

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, the writer provides theoretical framework including main theory and supporting theory. This present study was based on the theory of lexical cohesion proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) and some categories of lexical cohesion proposed by Tanskanen (2006) as the main theory in analyzing one of cohesive devices. This chapter deals with an overview of related theory such as coherence, cohesion and types of lexical cohesion. In this case, the writer provides a brief explanation about coherence and cohesion to form a good text in the sentences in order to let the readers know their relationship before it discusses more about lexical cohesion. In addition, the supporting theory for the language of newspaper is also provided here for giving short description about what the newspaper is, how the language is and how the performance looks like. Furthermore, this chapter also provides some review of related studies which are related to the use of cohesive devices in written text.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 Coherence

Tanskanen (2006) explains that the term “coherence” not only exists in the text, but it is the production of listener and reader’s dialogue within the text. It is

in line with Hasan's definition that coherence is a phenomenon capable of being measured by the reader or the listener of a text, depending upon the interaction of cohesive devices (cited in Tanskanen, 2006, p.20). According to Brown and Yule (1983), coherence will produce particular interpretation in which the elements of the message are seen to be connected, with or without overt linguistic connections between those elements. It means that between parts of a text with one to another should be in coherence, in order to make the readers understand the text.

Coherence can also be referred to as a term of unity between the propositional units in text (Tanskanen, 2006). In this case, a cohesive tie, a term for occurrence of a pair of cohesively which refers to related items, is formed when the elements of cohesion devices are also related in texts. This cohesive tie gives contribution to the unity or coherence in texts. Furthermore, one of coherence's contributions occurs in cohesion in a way of marking cohesion in texts. Although coherence and cohesion are independent, but they are not different one another, since cohesive elements have a role to play in the dialogue or texts (Tanskanen, 2006). However, a good text is constructed not only by coherence, but also by cohesion.

2.1.2 Cohesion

Cohesion has been described as the linguistic devices which deal within words and phrases of a text. Cohesion is one part of the study of texture, which considers the interaction of cohesion with other aspects of organization (Martin, 2001). In other words, cohesion is part of the system of a language and like other

semantic relations; it is expressed through the stratal organization of language (Taboada, 2004).

Cohesion in text or discourse has to do with how actual texts are held together lexically and grammatically (Osinsanwo, 2003). Texts form coherent units of language that are also constructed to operate in units larger of sentences (Reah, 2002). Besides, Halliday and Hasan (1976) noted that cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. In relating different parts of a text to one another, certain linguistic device is needed. It can be called as cohesive devices. These devices become an important aspect of discourse in analyzing cohesive relation which is applying in a whole of newspaper articles.

Generally, cohesive relations fit into the same overall patterns of sentences. Cohesion is expressed partly through the grammar and partly through vocabulary used in written discourse. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), there are five types of cohesive relation: (1) reference which means act of referring to precede or follow element, (2) substitution which means the replacement of a word (group) or sentence by a word, (3) ellipsis which means the omission of a word or part of a sentence, (4) conjunction which means a relationship which indicates the subsequent sentence or clause that should be linked and (5) lexical cohesion which means connections based on the word used. Here is an example of cohesive relation:

*'Wash and core **six cooking apples**. Put **the apples** into a fireproof dish.'*

From this example, the word "apples" have cohesive function, which is repeated

by the word apples accompanied by 'the' as an anaphoric signal. One of the functions of the definite article is to signal identity of reference with something that occurs in the sentence before.

As depicted above about the various types of cohesive relation, Halliday and Hasan (1976) identified it into two types of cohesive relationship that can be formed within a text. These types include lexical cohesion and grammatical cohesion. Halliday and Hasan's model of lexical cohesion is based on the various lexical cohesive devices into two categories: reiteration and collocation. Reiteration includes the use of repetition, synonym, superordinate, co-hyponymy and co-meronymy and also antonym. He also divided the terms of grammatical cohesion which is expressed through the grammatical relations including reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction.

Fairclough (2003) also divided cohesive relation through semantic relations that include grammatical (clauses-sentences) and lexical (vocabulary) relations. He defined grammatical relations as relations between clauses within sentences including paractic, hypotactic and embedded relations. Paractic is grammatically equal or coordinate clauses. Hypotactic is one clause which contains the subordinate clause and the main clause. Embedded relation is one clause functions as an element of another clause or a phrase. Besides, lexical (vocabulary) relations are defined as predictable pattern of co-occurrence between words including semantic relations such as synonymy, hyponymy and antonym which constitute lexical chains through texts (Fairclough, 2003). These semantic relations are used to identify between clause and vocabulary within sentences in written texts such

as a report in local newspaper and a booklet given out in ante-natal clinics. Unlike Halliday and Hasan, Fairclough does not include collocation in his categories of semantic relations. Collocation is more or less regular patterns of co-occurrence between word, for example 'poor old' (as in 'poor old man') is more habitual and predictable combination, than 'poor young' (Fairclough, 2003).

Furthermore, the patterns of lexical and grammatical cohesion identified in texts can help the news readers to form complete and coherent units which also deliver certain meaning to them (Reah, 2002). However, in this case, lexical cohesion was proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) covers almost half of cohesive ties that they analyze. The discussion of lexical cohesion also pays attention to the interplay between cohesive items and the knowledge possessed by languages users of the text (Tanskanen, 2006).

2.1.3 Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion generally plays a pivotal role in structuring a text and making it a coherent whole (Zhao and Zhou, 2009). According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), lexical cohesion is cohesion that is established through the structure of the lexis or vocabulary. It is revealed through the vocabulary used in text and its semantic relations that occur between the words. Lexical cohesion is one of lexical devices which are also a significant element of a text, so that it is useful to analyzing it in the language used in written discourse such as newspaper articles. Reah (2002) proposed the ways to identify lexical cohesion in the newspaper articles through some of patterns that exist within the words and phrases of a text. There are six patterns that exist within the texts including semantic field, direct

repetition, synonyms, specific to general references, specific to more specific reference and level of formality.

First, semantic field is the use of words and phrases from a particular area of meaning, for example the use high number of words from the semantic field of conflict such as: *massed, breach, hit* and *fury*. Second, direct repetition is the same word repeated, for example *security . . . security . . . secure*. Third, synonyms is word with very similar meanings, for example *railway, rails, track, trackside; rocks, stones*. Fourth, specific to general reference is the same thing which referred to, but the first reference has more detail, for example *100 asylum seekers, they*. Fifth, specific to more specific reference is the same thing which referred to, but the second reference is more specific, for example *100 asylum seekers, one of the groups*. The last, level of formality is when texts can used different levels of formality to address a specific topic, for example high use of metaphor and narrative structure: *then . . . then . . . suddenly . . . as*.

In this subchapter, the writer applied the theory of lexical cohesion suggested by Halliday and Hasan (1976) and some categories of lexical cohesion proposed by Tanskanen (2006) as the main theory. Halliday and Hasan (1976) divided lexical cohesion into two types: (a) reiteration and (b) collocation. Here are the types and examples of each type:

A. Reiteration

Reiteration is the repetition of a lexical item, or the occurrence of a synonym of some kind, in the context of reference; that is, where the two occurrences have the same referent. It is usually used a reference item typically

'the' in sentences in most cases. Reiteration includes repetition, synonym or near-synonym, superordinate (hyponym), co-hyponym and co-meronym, and antonym which can be realized such as follows:

A.1 Repetition

Repetition is the use of same lexical item several times in a text. According to Tanskanen (2006), repetition is categorized into three types, such as: simple repetition, complex repetition and repetition by substitution. The first category is simple repetition that occurs when an item is repeated either in an identical form or with no other than a simple grammatical change. It means that the item repeated is same as the word which written before or reduplication of same words. The second category is complex repetition which involves a more substantial change, in which the item repeated may be identical, but it is different in grammatical functions or it may be not identical, but share a lexical morpheme. In this type, a repetition can be occurred in grammatical changes for example singular-plural, present tense-past tense or vice versa. Let us consider this following sentence include both repetition above, simple and complex. It is taken from Tanskanen study in 2006, p.50:

Rosie, one option for dealing with _any_ conflict of interest with *a student* in *your* class is to ask a colleague who is familiar enough with the subject and *your* expectations to *grade the student*, or at least review with *you the grade you give*. (Mailing List 1)

From an example above, it can be identified both simple and complex repetition. Firstly, there is a simple repetition of *student* and four related pronouns such as *your-your-you-you*. These repetitions are same as the word written in one sentence without any form changed, while repeated pronoun 'you', it seems to show the

main point that have been mentioned before in the sentence. Secondly, there is a complex repetition of grade. These repetition of 'to grade the student' and 'you the grade you give' differ in construction of the sentences form which it shares a lexical morpheme.

The third category is repetition by substitution. According to Hoey (1991), substitution items function in a way very similar to lexical repetition (cited in Tanskanen, 2006). Repetition of words can be revealed by the substitution of words or phrases. The most common form of substitution is a pronoun which is used in substituting for a noun. An example is taken from Tanskanen study in 2006, p.50, as follow:

Whatever the merits or otherwise of deciding that English as spoken by many USA blacks is a new, English-descended language instead of a dialect, such a decision opens up the "perfect" way for *any racist employer or group* to exclude blacks. *ALL* *they* would have to do would be to say that they needed only totally English-proficient, English-as-native-language speakers. . .
(Mailing List 1)

It has been clearly viewed from an example above that 'they' reiterates 'any racist employer or group'. In this case, 'any racist employer or group' is repeated in implicit way. However, actually a pronoun of 'they' is used for substituting a noun toward 'racist employer or group'.

A.2 Synonym or near-synonym

It deals with those words that have similar meanings or that are nearest meaning. The examples above adapted from (Haliday and Hasan, 1976, p.278):

(a) Accordingly... I took leave, and turned to the *ascent* of the peak. The *climb* is perfectly easy...

(b) Among the bulrush beds and clutch'd the *sword*. And lightly wheel'd and threw it. The great *brand* made light'nings in the splendour of the moon...

In the examples above, (a) 'climb' refers back to 'ascent', which both words are considered as a synonym. In (b), 'brand' refers back to 'sword' which is considered as near synonym.

A.3 Superordinate (hyponym)

It refers to any item that dominates the earlier one in the lexical taxonomy (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). It is in line with Olaniyan (2011) who pointed out that superordinate items are those that have been used as umbrella terms and they encompass several items under them. For example:

Henry's bought himself as a new *jaguar*. He practically lives in the *car*. (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, p.278).

In the sentence stated above, 'car' refers back to 'jaguar'. 'Car' is a superordinate concept for 'jaguar' which is a name of a car. In more general class, the word 'car' is also a superordinate from the word vehicle. In addition, Tanskanen (2006) has a different way in defining this type. According to her, it covers the relation between an item and a more general item including generalisation or superordinate (hyponymic) and specification or meronymy.

Generalisation or Superordinate (hyponymic) is a relation of inclusion. It includes the meaning of words from specific into general. Let us consider the example below:

Davie has been bought some *furnitures* for his new house. They are *chair, table, cupboard* etc.

The word 'furniture' is a superordinate concept for the word 'chair', 'table' and 'cupboard'. Then, specification or meronym is also type of inclusion relation. It includes the meaning of words from general into specific. In other word, it can

be described as a part-whole relationship between lexical items. This following example is taken from Tanskanen (2006, p.58) as follow:

The deceptive nature of the accelerated growth argument occurs also with respect to *the other social services*. The White Paper tells us that what we want to do in *health, education*, etc. depends on faster growth. (Academic Writing 1)

From example above, the word 'health' and 'education' are reiterated. Those words are the specification of 'the other social services'.

A.4 Co-hyponymy and co-meronymy

In 1985, Halliday proposed this category co-hyponymy and co-meronymy (cited in Tanskanen, 2006). Tanskanen calls this category as co-specification which includes the relation between two items that have a common general item.

For example:

It is widely agreed, though, that while all *RP speakers* also speak Standard English, the reverse is not the case. Perhaps 9%–12% of the population of Britain (see Trudgill & Cheshire 1989) speaks Standard English with some form of regional accent. It is true that in most cases *Standard English speakers* do not have 'broad' local accents (i.e. Accents with large numbers of regional features which are phonologically and phonetically very distant from RP). . .
(Academic Writing 4) - (Tanskanen, 2006, p.59).

Based on an example above, both "RP speakers" and "Standard English speakers" have a relation. It can be related each other without mentioning the general item. This general item is referred to as English speakers. Thus, both 'RP speakers' and 'Standard English speakers' can be considered as co-hyponymy and co-meronymy, although the general item of those words is implicit in the sentence.

A.5 Antonym

In 1985, Halliday also proposed antonym as a new category. It refers to the relation between an item and another item which has an opposite meaning (Tanskanen, 2006). For example:

The *general* question concerns the search for a broader curriculum, which stems from dissatisfactions with the limits of given “disciplines” and with the disciplinary confinement of degree structures in higher education. . . (8 sentences omitted) . . .For Departments of English outside Britain, the *particular* questions involve the connections – or distinctions – between “language and literature” and “studies”. (AcademicWriting 3) – (Tanskanen, 2006, p.59-60).

As stated in the example, the word ‘general’ is an opposite word from ‘particular’.

These relations, of course, have an opposite meaning.

B. Collocation

Collocation is cohesion that is achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly co-occur (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). This collocation can occur in the same field. For example, *boy* and *girl* are cohesive because they have opposite meanings, but *laugh* and *joke* are also cohesive, although they are not systematically related; only typically associated with one another (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). However, collocation is less frequently used in a text. The effect of lexical, especially collocational on a text is subtle and difficult to estimate (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). According to Tanskanen (2006), collocation is categorized into three types, such as: ordered set, activity-related collocation and elaborative collocation. The first category is ordered set which includes members of ordered sets of lexical items, for example, colors, numbers, months, days of week and the like. This example is taken from Tanskanen (2006, p.61):

The working people of **today** are the pensioners of **tomorrow**; the single people of **today** were the children of **yesterday** and are the parents of **tomorrow**. (AcademicWriting 1)

From an example above, the words ‘today – tomorrow – yesterday’ are considered as ordered set of collocation. Those words are classified as one unity in days of week which is written orderly.

The second category is activity-related collocation in which the relation between the items is based on an activity such as this following example:

. . .it means of course that they will have the utmost difficulty in paying for their **meals** in the refectories and that means that the refectories go into deficit if they can’t afford to **eat** here. . . (Add. Speech) – (Tanskanen, p.62).

The words ‘meals – eat’ are considered as activity-related collocation which show both item and activity that relate each other. The third category is elaborative collocation which is combination from both ordered set and activity-related collocation. Let us consider this following example:

[beginning of a message] **LA Times**: Saturday, December 28, 1996. Page B7. “Youth Opinion”. . . . (15 sentences)

Getting back to **the news article**: really? The students realised it was about getting additional funds for the schools . . . (Mailing List 2)

From an example above, elaborative collocation from the words ‘LA Times’ and ‘the news article’ are found in the sentences. It shows that this category contains pair which its relation is impossible to define more specifically about its pair, so that the items can elaborate with another item on the same topic.

2.1.4 The Language of Newspapers

The language of newspapers is useful for analyzing a structure of the text. Newspaper contains the news that presented in a particular way. It contains also a range of item including news, comment and analysis, advertising and entertainment (Reah, 2002).

Due to the development of technology today, newspaper is not only available in printed form, but also in online form. According to Conboy (2010), the primary function of news in the contemporary has been replaced by adding some new formats such as a range of views, lifestyle commentary and analysis. In online media, the language as well as the layout and accessibility of the newspaper have begun to change so much. Those changing has innovated many variations on the appearance of online news including sidebars, top bars, breaking ticker tapes, references to hypertext and website material (Conboy, 2010). However, the language of media, especially in online media has some characteristics on it. According to Ramli (2012), there are four characteristics that are applied in online media such as (1) simple sentence, it means that the language used also in daily activities, not the terms that are understood by certain society, (2) to the point, it does not contain ambiguous meaning, (3) efficiently, it contains efficient sentence and (4) avoid overlapping contexts and stereotype.

Thus, it is important for knowing the language of newspaper since it gives more information to news readers and also news writers. Reah (2002) argued that it is important for readers to become critical readers, who are aware of and can identify, gaps and swing in the information they are given. Similarly, Conboy

(2010) states that news contains more some values that will continue to structure what particular communities want from their news and how it carries meaning for them.

2.2 Review of Related Studies

Some previous studies have been conducted on the use of cohesive devices in written text. One of them is Rohim (2009) identified the uses of cohesion editorial on the Jakarta post daily newspaper. The data was analyzed by using a library study and quantitative analysis. The result of this study showed that cohesive devices both grammatical and the lexical has the highest and lowest occurrence. For grammatical cohesive, the highest occurrence is reference item, especially personal reference, while the lowest one is substitution. For lexical cohesion, it was found that some repetition words place the highest occurrence. It means that cohesion has correlation between clauses within a text grammatically or lexically and cohesive agencies have a function as unifier of text properties and have significance role in giving information to the readers to understand a text easily as good as possible.

Fardjrin (2011) examined the grammatical and lexical cohesion in journalistic text of online media *VoAnews.com*. This study were aimed to know kind of the cohesive devices utilize in journalistic text and the cohesiveness degree of cohesion markers. She used theory of cohesion proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976). The result of this study showed that all kind of grammatical cohesion devices utilize in the journalistic text including reference, substitution,

ellipsis and conjunction, while repetition, synonym, near-synonym, superordinate, general word and collocation as lexical cohesive devices. The dominant device of grammatical cohesion is reference which reaches 55.64%, while the dominant device of lexical cohesion is repetition which attains 15.39%. Moreover, the cohesiveness degree each markers were different, grammatical cohesion reached 85.77%, while lexical cohesion reached 50.01%.

In addition, another study by Khoirunnisa (2011) discussed the using of cohesion devices on Editor's Note in U.S News and World Report Magazine. This study aimed to find out the kinds of cohesion devices that appear on Editor's Note in U.S News and World Report Magazine and degree of cohesiveness in it. She applied theory of cohesion proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976). For the data, she collected from Editor's Note in U.S News and World Report Magazine from three editions, they are May 2010, June 2010 and August 2010 edition. The result of this study showed the differences in using grammatical cohesion, lexical devices and degree of cohesiveness in each text. Generally, text one was the fewest cohesive of all text and text two was the most cohesive of all text.

The last related studies comes from Pandiya (2012) attempted to find out the coherence, the cohesion and the difference features of coherence and cohesion in the Written English News Texts in Programa II RRI Semarang. For the data, it was coming from RRI Semarang as the form of tape scripts of English News Texts in Programa II. Among four month editions (January-April 2010), 15 item texts were selected for the representative of data. The result of this study showed that the coherence and the cohesion in the Written English News Texts in

Program II are not fully significant. In the coherence, it is indicated by the fact that only 60% of the texts can fulfill the schematic structure of news item. In the cohesion, it is indicated by the fact that only 13.33% of the texts can fulfill cohesive devices.

Those previous studies have been concerning to the use of cohesive devices in written text such as daily newspaper, online media, magazine and English news texts. Most of studies analyze the use of cohesive devices which focus on cohesion and coherence, while this present study analyzes also the use of cohesive device, but it is only concerning to one of parts of cohesion on the use of lexical cohesion. None of those studies did research in comparing two online news media as the subject of the research. This present study is obviously different from those previous studies based on two reasons. Firstly, this study examines the duties of prominent figure, Joko Widodo, which also as Jakarta's governor in handling flood disaster. Secondly, the source of data here were articles from two online media, Kompas.com and Solopos.com in which the writer attempted to compare lexical cohesion used by journalists of the media.