COHESION OF ABSTRACTS USED IN SKRIPSI OF ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF MURIA KUDUS UNIVERSITY

by Slamet Utomo

Submission date: 14-Jan-2020 11:14AM (UTC+0700)
Submission ID: 1241720118
File name: Galuh_seminar.docx (28.33K)
Word count: 2478
Character count: 12441

COHESION OF ABSTRACTS USED IN SKRIPSI OF ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF MURIA KUDUS UNIVERSITY

BY:

Slamet Utomo
English Education department
Faculty of Teacher Training and education
University of Muria Kudus
Slamet_utomo16@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The development of curriculum from year to year brings about some modifications in many aspects. The development of curriculum also involves the development of skripsi written by students. When a new curriculum is released, students start competing to write skripsi based on the new curriculum. This paper was conducted to see some linguistics aspects of the abstract written in students' skripsi of English Education department of University of Muria Kudus. The abstracts were chosen as the study object for completing the Sarjana Program in English education. The English lecturers have complained that the abstracts are very hard for them to understand.

The problem statements to which I wanted to find are:
1/ What kinds of grammatical and lexical cohesive devices are found in abstracts used in the students' skripsi of English Education Department of Muria Kudus University?., 2/ To what degree are those abstracts cohesive?

The paper was based on Halliday and Hasan's theory of cohesion of reading text. The analysis is based on some criteria, that is, the abstracts may have; (1) co-referential cohesive ties (2) co-classification cohesive ties, (3) coextension cohesive ties. Besides, the abstracts are also analyzed in terms of their level of cohesiveness.

Keywords : cohesion, curriculum, abstract, skripsi

INTRODUCTION

Cohesion of abstracts used in skripsi of Muria Kudus University is my concern here because I have taught Writing at this university. Teaching Writing at English Education Department covers the quality of reading text; Coherence and cohesion, but cohesion gets more portion than the other one. According to Halliday that a text is considered good if the text is cohesively. So, I think that cohesion is very important, because it can be used as a medium in seeing whether the text is good or not. I have taught writing for more than twelve years, but I still find that students can not write the text cohesively. Although teaching writing at Muria Kudus University is very important, many writing texts, especially abstracts found in skripsi are difficult to understand. This happens not only to the students but also their lecturers, including me as an English lecturer. When I asked my colleagues why abstract is difficult, most of them had similar answers. My colleagues said that abstracts used in students' skripsi were difficult to understand, so, they make lecturers feel bored.

The unsatisfactory result of writing specially writing abstracts of skripsi might be due to some reasons. First, I often find out my students write abstracts less cohesively, Second, I

often find out that lecturers are overwhelmed by messages contained in the abstracts although they have translated the texts. Probably, this is because those abstracts contain some ambiguities and are hard to understand. I predict that the abstracts used many exohoric reference. One contributing factor that helps students understand is cohesion. It may be easier for the students to understand the reading texts which are written cohesively. Cohesion may reduce confusion in understanding the text because the students will know how sentences or paragraphs are related. This will help them understand the plot of the reading texts and also the characters of the story. The other factors that contribute to readability of texts is coherence. Coherence means that a group sentences which relate to the context. Here, I will pay special attention to cohesion of reading passages.

Cohesion here can be reference, substitution, conjunction, ellipsis, and lexical cohesion.

STATEMENTS OF THE PROBLEMS

1. What kinds of grammatical and lexical cohesive devices are found in the abstracts of skripsi of English Education department ?
2. To what degree are those abstracts cohesive?

PROPOSES OF THE RESEARCH

1. To find out the types of grammatical and lexical cohesive devices of abstracts of skripsi of English education Department?.
2. To find out the level of cohesiveness of those abstracts.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. Cohesion
   Cohesion means that a group of sentences which tie together. (Halliday and Hasan, 1989)
2. Coherence
   Coherence means that a group of sentences or paragraphs which relate to the context. (Halliday and Hasan, 1989)
3. A cohesive text
   According to Halliday and Hasan (1989), a cohesive text is a text which consists sentences or paragraphs that tie together.

4. Qualities of reading passages
   Cohesion and coherence of the reading passage are very important because they can determine the reading passage is good or not as stated by Hallyday and Hasan (1989)

   > A text should have two properties, cohesion and coherence. The term cohesion refers to the way we relate or tie together bits of our discourse, whereas coherence refers to the way group of clauses or sentences relate to the context. If we can not identify cohesive tie, it is this absence of semantic ties between elements in the paragraph that prevents it from hanging together internally as a piece of language (Halliday and Hasan, 1989)
   >
   > A good text is a text that does not create confusion or worse because the author himself has failed to maintain a consistent imagined reader from sentence to sentence or paragraph to paragraph. (Malcolm Couthard, 1981)

KINDS OF COHESION

M.A.K Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan (1989) classified cohesion into :

1. Grammatical cohesive devices

   Grammatical cohesive devices can be reference (pronominal, demonstrative, definite article and comparative), it is called co-reference. Grammatical cohesive devices can also be substitutions and ellipsis (nominal, verbal and clausal). It is called co-classification.

   Example : - *Vocabulary is one of the most important components that should be given. It has to be mastered by the students in learning new language.*

   The word it refers to vocabulary. The word it is personal reference. This personal pronoun is considered to be an anaphoric reference.

2. Lexical cohesive devices

   Lexical cohesive devices can be : repetition, synonymy, antonymy. It is called co-extension.

   Example : - *The writer conducted classroom action research to solve the research problem. The research was conducted in MAN 2 Kudus in the academic year 2009/2010.*

   The word research refers back to research. This word is call lexical reiteration, it is a form of lexical cohesion which involves the repetition of a lexical item. This belongs to repetition.

METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

1. Technique in gathering the data
2. Selecting skripsi
3. Selecting the topics
4. Deciding abstracts
5. Analyzing the data
6. Interpreting the result

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The findings are based on the analysis of types of cohesion of reading passages, i.e. 1) co-referentiality, 2) co-classification, 3) co-extention. The findings are also based on the analysis of levels of cohesion of reading passages, i.e. 1) grammatical cohesive devices, 2) frequency of 1 per clause, 3) percentage of 1 entering in chains, 4) explicit lexical tokens, 5) cohesive interpreted lexical tokens, 6) total lexical tokens, 7) percentage of 1 interpreted anaphorically, 8) percentage of 1interpreted exophorically, and 9) percentage of 1 interpreted ambiguity.

Following are examples of each type of cohesion :

1. *Education and Cultural department (2002) says that anyone will master a language if he has good grammar.*
   The pronoun *he* refers to *Mrs. Anyone.* it belongs to a singular pronoun.

2. *The computation result of the test was in the pre-test was 63.5, cycle 1 was 66.4, and cycle II was 70.5.*
   The word *and* is and additive conjunction.

1. The number of grammatical and lexical cohesive devices found in those reading passages.

No	Items	Texts								
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1.	Grammatical and lexical devices	26	24	20	23	31	44	28	36	11
2.	Frequency of 1 per clause	1.2	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.1	1.6	1.3	1.3	0.55
3.	Percentage of 1 entering in chain	17.4	41	14	15.5	14.5	81	10.1	10.5	28.1
4.	Explicit interpreted lexical tokens	29	10	28	36	45	36	31	38	31
5.	Cohesive interpreted lexical tokens	43	65	53	44	69	74	35	87	33
6.	Total lexical tokens	72	75	81	80	114	110	66	125	64
7.	5 percentage of 6	59	86	65	55	61	67	53	61	51
8.	Percentage of 1 interpreted anaphorically	67	25	55	52	67	88	98	75	81
9.	Percentage of 1 interpreted exophorically	33	66	45	48	33	12	2	25	19
10.	Percentage of 1 interpreted ambiguous	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

According to Halliday and Hasan (1989), a text is considered whether it is cohesive or less cohesive by looking at the number of anaphoric and exophoric references. A text is considered to be more cohesive if it has more anaphoric references than exophoric ones. When I look at the table above, the most cohesive text among the nine texts is text G. This text has 98% anaphoric reference, and 2% exophoric one. When we look at cohesive ties, co-classification, this text is linked closely by some kinds of cohesive ties, co-classification, such as nominal ellipsis. Ellipsis is always cohesive, there is no ambiguity in ellipsis. Ellipsis is always anaphoric, this is always presupposed by certain words, either noun, verb, or clause. In text G consists of nominal ellipsis. In cohesive ties, co-extention, G has four kinds of cohesive ties, co-extention, such as ; synonymy, antonymy, meronymy and repetition. Text G is considered to be a good text because there are some reasons (1) it has more anaphoric references than exophoric ones. (2) It has more anaphoric of cohesive ties, co-referentiality than exophoric ones. (3) This text is linked by ellipsis closely in cohesive ties, co-classification, and (4) this text has covered all kinds of cohesive ties, co-extention. It means that this text is understandable. This text may not make ambiguity, so this text is easy for students to comprehend.

If we look at the table above, I conclude that the text which has the least anaphoric references is text B, it has 25% anaphoric and 66% exophoric and 4% ambiguous. Text B is considered to be the least cohesive among the nine reading passages because this text may cause ambiguity. It has some reasons, (1) this text is not good enough in term of cohesive ties, co-referentiality, such as; pronominal, demonstrative, definite article and comparative. Most of cohesive ties are exophoric, it means that the text is not easy enough for students to understand. (2) This text is not good enough in term of cohesive ties, co-classification. This text has tied by two of cohesive ties, c0-classification, such as; substitutions, and ellipsis. This text is considered to be the least cohesive because this text consists of more exophoric references than anaphoric ones. (3) This text is neither good in term of cohesive ties, co-extention. This is repetition. Repetition sometimes makes students feel bored. This text has also 4% ambiguity, it means that this text can create confusion.

2. The level of cohesiveness of 9 reading passages

No	Text	Level	Anaphoric (%)	Exophoric (%)	Ambiguous (%)
1.	G	1	98	2	-
2.	F	2	88	12	-
3.	I	3	81	19	-
4.	H	4	75	25	-
5.	A	5	67	33	-
6.	E	5	67	33	-
7.	C	6	55	45	-
8.	D	7	52	48	-
9.	B	8	25	66	4

From the result of the analysis above, the nine abstracts (A,B,CD, E,F,G,H and I) stated in skripsis,of English Education department in terms of cohesion (following Halliday and Hasan's principle of reading passages) respectively the everage score of anaphoric references : 98% for text G, 88% for text F, 81% for text I, 75% for text H, 67% for text A and E, 55% for text C, 53% for text D, and 25% for text B

After consulting to Halliday and Hasan's principles of cohesion of the abstracts (1989), the most cohesive abstract among the nine abstract is text G from the skripsi, written by Chorina Nurul Ummayah.

Text G is considered to be the first level of cohesiveness among the nine abstracts, because this text is the most cohesive among those texts. This text is considered to be the most cohesive because this text has more anaphoric references than exophoric ones.

Text B in the table above has more exophoric references than anaphoric ones. This text is the lowest level among the nine abstracts, because this text has more exophoric references than anaphoric ones. And this text also has 4% ambiguity. This text is considered to be the least cohesive and it is also the lowest level of cohesiveness out of nine abstracts, meaning that the text is not understandable. This text may create ambiguity.

CONCLUSION

From the result of the study above, some conclusions have been drawn, as follows:

(1) A text is considered to be cohesive, if the sentences and paragraphs are written closely related one to another. The sentences and paragraphs are liked closely by using cohesion, such as references (it belongs to cohesive ties, co-referentiality), substitutions, ellipsis (they belong to cohesive ties, co-classification), or lexical cohesion (it belongs to cohesive ties, co-extentions). Cohesion is one of requirements that determines the value of the text good or not. This concides with with Halliday and Hasan (1989) who write that a text is regarded to be good it it consists of more anaphoric references than exophoric ones.

(2) When we look at the numbers of cohesion that are stated among nine abstracts, the text G has more anaphoric references than exophoric ones. When we look at the types of cohesion, this text has all types, such as, co-referential, co-classification, and co-extention cohesive ties.

Based on the findings above I conclude that text G is the most cohesive reading passage. This text may be understood more easily by students because it may not create ambiguity.

When we look at the list of cohesive level. Text B is the least level of cohesiveness among nine reading passages. It has 25% anaphoric reference, 66% exophoric ones, and 4% ambiguity. The ambiguity of the text is for example, the use of the word "second", since there is no the word "first" in the text. This word may create ambiguity.

REFERENCES

Coulthard, M. 1981. *Studies in discourse analysis*. London : Routledge and Kegan Paul

Couthard, M. 1986. *On composing and evaluating text*. The modern Language Journal. Vol.3 : 179 -187

Celce-Murcia, et al's.1995. *Communicative Competence : A Pedagogically Motivated Model with Content Specifications*.The modern Language Journal Vol.6 : 10-11

Garot, Linda & Peter Wignell. 1995. *Making sense of functional grammar*. Sydney : Gerd Stabler

Halliday, M.A.K & Hasan, Ruqaiya. 1989. *Language, context*, and text : aspects of language in a social – semiotic perspective. Victori : Deakin University Press

Halliday, M.A.K & Hasan, Ruqaiya. 1994. *Cohesion in English*. Singapore: Longman Singapore Publisher (Pte) Ltd.

Halliday, M.A.K and Hasan, Ruqaiya. 1984 . *Language as social semiotic*. London : Athenaeum Press Ltd.

COHESION OF ABSTRACTS USED IN SKRIPSI OF ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF MURIA KUDUS UNIVERSITY

ORIGINALITY REPORT

25%	26%	0%	0%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

MATCH ALL SOURCES (ONLY SELECTED SOURCE PRINTED)

19%

★ repository.unika.ac.id

Internet Source

Exclude quotes	Off	Exclude matches	< 2%
Exclude bibliography	Off		