cohesive relations connect sentences together and help the reader establishing a coherent memory as he reads. It can be noted that if the text displays cohesion, the reader can find measurable semantic relationships in the text. The reader, then, will establish coherence more

easily than reading a text with a little or no cohesion, and gain deeper understanding during the process.

The Concept of Cohesion

Local relation, the relation among the ideas transfer in a text, is studied by discourse analysts. They are interested in language use beyond the boundaries of a sentence and the interrelations between sentences. Many linguists are interested in studying local relation. Halliday and Hasan (1976 : 4), the famous linguists, view cohesion as only one component describing broader function of language. They define cohesion as a semantic one. It refers to relation of meaning that exists within the text, and that defines it as a text. Halliday and Hasan say that :

“Cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposed the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed are thereby at least potentially integrated into a text.” (p.4).

Halliday and Hasan identify five types of cohesion : reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. They further explain that cohesion helps create text that is the textual or text-forming component of the linguistic system. Cohesion, within textual component, plays a special role in the creation of text. It expresses the continuity that exists between one part of the text and another. The continuity is provided by cohesion that helps the readers or listeners to supply the missing information which are not present in the text but are necessary to its interpretation. (p.299).

According to Grimes (1975 : 113), a distinct set of relationships find in discourse consists of content, cohesion and staging. However, cohesion is fundamentally independent of cognitive sets which relate what is being said at a moment to what has already been said. He asserts that cohesion is cumulative and linear rather than hierarchical. It has to do with the means of introducing new information and old information rather than with what the content of the new or old information actually is. It is also tied up with the speaker's estimate of rate at

which the hearer can process new information. Grimes argues that cohesion appears to involve the further grouping of information blocks into larger units, rather the way sentences are grouped into paragraphs in written discourse.(p.276).

Cohesion, as described by de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981 : 3), concerns “the way in which the components of surface text, the actual words that we hear or see are mutually connected within a sequence”. De Beaugrande & Dressler prefer to call the type of cohesion in question "junction" and discuss four major types of junctive expressions. They define junction as a clear device for signaling the relationships among events or situation. The four major types of junction are conjunction, disjunction, contrajunction, and subordination. Conjunction links the occurrences which have the same status. Disjunction links things the occurrences which have alternative status. Contrajunction refers to things that link the same status but inappropriate and incompatible in textual world. Finally, subordination links things when the status of one depends on that the other. (p.71).

Horning (1993 : 4) says that cohesion, the key feature of readable writing, plays a central role in reading as the process that gets meaning from print. Cohesion connects sentences to form a text rather than a series of unrelated statements. Horning claims that cohesion and redundancy are the major characteristics that make possible the connection of reader expectation and writer intention. Cohesion is created from ties that the writer builds in, while redundancy comes from both the writer' language and the reader's world in a particular linguistic and psycholinguistic sense. (p.6).Thus, both cohesion and redundancy support and enhance readable writing .

Yule (1985 : 140-141) sees that a text must have a certain structure which depends on factors different from those required in the structure of a single sentence. Some of those factors are described in terms of cohesion. Cohesion ties and connects sentences which exist within a text. He points out that analysis of cohesion links within a text give readers insight into how writers structure what they want to say, and may be crucial factor in their judgments on whether something is well- written or not. By itself, cohesion would not be sufficient to help readers to make sense of what they read.

Cohesion, according to Schifrin (1987 : 9), is that the meaning conveyed by the text is meaning which is interpreted by speakers and hearers based on their inferences about the

propositional connections underlying what are said. Cohesive devices do not themselves create meaning. They are clues used by speakers and hearers to find the meaning which underline surface utterances. Schiffrin explains that cohesion can be found both in monologue and dialogue. She additionally describes that cohesive link is established because interpretation of an element in one clause presupposes information from a prior clause.

McCarthy (1991 : 26-27) notes that cohesion is only a guide to coherence. It is only part of coherence in reading, writing, and indeed spoken language too. He points out that cohesion is marker that is very much concerned with the surface of text. Cohesive markers create links across sentence boundaries and pair and chain together items that are related.

A parallel view is given by Baker and Galasinski (2001 : 80). They see cohesion that enables the text to stick together. It concerns how the various elements of a text are linked to each other to form larger segments. This linkage is achieved through various meaning including : reference, conjunction, ellipsis and lexical cohesion.

Cohesion can be noted that it is only one component describing broader function of language. It refers to relation of meaning that exists within the text. Cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse dependent on another. Cohesion is the key feature of readable writing and plays a central role in process of reading for getting meaning. The increasing of cohesive ties will help readers understand the text more fully and more easily.

The Concept of Coherence

According to Halliday and Hasan (1989 : 48), a text is characterized by coherence. An important contribution to coherence comes from cohesion that is set by linguistic resources that every language has for linking one part of a text to another. Halliday and Hasan explain that a passage of discourse which is coherent in two regards : “it is coherent with respect to the content of situation and consistent of register. And it is coherent with respect to itself and therefore cohesive”. (1976 : 23).

De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981 : 4) view that coherence is one of seven standards of textuality. Coherence concerns “the ways in which the components of textual world, the configuration of concepts and relations which underlie the surface text, are mutually accessible and relevant”. De Beaugrande and Dressler further explain that a concept is a configuration

knowledge (cognitive content) which can be recovered or activated with more or less unity and consistency in the mind. Relations are the links between concepts which appear together in textual world. Thus, the readers get a continuity of senses as the foundation of coherence that is the mutual assess and relevance within a configuration of concepts and relations. (p. 84)

The other perception of coherence is explained by van Dijk and Kitch (1983 : 149). They note that semantic coherence may be local and global. Local coherence is defined in the terms of semantic relationships between the successive sentences of the discourse. And it does not stand alone but needs macro-control in the form of a theme, topic, or point as macrostructure. That is, local coherence is defined as relative to the global coherence of discourse.(p.151). Van Dijk and Kitch use the term coherence to denote some form of relatedness or unity in discourse. His coherent view consists of syntactic coherence, stylistic coherence, and pragmatic coherence. Syntactic coherence refers to the syntactic that expresses semantic coherence. Stylistic coherence concerns that a speaker or a discourse makes use of the same style register, in lexical choice, sentence complexity and length. Pragmatic coherence refers to characterize discourse when studies as a sequence of speech act.

Coherence, as explained by Yule (1985 : 141), is not something which exists in the language, but something which exists in people who make sense of what they read and hear. They try to arrive at an interpretation which is in a line with their experience of the way the world is. He further explains that our ability to make sense of what we read is probably only a small part of that general ability we have to make sense of what we perceive or experience in the world.

According to Irwin (1986 : 5), cohesive ties are very helpful for readers who must establish a coherence memory structure. Coherence is the continuity of sense provided by cohesion that enables the reader to supply the missing piece of information. If a text displays cohesion the reader can find measurable semantic relationships in the text. It follows that the reader will establish coherence more easily than if little or no cohesion exists. He additionally describes the distinction between local and global coherence. Global coherence refers to the relationship between each sentence, general topic, and whole passage. While local coherence refers to the relationships between specific adjoining sentences.

Coherence is asserted by McCarthy (1991 : 26-27) that is the feeling that a text hang together, that it makes sense. He notes that cohesion is a guide to coherence, and coherence is something established by the reader in the act to reading the text. McCarthy describes coherence as a set of procedures. Procedural approaches emphasize the role of the readers in activity building the world of the text based on theirs experience. The reader has to activate such knowledge, make inferences and constantly assess his/her an interpretation in the light of the situation, the aims, and goals of the text as the readers perceive them. If the readers take a text which is cohesive in the sense, they can see that a lot of more mental work has to go on for them to make it coherent.

Coherence, “the ways in which the parts of a piece of writing are linked together to from a whole”, is defined by Horning (1993 : 6) that it is the broader characteristic of unity of text as a whole. He argues that coherence comes from cohesion and redundancy. Both come from the writer’s language, cohesion comes from the tie of the writer builds in, while redundancy comes from both the writer’s language and reader’s world.

Barker and Galasinski (2001 : 80-81) explain that “coherence describes the text as sticking together not because of formal linguistic units, but as a consequence of social rules of communication and cultural knowledge”. They view coherence as a text in which there is no violation of conversation rules according to cultural knowledge of scripts, interaction, dialogue etc. Coherence is felt rather than measured. It depends on who we talk to and what context is. Consequently, it is socially and culturally specific.

In short, coherence is the ways in which the parts of a piece of writing that link ideas together as a whole. It is the broader characteristic of unity of the text. Coherence comes from cohesion but cohesion comes from the writer’s language. Coherence is the feeling that exists in people who make sense of what they read and hear. The continuity of sense provided by cohesion helps the reader to supply the missing information and enhance comprehension of the text.

Halliday and Hasan’s Conceptual Framework

Halliday and Hasan (1976) define two general categories of cohesion : grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. According to them, grammatical cohesion embraces four

different devices: reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction. Lexical cohesion divides into main categories : reiteration and collocation. Grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion will be detailed since they are related in the study.

1. Reference

Reference cohesion is a semantic relation which relates one element of the text to another for its interpretation. Reference consists of exophoric and endophoric reference.

Exophoric reference signals a thing as identified in the context of situation. It is used for referents which refer outside the text (think of an exit). The following sentences are illustrated below :

For he's a jolly good fellow

And so say all of us.

As readers outside of this environment, they are unfamiliar with who the "he" is that is being refers to, but the readers involved this environment can find the "he" in the sentences.

Endophoric reference is textual reference referring a thing as identified in the surrounding text. It is either anaphoric, referring to preceding text, or cataphoric, referring to the text that follows. Illustrations of relations can be discussed below :

(a) There blind mice, three blind mice

See how they run! See how they run

(b) He who hesitates is lost

In (a), "they" refers to *three blind mice*, is illustration of anaphoric. In (b), "he" does not presuppose any referent in the preceding text but simply refers forward to *who hesitates*, is example of cataphoric.

Halliday and Hasan describe three types of reference : personal, demonstrative, and comparative.

1.1 Personal reference; pronouns and determiner that refers to the speaker, the addressee, other person or objects, unit of text, and generalized person. The category of personal reference includes :

1.1.1 Personal pronouns : *I, me, you, we, us, he, him, she, they, them, it, and one.*

1.1.2 Personal determiners : *mine, my, yours, your, his, her, theirs, their, its, thè, some, and one's*

1.2 Demonstrative reference : determiners and adverb that refers to locative or temporal proximity or distance (near, far or neutral). The category of demonstrative reference includes :

1.2.1 Determiners : *the, this, these, that, and those*

1.2.2 Adverbs : *here, there, and then.*

1.3. Comparative reference : adjectives or adverbs that express a general similarity based on identity, general similarity, difference, and express a particular comparison. The category of comparative reference includes :

1.3.1 Comparative adjectives : *same, identical, equal, similar, additional, other different, better and more.*

1.3.2 Comparative adverbs : *identically, similarly, likewise, so, such, differently, otherwise, more, less, and equally.*

2. Substitution

Substitution is very similar to ellipsis. It occurs when instead of leaving a word or phrase out, as in ellipsis, it is substituted for another and ellipsis is an omission of an item. Substitution is also divided into subcategories such as nominal substitution, verbal substitution, and clausal substitution.

2.1 Nominal substitution occurs when the presupposed item is a nominal group, and can substitute only for an item. The nominal group is usually the word *one/ ones*. For example :

(a) Let's go and see dolphins. The pink ones are performing.

(b) These bananas are stale. - Get some fresh ones.

In (a), the *ones* substitute for *dolphins*, and the *ones* in (b) substitute for *bananas*.

2.2 Verbal substitution occurs when the presupposed item is a verbal group. The substitution is usually “verb to do” and its various forms, e.g. *do*, *does*, *did*, and *done* as in the example below :

(a) Supapan : Have you called Dr. Supavadee?

Patchanin : I haven't *done* it yet. I will *do* it soon.

(b) Patchanin : Dr. Supavadee is trying to insert an endotracheal tube in the obesity patient.

Supapan : I hope she *does* it successfully.

In (a), *done* and *do* substitute for *calling Dr. Supavadee*. In (b), *does* substitutes for *inserting the tube*.

2.3 Clausal substitution occurs when the presupposed item is an entire clause. The word used as substitutes is *so* and *not*. For example :

(a) Is there going to be an earthquake? - It says *so*.

Here the *so* presupposes the whole clause “*there is going to be an earthquake*”.

(b) Has everyone gone home? - I hope *not*.

The *not* presupposes the whole clause “*everyone has not gone home*”.

3. Ellipsis

Ellipsis, a third kind of cohesion, is also like substitution. The term ellipsis refers to the absence of a word, a phrase or a clause which the speaker/ writer assumes from the context and therefore need not be raised. Halliday and Hasan classify three types of ellipsis : nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis, and clausal ellipsis.

3.1 Nominal ellipsis shows when a nominal group is presupposed, as shown below :

‘And how many hours a day did you do lesson?’ said Alice, in a hurry to the subject change.

‘Ten hours the first day’, said the Mock turtle : ‘nine the next, and so on’.

The nominal group *nine* is presupposing, meaning *nine hours*, and *so* is the *next*, meaning *the next day*.

3.2 Verbal ellipsis occurs when a verbal group is presupposed. For example :

(a) Have you been swimming? - Yes, I have.

(b) What have you been doing? - Swimming.

The two verbal groups in the answer, *have* (in Yes, I have) in (a) and *swimming* in (b), are both instance of verbal ellipsis. Both can be said to 'stand for' *have been swimming* in (a), and *I have been swimming* in (b).

3.3 Clausal ellipsis occurs when the presupposed element is clausal group. For example :

(a) Kanokwan doesn't know how to operate this computer.

She will have to learn how.

(b) Pikky : Are you going to buy a new TV today?

Tukky : Yes.

(c) What do you draw a picture with? - A pencil.

In (a), *to operate this computer* is omitted. In (b), Tukky is affirming the entire clause *I am going to buy a new TV today*. In (c) *I draw a picture with* is omitted. These examples are the presupposition of the previous clause that create cohesion between two sentences

4. Conjunction

Halliday and Hasan (1976 : 226) point out that "conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meaning". They are not primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding (or following), but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse. Conjunction can be classified into four types : additive, adversative, causal, and temporal.

4.1 Additive conjunction acts to structurally coordinate or link by adding to the presupposed element and is signaled by "and, also, furthermore, additionally, similarly, besides that, likewise, on other hand, etc", as in the example below :

(a) Deaf people learn to understand sign language. *Besides*, they learn to read the lip movement of speaking people.

(b) We can promote the communication with the developed areas. Moreover, we should help people to develop education.

4.2 Adversative conjunction performs to indicate “contrary to expectation”. The expectation may be derived from the content of what is being said, or from the communication process. It is signaled through “yet, only, but, in fact, rather, though, however, on the other hand, etc”. For example :

(a) Tarn loves to play football. *Only* he doesn’t know how to play

(b) Thai food is placed in a serving bowl on the table. *On the other hand*, the western people place the food on their plate.

(c) Tun failed the examination. *However*, he’s tried his best.

4.3 Causal conjunction is expressed through use of such linking devices as so, thus, hence, therefore, consequently, accordingly, this reason, as a result, in this respect, etc. these express result, reason, and purpose. See example illustration below :

(a) There are twenty nurse students in the class room and twenty computers. *So* there are an adequate number of computers.

(b) Last week Tuktan had an accident and a dirty wound on her leg. *As a result*, her leg got infection.

4.4 Temporal conjunction is linked by signaling sequence or time. Some sample temporal relation signals are then, next, after that, at the same time, previously, while, just before, finally, to resume, etc. For example :

(a) The nurse will monitor you every 15 minutes until you are awake and stable. *Then* we will move you to the ward.

(b) I think you should have checked your blood every 2 months until the red cell count stabilized. *After that*, once a year is enough.

5. Lexical cohesion

Lexical cohesion refers to the lexical chains that connect sentences in discourse. Halliday and Hasan identify two major subclasses of lexical cohesion : reiteration and collocation.

5.1 Reiteration is a form of lexical cohesion which involves the repetition of lexical item, either directly or through the use of a synonym, near-synonym, a superordinate or a generally related word. Reiteration is not the same as reference so it does not necessarily involve the same identity. For example :

There is a boy climbing that tree.

The *boy* is going to fall if he does not take care. (repetition)

The *lad* is going to fall if he does not take care. (synonym)

The *child* is going to fall if he does not take care. (superordinate)

The *idiot* is going to fall if he does not take care. (general word).

5.2 Collocation refers to lexical cohesion that is achieved through the semantic and structural relation among words. It is any pair of lexical items that stand to each other in word meaning. Collocation occurs when a pair of words is not necessarily dependent upon the same semantic relationship but rather they tend to occur within the same lexical environment. The form of lexical cohesion involves a systematic relationship between a pair of words which is related by a particular type of oppositeness such as *boy ... girl* and involves a relationship between any pair of lexical items that stand to each other in word meaning relation such as *boy.....child, disease.....illness, wet....dry, and like....hate*. Also it includes pairs of words relating the same series such as *Monday....Tuesday, dollar.....cent, and south....north*. Moreover, lexical cohesion is not limited to a pair of words but it is a long cohesive chain that built up lexical relations of word patterns like *candle....flame....flicker, hair....comb....curl.....wave, poetry....literaturereader....writer....style, and sky....sunshine...cloud...rain*.

To sum up, Halliday and Hasan (1976) propose two general categories of cohesion : grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. Grammatical cohesion refers to the structural content and lexical cohesion refers to the language content. Furthermore, they identify five main cohesive devices that help create coherence in the text. These are reference, ellipsis, substitution, conjunction, and lexical cohesion, which are used as devices for creating textual relations and providing clues for appropriate interpretation by the reader. Thus, cohesive devices as suggested by Halliday and Hasan are well-known tools for linguistic analysis of text.

The Related Studies

In order to make the study better focused, the following studies will be presented and placed in the relevant context. The first study is conducted by Meisuo (2000) who studied the use of cohesive features in expository compositions of Chinese undergraduates, using both quantitative and qualitative methods. The study used Halliday and Hasan's theory (1976) for analysis. The data, one hundred and seven essays, were collected from two Chinese universities and assessed by three raters. The study showed that the students used a variety of cohesive devices in their writing. Lexical devices were the most frequently used, followed by conjunctions and reference devices. In terms of tie distances, the majority of the cohesive ties were either immediate or remote.

Murphy (2001) created his work, "The emergent of texture : An analysis of the functions of the nominal demonstrative in English interlanguage corpus". The research was carried out on an interlanguage corpus created during the fall 1999 semester, assembled from the various genres of single paragraph compositions written by two undergraduate writing classes at Yonsei University. Utilizing the basic framework of textual cohesion outline in Halliday and Hasan's *Cohesion in English* (1976), the study analyzed the manner in which certain basic grammatical units, the nominal demonstratives, become progressively integrated into second language writing.

Kaewlai (2003) conducted a thesis entitled "A comparative analysis of cohesion in English and Thai editor columns." The study investigated what cohesive devices, reference, and conjunction were applied in English and Thai editorial columns following the categorization of Halliday and Hasan (1976). The purpose of her study was to identify the differences between English and Thai conjunctions and references. The results showed that there were differences in the occurrence of reference and conjunction in both languages. Reference and conjunction in Thai editorial columns were used more than in English editorial.

Meurer (2003) investigated the relationship between cohesion and coherence in two different kinds of text : essays and narratives. Central to this investigation were cohesive ties that were the semantic links contributed making a text coherent according to Halliday and Hasan. The results showed that there were no significant difference between the essays and the

narratives. He also found that the distributions of lexical items were used the most in the essays (3.66 per sentence) and the narratives (2.14 per sentence).

Ramasawmy (2004) studied the relationships between conjunction cohesion and relational coherence in students' narrative and exposition compositions and writing quality. The 64 compositions were analyzed using Halliday and Hasan's (1976) cohesion theory and Crombie's (1985) set of interproposition relations. The results of the study showed that both conjunction cohesion density and relational coherence in writers of high-rated narrative and expositions composition were displayed more than writers of low-rated.

Buitkiene (2005) created a paper "variability of cohesive devices across registers" which aimed to investigate frequency and distribution of cohesive across registers. Three texts belonging to different registers were analyzed : a short story, a newspaper and a legal text. All texts were approximately of the same length 6500-7000 characters. The following major groups of cohesive devices were taken into account : lexical cohesive ties, reference cohesive devices, ellipsis/ substitution cohesive ties, and discourse markers taken together with conjunction.

Yankova (2006) was interested in studying statutory texts between English and Bulgarian. The statutory texts (200 pages in each language) were drawn from the area of criminal law and proceedings. Her creative work named "Semantic relations in statutory texts : A study of English and Bulgarian" using the categorization of Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model of cohesion. The analysis was based on the premise that the way meaning was created and superficially encoded by cohesive links which contributed to the texture of a stretch of discourse was specific for each genre and varies across languages.

It can be concluded that Halliday and Hasan's cohesion in English (1976) has prompted many researchers to be interested in the effects of cohesion in the text. Also, cohesion has been studied in different perspectives and purposes of diverse disciplines.

Conclusion

This chapter reviews the related literature concerning discourse analysis, comprehending written discourse, cohesion, coherence, Halliday and Hasan's conceptual framework, and the related studies. It can be concluded that discourse analysis is the investigation of language use and its effects. It is approached to a variety of disciplines,

perspectives and purposes. In this study, discourse analysis is approached to analyze written text concerning literacy, which is ability to read and understand the text. Discourse analysis of the written text is a method for describing the ideas and relations among the ideas displayed in the text. Local relations among the ideas, information, and knowledge linked together in the text are needed for the readers to understand them. Cohesion is only one component with a broader function of language that creates ties and connections within the text. Cohesive devices are called as linguistic cues that are relevant to understanding local relations among ideas. They signal the relationship of sentences in paragraphs, paragraphs to one another and to the overall structure of the text. The continuity is provided by cohesion that enables the readers to supply all missing pieces of the components and thus establishes coherence. Coherence exists in the readers who make sense of what they read. The continuity of sense makes them understand the text. It can be noted that coherence comes from cohesion and coherence is essential to understanding; studying different types of relations should be useful and reveal essential findings regarding textual creation and comprehension.