II. FRAME OF THEORIES

This chapter concerns the followings points: review of previous research, review of related literature, concept of cohesive ties, elements of cohesive ties, and teaching the cohesive ties.

2.1 Review of Previous Researches

Some previous research (Williams, 2005; Widdowson, 2004: 52-55; Brown and Yule, 2003; Carrell, 1998; and Hardo, 2001) states the process of students' learning and their problems as well as their opinions and feelings toward the material for reading comprehension.

Williams (2005) reveals the report of some experiments conducted by Garrod and Sanford, and Cohen (2001) reports readers' difficulty in identifying lexical cohesive and reference while Cohen (1989) reports readers' lacking of knowledge of conjunction. However, Williams did not only reveal those facts but he also offered the tentative solution to overcome such problems. That is, teaching the recognition of cohesive ties.

Additionally, Widdowson (2004: 52-55) defines it in terms of the distinction that is made between the illocutionary act and the proposition. In his view, propositions, when linked together, form a "text" whereas illocutionary acts, when

related to each other, create different kinds of "discourse." According to Halliday (1994: 309–311), cohesion is the set of language resources which express relationships or links through a text or discourse separated from the structural level of sentence grammar.

Brown and Yule (2003) state that cohesive ties are developed as a technique to help Teachers Bridge the gap for students who demonstrated a discrepancy between decoding skills and comprehension skills.

Carrel (1998) study found that students taught using cohesive ties teaching technique scored arose higher on a process of students' learning and their problems as well as their opinions and feelings toward the material.

On the other side, previous research has been done by Hardo (2001) at SMA 5 Tanjungkarang, he made an experiment using the problems of recognition of cohesive ties faced in understanding reading texts to investigate whether it might increase students' reading comprehension. In his research, He found some problems that arose while the process of students' learning about cohesive ties as well as their opinions and feelings toward the material. The result of his research was most students were still confuse about lexical cohesion.

2.2 Review of Related Literatures

For further explanation about the students' problem of cohesive ties identification in understanding reading texts, the researcher would like to explain some related literatures about the reading comprehension.

2.2.1 Concept of Reading Comprehension

In relation to the importance of reading comprehension the 2006 curriculum known as School Based Curriculum (KTSP), the focus of language teaching learning process is a text. There are many kinds of texts introduced to the students; one of them is narrative text. The text is applied in four language skills namely listening, speaking, reading and writing. In this case the research would focus only in reading comprehension because it is not as easy as we heard. According to Goodman (1988) reading is a receptive process. It creates an interaction between a writer and a reader. It is a difficult thing since a writer and a reader could not contact each other, they only communicated through the text. So a reader should try some hard effort to do this language skill.

Concerning with reading, Murcia (2002) states that reading is a skill that everyone needed whether in elementary, secondary, and university. Furthermore, Dallman (1982) states that reading comprehension means constructing meaning from what is being perceived in writing. From the statements, it is assumed that when a reader read a written material, he/she had to be able to comprehend what the content is. Thus the reader should understand what the author's expectation from readers through his or her written material.

According to Howart (2006) reading is just as a communicative as any other form of language. It means that in reading, there is an interaction between the researchers tried to encode the messages to the readers. Then the readers try to decode the messages that sent by the researcher.

Furthermore, Walker (2004) states reading is a result of the interaction between the perceptions of graphic symbols and the written language form. In reading processes, the reader tries to recreate the meaning intended by the researcher. From the descriptive above, it can be stated that reading is a process that requires thought, students' ability in understanding the meaning and the information from the text.

Moreover, in teaching reading the teacher should provide technique to the students with purpose for reading to anticipate different type of reading texts. Therefore, reading technique should be matched to the reading purpose to read efficiently and effectively. Suparman (2005:1) states that there are two major reasons for reading (1) reading for pleasure; (2) reading for information (in order to find out something or in order to do something with the information readers get).

About this situation it can be stated that in reading comprehension, it is important that the reader should be able to interpret what they read and associate with their experience, not only see and identify the symbol in front of them. From the entire question above, the researcher sums up that *reading* is an activity which involved the schemata of the readers to build up their comprehension of the text. It is clear that reading and comprehension are regarded as one activity which can not be separated. In other words, *reading comprehension* is an activity to extract the meaning of written materials with fully understanding.

2.2.2 Concept of Cohesive Ties

Cohesive ties are a semantic concept and it refers to relations of meanings that exist within the text and that define it as a text. So, a cohesive tie helps to create text by providing texture. As has been mention before, according to Halliday & Hasan (1994:3) by using the concept of cohesive ties, it is possible to count the amount of instances of cohesion within a given text and it is also a semantic one which refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as a text.

They stated that cohesive occurs where the interpretation of some elements in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other, in the sense that it could not effectively be decoding except by recourse to it. When this happen, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are there by at least potentially integrated into the text. The two elements integrated ear what is called cohesive ties.

2.3 Elements of Cohesive Ties

The elements of cohesive ties as (Halliday and Hasan, 1994) state are reference, substitution, ellipsis, lexical cohesive, and conjunction. Here is the explanation of each of elements the cohesive ties:

2.3.1 Reference

The term *reference* refers to specific items within a text/discourse which can not be interpreted semantically in their own right, but make *reference* to something else, i.e. some other items within the text/discourse for their interpretation (Halliday & Hasan, 1994:31). These reference items, which referred to something

else, are called directives and indicate information which is to be retrieved from elsewhere (Halliday & Hasan, 1994: 31). The information to be retrieved is the referential meaning, the identity of the particular thing or class of things that is being refers to (Halliday & Hasan, 1994: 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, the identity of the particular thing or class of things that is being referred to. *Reference* can be divided into two kinds. They are anaphoric (pointing back) and cataphoric (pointing forward). The constituents of both anaphoric and cataphoric can be described as the following:

a. Personal: - I, me, mine, my
                 - They, them, their, theirs
                 - We, us, our, etc.

b. Demonstrative: this, that, these, those, then, etc.

c. Comparative: such, so, likewise, equally, same, etc.

For further knowledge, let us see the following example:

> In <u>1969</u> work began on the construction of a vast dam across the Zambesi River, near the border with Zambia. When complete, the <u>Caborra Bassa</u> dam (named after the rapids at which <u>it</u> is sited) will irrigate 1.6 million ha of land produce 2200 mw of electric power. But since <u>then</u>, and particularly since <u>its</u> independence, <u>Mozambique</u> has become increasingly worried about the cost of completing and operating project.

The instances of *it* and *then* are anaphoric and cohere respectively with the previously mentioned, more explicit *Caborra Bassa* and *1969*. Conversely, *its* is cataphoric and links with the about to be mentioned, more explicit *Mozambique*. Anaphoric reference in text is frequent, cataphoric reference is rare.

2.3.2 Substitution

Substitution as another type of cohesive relation, or cohesive tie, is the process in which one item within a text or discourse is replaced by another (Halliday & Hasan, 1994:88). While reference is a relation on the semantic level, i.e. between meanings, *substitution* is a relation on the lexicogrammatical level (level of grammar and vocabulary) between linguistic items, such as words or phrases (Halliday & Hasan, 1994: 89). *Substitution* is divided into three categories. They are described as the following:

a. Nominal: one/s, the same

b. Verbal: do, does, did

c. Clausal: so, not

The following example may give us explanation of the process of *substitution:*

> The use of wind power for sailing is of course well-known, and is recognized as having played a large part in the development of civilization. But for centuries the wind has also been harnessed for other mechanical tasks, in particular for pumping water. Simple windmills were in fact so used in ancient Persia and China. In recent times, more powerful ones have been used in Holland to make vast areas of land suitable for agriculture, by pumping away the sea-water. The Dutch also developed saw-mills, corn-mills, oil-mills and paper-mills. All of which worked just as efficiently as windmills did. Following Holland's success, many countries did the same. Most met with great success; some not.

Since a substitute is avoid unnecessary and intrusive repetition of the more explicit item, thus the text above contains:

The substitute	Instead of repeating
So (clausal)	For pumping water
Ones (nominal)	Wind-mills
Did (verbal)	Worked…efficiently developed
The same (nominal)	Wind-mills, saw-mills, corn-mills, oil-mills, and paper-mills
Not (clausal)	Did (not) meet with great success

2.3.3 Ellipsis

Ellipsis as a type of cohesive relation is very similar to substitution. While substitution referred to the replacement of one textual element by another, ellipsis is simply characterized by the omission of an item (Halliday & Hasan, 1994:88). The process can, therefore be interpreted as that form of substitution in which an item is replaced by nothing or as substitution by zero (Halliday & Hasan, 1994: 142). *Ellipsis* can be interpreted as that form of substitution in which the item is replaced by nothing. Simply, *Ellipsis* was substitution by zero. The following example might give the illustration:

a. I carried the bag and my friend the suitcase.

b. We agreed that the patient should be taken to the hospital and the house locked.

c. She said that her informant had revealed the name but would say nothing more.

In item A the exact word which is omitted is <u>carried</u>. This omitted word actually lays between the word "friend" and the word "the suitcase". In item B the exact words omitted are <u>should be</u> (lie between the word "house" and the word

"locked"). And in item C the exact words omitted are <u>her informant</u>, which lie between the word "but" and the word "would".

2.3.4 Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion is the fourth of the cohesive relations in English. It is generally understood as the cohesive effect that is achieved by the selection of vocabulary (Halliday & Hasan, 1994:274). *Lexical cohesion* is the cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary. The author may employ two or more words to refer to one point of something. *Lexical cohesion* consists of collocation, repetition; synonym, super ordinate and general noun are categorized into what was so-called reiteration.

a. Collocation means coming together, that is, words which come together in a distance or more.
b. Reiteration means the act of reiterating: saying or doing something again for several times.
c. Repetition means the instance of reiterating.
d. Synonym means word with the same meaning as another in the same as language but often with different implication and associations.
e. Super ordinate means that a word which is at the upper level of another.

(Hornby, A. S., 2003)

Such cohesion in the text above could be summaries in the following text:

> Until fairly recently, nearly all <u>waterworks</u> in both <u>industrial</u> and <u>developing</u> countries were originally <u>built</u> with one particular <u>objective</u> in mind. It might have been hydroelectric power, irrigation, and swamp drainage of some other <u>purpose</u>. A secondary benefit, such as flood control in the case of a river in the monsoon area, might have accrued <u>when a large dam was built</u>, but would not have been a primary consideration in the <u>matter</u>.

Lexical cohesion in the text above could be summarized in the following way:

a. Collocation: industrialized and developing
b. Reiteration: 1. Repetition (built and built)

2. Synonym (objective and purpose)

3. Super ordinate (waterworks and dam)

2.3.5 Conjunction

Conjunction is the fifth type of grammatical cohesion, but forms the borderline to the field of lexical cohesion since it also included lexical features. Unlike the other typed of cohesive ties, conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings; they are not primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding (or following) text, but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse (Halliday & Hasan, 1994:226). It is not very easy to give a precise explanation of the way in which conjunctions create cohesion. Neither are they a type of semantic relation that points to something else in the text/discourse, nor are they a grammatical relation that implies that something is left out or replaced by something else. The constitutions of conjunctions, according to Nuttal (2001) are: then, first, at once, next, the following day, in conclusion, that is to say, in this connection, for example, to resume, in short, moreover, incidentally, similarly, however, concerning this, in this respect, and so forth.

For further knowledge, let us see the following example:

The fire had started in the early morning while most of the guests were still sound asleep. One guest who happened to be awake already, however, thought he smelt smoke. He went out into the corridor and

informed a passing bell-boy. <u>Then</u>, they saw smoke coming around the corner at the other end of the corridor, banging on every door <u>and</u> shouting "Fire! Fire!" the bell-boy alerted the rest of the staff <u>and</u> telephoned the fire brigade.

From the text above we can see that some kinds of conjunction appear in the text, they are: however, and, then.

Based on the explanation of the five elements of cohesive ties above, the writer concluded that a reader could avoid misinterpreting of a text on the condition that he or she has mastered the elements well and could apply them to get the meanings of the content while reading it.

2.4 Teaching Cohesive Ties

Since it has been mentioned previously on the background, the researcher would like to try teaching the recognition of cohesive ties in reading class. She hopes she may find something valuable during the implementation of the cohesive ties concerning the students' reading comprehension. The process of teaching the recognition of cohesive ties as Williams (2005) proposes could be conducted such in the following steps:

1. The teacher started by introducing and explaining the elements of cohesive ties separately. The separated treatment she was best to familiarize students with the process involved and with associated terminology, but without the distraction of other matters. In category of textual cohesion.

2. Then the teacher demonstrated the material used an overhead transparency of the text concerned. Demonstration was done by presenting texts marked-up

and discussing with the students the ties involved. This was to indicate to the students that such ties exist.

3. The teacher presented a text and asked the students to identify and mark the constituents of the existing ties. In this stage, the students worked on the text in two or three, comparing and discussing their worked with the teacher as a roving consultant.