

COHESIVE DEVICES OF ABSTRACTS USED IN INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR HELD BY TEFLIN IN 2010

by Slamet Utomo

Submission date: 14-Jan-2020 11:13AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1241719766

File name: CELT_proceeding.pdf (187.65K)

Word count: 1577

Character count: 8037

1
**COHESIVE DEVICES OF ABSTRACTS
USED IN INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR
HELD BY TEFLIN IN 2010**

By:

Slamet Utomo

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

ABSTRACT

Paper which is written can be understood well if it is written cohesively and coherently. But this is not always realized by writers. They usually write papers do not pay attention about the connection between one clause and the other clauses. Based on the condition may cause some readers confused because the papers are less **2** cohesive or may be not cohesive any more. The research was conducted to see some cohesive devices of the abstracts used in International Seminar held by TEFLIN in 2010. The readers have complained that the abstracts are very confusing to understand.

The problem statements to which I wanted to find are: **2**

1/ What kinds of grammatical cohesive devices are found in abstracts used in International Seminar held by TEFLIN in 2010 ?, 2/ what of kinds of lexical cohesive devices are found in abstracts used in International Seminar held by TEFLIN in 2010 ?./ To what degree are those abstracts cohesive?

Keywords : Cohesive Devices, abstract, TEFLIN

INTRODUCTION

Message can be delivered well through a text if the text is easy to understand. Sometimes, readers are not easy to understand the written text because the quality of reading text is not good. Based on Halliday's book, a good reading text should fulfill the quality of reading text, namely Coherence and **2** cohesion. When we look at the quality of reading text above, I can say that the abstracts used in International seminar held by TEFLIN in 2010 may be less cohesive. It causes the readers difficult to understand those abstracts.

The condition why the readers are hard to understand those abstracts may be due to some reasons. One, I sometimes found the abstracts used in International Seminar less cohesive. Two, I also still found there are some ambiguity words, especially in the form of references. Those references do not refer to anything or anyone. They are called exophoric references. Halliday said that exophoric reference can create ambiguity and confusion. He also added that a text has exophoric reference, it is considered not a good text. To reduce confusion in understanding the abstracts, the

cohesive devices can help the readers. Cohesive devices can be used to relate one clause to the other clauses in a text. The other quality of a good text is coherence. It means that a group sentences are inter relationship to each other. In this paper, I only pay attention on Cohesive Devices. Cohesion here can be Grammatical and Lexical devices.

STATEMENTS OF THE PROBLEMS

1. What kinds of grammatical cohesive devices used in the abstracts of International Seminar held by TEFLIN in 2010?
2. What kinds of lexical cohesive devices used in the abstracts of International Seminar held by TEFLIN in 2010?
3. To what degree are those abstracts cohesive?

PROPOSES OF THE RESEARCH

1. To find out kinds of grammatical cohesive devices used in the abstracts of International Seminar held by TEFLIN in 2010.
2. To find out kinds of grammatical cohesive devices used in the abstracts of International Seminar held by TEFLIN in 2010.
3. To describe the level of cohesiveness of those abstracts.

KINDS OF COHESIVE DEVICES

There are two kinds of cohesive devices, based on Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan (1989), they are:

1. Grammatical Cohesive Devices
Grammatical Cohesive devices can be; reference, conjunction, substitution, and ellipsis

Example : In Indonesia, where English is a foreign language, it has been reported to be in the implementation for about three decades.

The word it refers to English. It is called anaphoric reference because it is preceded by the word English.

2. Lexical Cohesive Devices
Lexical Cohesive Devices can be; repetition, Synonym, Antonym, Hyponym, and Meronym.

Example : They are our power of imagination, empathy, sympathy, antipathy, feeling, and thinking.

The four words empathy, sympathy, antipathy, feeling and thinking belong to Hyponym because they are the same class of the power of imagination. Those words belong to good lexical cohesive devices.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The findings are based on the analysis of kinds of cohesive devices of reading passages: i.e. 1) reference, 2) conjunction, 3) substitutions, 4) Ellipsis, 5) repetition, 6) synonym, 7) antonym, 8) hyponym, 9) meronym. The findings are also based on the analysis of level of cohesive devices of reading passages, i.e.

1)Grammatical and Lexical Devices, 2)Frequency of a per clause, 3) percentage of 1 entering in chains, 4) explicit lexical token, 5) cohesive interpreted lexical tokens, 6) total lexical tokens, 7) percentage of interpreted exophorically, and 9) percentage of 1 interpreted ambiguity.

Following are examples of each type of cohesive devices :

1. Compare to other literally works, drama is the most unique one, it is based on the definition that drama is made to be performed.

The word it refers to drama, it belongs to anaphoric reference.

2. This poor environment does not provide them with good inputs which they can use to filter or correct incorrect or inappropriate form,

The words them and they refer no ones before, they are called exophoric reference because they are not preceded nor followed by anyone. The cohesive devices like this will create the ambiguity, and this text is considered not a good text.

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

No	Items	Texts				
		A	B	C	D	E
1.	Grammatical and lexical devices	13	12	10	11	16
2.	Frequency of 1 per clause	0.6	10.7	0.6	07	0.6
3.	Percentage of 1 entering in chain	8.5	21	7	7.5	7.5
4.	Explicit interpreted lexical tokens	15	5	14	18	23
5.	Cohesive interpreted lexical tokens	22	32	26	22	34
6.	Total lexical tokens	36	35	41	40	54
7.	5 percentage of 6	28	43	32	26	32
8.	Percentage of 1 interpreted anaphorically	67	88	98	75	81
9.	Percentage of 1 interpreted exophorically	33	12	2	25	19
10.	Percentage of 1 interpreted ambiguous	2	-	-	-	-

Based on the table above, we can see that the most cohesive abstract is abstract C. It has 98% anaphoric references, whereas the exophoric references is 2%. According to Halliday and Hasan that the text is considered cohesive if the text has more anaphoric references than exophoric ones. Besides that reason, the abstract C is the most cohesive among 5 abstracts 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 abstract covers all kinds of cohesive ties devices, (4) this abstract does not create confusion and ambiguity.

When we see the table above, the least cohesive abstract is abstract A, This abstract has most exophoric references (33%) among the 5 abstracts, whereas the anaphoric references only 67%, and the ambiguity is about 2%. This abstract is considered the least cohesive because there are some reasons; (1) this abstract is not cohesive in term of cohesive ties, co-referentiality, (2) this abstract is not good enough in term of cohesive ties, co-classification, (3) this abstract also has 2% ambiguity, it may create confusion.

2. The level of cohesiveness of 5 abstracts.

No	Text	Level	Anaphoric (%)	Exophoric (%)	Ambiguous (%)
1.	C	1	98	2	-
2.	B	2	88	12	-
3.	E	3	81	19	-
4.	D	4	75	25	-
5.	A	5	67	33	2

Based on the table above, we can see that the 5 abstracts (ABCDE) stated in the International Seminar held by TEFLIN 2010 respectively the everage score of anaphoric references : abstract C 98%, abstract B 88%, abstract E 81\$, abstract D 75% and abstract A 67%. Based on Halliday and Ruqaya Hasan (1989) and also Garet and Wignel (1995), the most cohesive abstract is abstract C and the least cohesive abstract is abstract A. this text has the lowest anaphoric references and the highest exophoric references among the 5 abstracts.

CONCLUSION

- (1) Abstract which is considered cohesive, if clauses, sentences, and also paragraphs in a text are linked to each other. These clauses, sentences and paragraphs are tied together by using cohesive ties devices, they are grammatical cohesive devices (references, conjunction, substitutions, and ellipsis), lexical cohesive devices (repetition, synonym, antonym, meronym and hyponym). Hopefully, that the text

does not have exophoric references. A good text should have two requirements of a good reading passage, they are cohesion and coherence.

- (2) Abstract which has good requirement of good reading passage is abstract C, because it has more anaphoric references(98%) than exophoric one (2%), when we look at the table percentage of cohesive devices above, the abstract A is the least cohesive abstract because it has anaphoric references (67%), and exophoric references (33%), ambiguity (2%). It means that the text is hard to understand because those exophoric references may create ambiguity and confusion.

REFERNCES

- Couthard, M. 1986. *On composing and evaluating text*. The modern Language Journal. Vol.3 5 179 -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.

COHESIVE DEVICES OF ABSTRACTS USED IN INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR HELD BY TEFLIN IN 2010

ORIGINALITY REPORT

13%

SIMILARITY INDEX

7%

INTERNET SOURCES

2%

PUBLICATIONS

11%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

Submitted to Universitas Muria Kudus

Student Paper

4%

2

radarmas.blogspot.com

Internet Source

3%

3

Submitted to Higher Education Commission
Pakistan

Student Paper

2%

4

semnas.untidar.ac.id

Internet Source

2%

5

media.neliti.com

Internet Source

2%

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude bibliography Off

Exclude matches < 2%