

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I.1 Background of the Study

Language plays an important role in human life. All normal human beings speak at least one language, and they often use language to communicate and express their feelings, ideas, and thoughts to others. Sometimes people also use language to establish and maintain social relationships. Therefore, in general, it can be said that language is used in many things – a system of communication, a medium for thought, a vehicle for literary expression, a social institution, a factor in national building, and many more. It is hard to imagine if there is a significant social or intellectual activity taking place in its absence.

In the study of language, some of the most interesting questions arise in connection with the way language is 'used', rather than what its components are. Consequently, how it is that language-users interpret what other language-users intend to convey is an interesting phenomenon to be investigated. To carry investigation of such phenomenon further and ask how it is that the language-users make sense of what they read in texts, understand what speakers mean despite what they say, and recognize connected as

opposed to jumbled or incoherent discourse, we arrive to what is known as discourse analysis (Yule, 1985:104).

Stubbs (1983) has stressed discourse analysis as a linguistic analysis which covers two forms, spoken and written. It is the linguistic analysis of naturally occurring connected spoken or written discourse. It attempts to study the organization of language above the sentence or above the clause and therefore to study larger linguistic units, such conversational exchanges or written texts (Stubbs, 1983: 25).

Concerning written texts (since the written language is the object of this study), we usually expect them to be coherent, meaningful communications in which the words or sentences are linked to one another so that we can interpret the producer of the texts' intended message properly. And to arrive at an interpretation, we certainly rely on what we know about linguistic form and structure. But, as language-users, we have more knowledge than that. We know, for example, that texts must have a certain structure which depends on factors quite different from those required in the structure of a single sentence. Some of those factors are described in terms of cohesion, or the ties and connections which exist within texts (Yule, 1985:105).

The major work on cohesion in English is by Halliday and Hasan (1976). They stated that cohesion is a necessary condition to create a text.

They have stressed that it is the presence of the cohesive markers which constitutes 'textness' (Halliday and Hasan in Brown and Yule, 1983:192).

However, by itself, cohesion would not be sufficient to enable us to make sense of what we read. It is quite easy to create a highly cohesive text which has a lot of connections between the sentences, but which remains difficult to be interpreted. Note that the following text has connections such as *Lincoln - the car; red - that color; her - she; letters - a letter; and so on.*

*My father bought a Lincoln convertible. The car driven by the police was red.
That color doesn't suit her. She consists of three letters. However, a letter
isn't as fast as a telephone call.*

It becomes clear from an example like this that the 'connectedness' is not simply based on connections between the words. There must be other factor which leads us to distinguish connected texts which make sense from those which do not. This factor is usually described as *coherence* (Yule, 1985:106).

So cohesion is only a guide to coherence, and coherence is something created by the reader in the act of reading the text. Coherence is the feeling that a text hangs together, that it makes sense, and is not just a jumble of sentences. Therefore it can be said that in reading a text, in order to make it coherent, we have to interpret the cohesive ties and try to make sense of them. That is, we attempt to arrive at a reasonable interpretation of what the writer intended to convey.

The central concern of this study will be to investigate how the cohesion works in written texts. And recipe texts are chosen to be analyzed in this study. As one type of information materials, the function of this kind of texts is to convey information of cooking something. And, moreover, as a kind of instructional materials, recipe texts would appear to be straightforward instructional texts designed to ensure that if a series of activities is carried out according to the prescriptions offered, a successful gastronomic outcome will be achieved.

Therefore, it is important that the recipient of a recipe text gets the informative details correct. There will be unfortunate consequences if the message is not properly understood by the recipient. Hence, the language of recipe has its own linguistics features which make the reader easy to follow and understand the instructions.

Since it is already said that in order to make a text coherent we have to interpret the cohesive ties and try to make sense of them, this study attempts to describe such phenomena by analyzing some texts of recipe. What kinds of cohesive relations are applied in some texts of recipe and how these cohesive relations may lead to the interpretation of the texts in order to arrive at the intended message of the texts writer are the phenomena that would be investigated and described in this study.

o

I.2 Statement of the Problem

In accordance with the phenomena described in the background of the study, the problem to be discussed in this study is formulated as follows :

1. What kinds of cohesive relations are applied in some texts of recipe ?
2. How do these cohesive relations lead to the interpretation of the texts ?

I.3 Objective of the Study

The objective of this study is to know the cohesive relations which are applied in some texts of recipe and to describe how these cohesive relations may lead to the interpretation of the texts in order to arrive at the intended message of the texts writer.

I.4 Significance of the Study

Hopefully this study will broaden the knowledge of the readers about discourse analysis. It is also expected that this study will be an essential step to further research for the English Department students who wants to analyze the same subject matter.

I.5 Scope and Limitation

The scope of this study is a study of cohesion (grammatically and lexically), proposed by Halliday and Hasan, in some texts of recipe.

Text is a communicative occurrence which meets seven standards of textuality, namely *cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality, and intertextuality*. In this study, however, the discussion is limited only on cohesion and coherence since they are both *text-centered*.

1.6 Theoretical Background

COHESION

The major work on cohesion in English is Halliday and Hasan (1976). They stated that cohesion is a necessary condition to create a text. They have stressed that it is the presence of the cohesive markers which constitutes 'textness' (Halliday and Hasan in Brown and Yule, 1983:192). The organization of language in a text can be realized through cohesive markers. The existence of those markers makes the sentences in a text stick to each other. That kind of relationship of the sentences in a text is called *cohesiveness*. Cohesive relations are relations which function as a glue. They stick one sentence to another in a text. These relations make the text easily understood.

In English, cohesion is created in four ways (Halliday, 1985, ch. 9) : by *reference, ellipsis* (including substitution), *conjunction*, and *lexical*

organization (as quoted from Malmkjær, 1991:463). In this study, the first three are discussed under the heading *grammatical cohesion* and the last one is discussed under the heading *lexical cohesion*.

Grammatical Cohesion


Halliday and Hasan said that grammatical cohesion means that some forms are realized through the grammar. The grammatical cohesion can be classified under three broad types : *reference, ellipsis/substitution, and conjunction* (McCarthy, 1991:35).

Reference

According to Halliday and Hasan, reference is a specific nature of the information that is signaled for retrieval. In the case of reference, the information to be retrieved is the referential meaning, the identity of the particular things or class of things that is being referred to; and the cohesion lies in the continuity of reference (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:31).

Reference may be of two types (Brown and Yule, 1983:193) :

(1) exophoric, referring to an item in the world out of the text :

e.g. Look at that. (*that* = )

(2) endophoric, referring to textual items either by :

- (i) anaphoric, backward reference - Look at the sun. It's going down quickly. (*It refers back to the sun*)
- (ii) cataphoric, forward reference - It's going down quickly, the sun. (*It refers forwards to the sun*)

Ellipsis/Substitution

Ellipsis is the omission of elements normally required by the grammar which the writer assumes are obvious from the context and therefore need not be raised. This is not to say that every utterance which is not fully explicit is elliptical; most messages require some input from the context to make sense of them. Ellipsis is distinguished by the *structure* having some 'missing' element (McCarthy, 1991:43).

According to Halliday, ellipsis is simply substitution by zero. The starting point of the discussion of ellipsis can be the familiar notion that it is 'something left unsaid'. Furthermore, according to Halliday and Hasan, a reader who encounters ellipsis is forced back into the text to look for a previous expression to provide the elliptical element. An elliptical item is one which leaves specific structural slots to be filled from elsewhere. In ellipsis, nothing is inserted into the slot (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:143).

e.g. *Joan bought some carnations, and Catherine \emptyset some sweet peas*

(the verb is not repeated but the two clauses are linked).

Basically, ellipsis and substitution are very similar to each other. According to Halliday and Hasan, substitution is a relation between linguistic items, such as words or phrases within a text. In terms of linguistic system, substitution is a relation on the lexicogrammatical level, the level of grammar and vocabulary. It is used in place of repetition of a particular item. The substitute item has the same structural function as that for which it substitutes (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 88-89).

Conjunction

Conjunction is included in the discussion of grammatical contributions to textuality even though it is somewhat different from reference, ellipsis and substitution. A conjunction does not set off a search backward or forward for its referent, but it does presuppose a textual sequence, and signals a relationship between segments of the discourse.

A familiar type of explicitly marked cohesive relationship in texts is indicated by formal markers which relate what is about to be said to what has been said before - markers like *and*, *but*, *so*, and *then*. Halliday and Hasan (1976) outline a taxonomy of types of cohesive relationships which can be formally established within a text, providing cohesive 'ties' which bind a text together. The taxonomy of types of explicit markers of conjunctive relations, as quoted from Brown and Yule (1983), is exemplified as follows :

a. additive : *and, or, furthermore, similarly, in addition*

- b. adversative : but, however, on the other hand, nevertheless
- c. causal : so, consequently, for this reason, it follows from this
- d. temporal : then, after that, an hour later, finally, at last

However, in natural data, we can observe the wide use of 'and', where the reader can supply additive, adversative, causal, and temporal meanings, depending on contextual information, as in the following example :

- She's intelligent. And she's very reliable. (additive)
- I've lived here ten years and I've never heard of that pub. (adversative)
- He fell in the river and caught a chill. (causal)
- I got up and made my breakfast. (temporal sequence)

Lexical Cohesion

Related vocabulary items occur across clause and sentence boundaries in written texts are a major characteristic of coherent texts. The relations between vocabulary items in texts described by the Halliday - Hasan model are of two principal kinds : *collocation* and *reiteration* (McCarthy, 1991:65).

Collocation

In this study, collocation is described through a chain of lexical collocation. Lexical collocation chains refer to general lexical connections created by a number of terms which share a common element of meaning. Some of lexical collocation chains can be identified in the following text :

My father once bought a Lincoln convertible. He did it by saving every penny he could. That car would be worth a fortune nowadays. However, he sold it to help pay for my college education. Sometimes I think I'd rather have the convertible.
(Yule,1985:105)

From the text we can observe chains of lexical collocation such as :

- *bought - saving - penny - worth a fortune - sold - pay*
- *once - nowadays - sometimes*

Reiteration

Reiteration means either restating an item in a later part of the discourse by *direct repetition* or else reasserting its meaning by exploiting *lexical relations*.

Reiteration by direct repetition could be in two forms (Brown and Yule, 1983:193) :

- Fully repeated form : *The Prime Minister recorded her thanks to the Foreign Secretary. The Prime Minister was most eloquent.*
- Partially repeated form : *Dr. E. C. R. Reeve chaired the meeting. Dr. Reeve invited Mr. Philips to report on the state of the gardens.*

Lexical relations are the stable semantic relationships that exist between words, such as synonymy and hyponymy. In the following two sentences, lexical cohesion (reiteration) by synonymy occurs :

The meeting commenced at six thirty. But from the moment it began, it was clear that all was not well.

Here, *commence* and *begin* co-refer to the same entity in the real world.

Meanwhile, lexical cohesion by hyponymy occurs in the following text :

There was a fine old *rocking-chair* that his father used to sit in, a *desk* where he wrote letters, a nest of small *tables* and a dark, imposing *bookcase*. Now all this *furniture* was to be sold, and with it his own past.

Here, furniture is *superordinate* of some *hyponyms* : rocking-chair, desk, tables, and bookcase (McCarthy, 1991:65).

I.7 Method of the Study

The method used in this study is qualitative descriptive analysis since it describes some texts of recipe based on the theory of cohesion applied in this study.

I.7.1 Definition of Key Terms

- **Cohesion** : the ties and connections which exist within a text.
- **Cohesive relations** : the relations which link one sentence and another within a text in terms of reference, ellipsis/substitution, conjunction, and lexical organization. These relations make the text easily understood.
- **Grammatical Cohesion** : the grammatical connections between clauses and sentences in a text.

- **Lexical Cohesion** : the exact repetition of words and the role played by certain basic semantic relations between words in creating textuality.
- **Recipe** : set of instructions for preparing a food dish, including the ingredients required.
- **Text** : a communicative occurrence which meets seven standards of textuality. The term 'text' used in this study only refers to written text, as against the spoken text.
- **Textuality** : quality of being a text, which distinguish it from a random sequence of unconnected sentences.

1.7.2 Sampling

This study uses purposive sampling method. It is a method of selection whereby the samples taken are the texts which are considered to have more variety of cohesive relations.

This study takes a recipe book entitled *Marie Claire Special Cookbook* as population. About the number of sample taken from population, there is no certain number. As stated by Sutrisno Hadi, actually there is no certain rule about how many samples must be taken from the population. Generally, people take a number of sample with practical consideration. (Hadi, 1981: 50). Moreover, according to

Ary, et al., the size of the sample depends on the homogeneity of the population from which it is to be selected. If the population under study is homogeneous, a small sample could represent it (Ary, et al., 1988 :179).

Thus, considering the practical and homogeneity factors, this study takes 5 texts to be analyzed from the 42 texts of recipe in the recipe book. Since all texts display some cohesive relations, the texts chosen to be analyzed are those which are considered to have more variety of cohesive relations.

1.7.3 Technique of Data Collection

1. Observation

The observation is done by reading through all recipe texts in the recipe book. This technique is used to catch both the content and the cohesive relations used in those recipe texts in order to find some texts which are considered to have more variety of cohesive relations needed for the analysis.

2. Selection

In obtaining data to be analyzed, since all recipe texts display some cohesive relations, I selected five recipe texts which are

considered to have more variety of cohesive relations needed for the analysis.

1.7.4 *Technique of Data Analysis*

In doing the analysis, I applied the theory of cohesion proposed by Halliday and Hasan. And in describing how the cohesion is applied in some texts of recipe, the analysis of each text is divided into two parts. The first is the analysis of grammatical cohesion which is classified into three broad types : reference, ellipsis, and conjunction. The second is the analysis of lexical cohesion which classified into two types : reiteration and collocation.

Then, to describe the kinds of cohesive relations which are applied in those texts, the result of the analysis is put in a table.

In short, the techniques of analyzing the data are as follows :

- Describing the cohesive analysis of the recipe texts by :
 - ◊ Analyzing each text in term of gramunatical cohesion under the three headings: reference, ellipsis, and conjunction.
 - ◊ Analyzing each text in term of lexical cohesion under the headings reiteration and collocation.
- Putting the result in a table.

CHAPTER III

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE OBJECT OF THE STUDY