



*Corresponding author: Haryanto Atmowardoyo, English Education Department, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

E-mail: haryanto@unm.ac.id

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Cohesion in Descriptive Discourse Written by The Sixth Semester Students of The English Department of FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang

Haryanto Atmowardoyo* & Geminastiti Sakkir

English Education Department, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

Abstract: This study of cohesion in descriptive discourse written by students of the English Department of FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang. This study describes the types of cohesion used in the students' discourse and the degree of cohesive harmony of the discourse. It is drawn from the facts that this type of cohesion occurs very frequently in every student's discourse. Cohesion in the students' discourse do not function well as the foundation of coherence, drawn from the degree of cohesive harmony of the students' discourse. As mentioned, the degree of cohesive harmony of the students' discourse is low. The low degree of cohesive harmony expresses that the cohesion of the discourse does not function well as the foundation of coherence. It reflects that, in general, the students do not stay long enough on the similar things they are on about.

Keywords: Cohesion, Descriptive Discourse, Descriptive Analysis.

1. Introduction

Today, language teaching methodologists are promoting a relatively new method of language teaching known as communicative language teaching (CLT). This method assumes that language is naturally a means of communication. As such, language is used to convey messages from the addressor to the addressee. This assumption has led CLT to give more emphasis on the teaching of language use over the teaching of language usage. This emphasis is provided to make language learners be able to communicate their intended messages as well as possible to other people.

CLT is clearly different from some other methods. Some other methods such as audio-lingual method and grammar translation method assume that language is naturally a system consisting of regularity with some exceptions (Richards, 1986). This assumption has led such the methods to give more emphasis on the teaching of the regularity of language forms and their exceptions. In other words, conventional methods stress more on the teaching of language usage rather than the teaching of language use.

Giving more emphasis on the teaching of language, CLT requires analysis of language use for its implementation. The analysis of language use is often called discourse analysis. With the discourse analysis the language elements supporting the communicativeness of language in use can be described. The description of these aspects will be beneficial for the implementation of CLT. Under the point of the significance of the study, the writer will explain how the description of an aspect of discourse, that is 'cohesion', contributes valuable insight to language teachers.

The scope of discourse analysis is very wide. It covers the analysis of elements inside or outside the discourse under analysis. The analysis of elements inside the discourse is often



known as text analysis. That is because a text is defined as passage of discourse (Halliday and Hasan,1980).

One important element that we can analyze under text analysis is 'cohesion'. This term refers to the semantic relation among elements of a text (Halliday and Hasan, 1980). Cohesion occurs where the interpretation of one element in the text is depend ent on that of another. The one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it.

In English, and perhaps in any other language, cohesion can be classified into many types depending on the types of what we call cohesive device. A very general classification of cohesion maintains that cohesion is divided into two. The first is grammatical cohesion, meaning that is cohesion established by grammatical items such as reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. The second is lexical cohesion, meaning that is cohesion established by lexical items. The lexical items include lexical reiteration and lexical collocation.

Some studies of cohesion have been conducted to particular types of discourse written by english learners abroad. Two of them are Crowhurst (1981) and Khalil (1989). Their studies, however, are restricted in the search of the types of discourse. Crowhurst (1981) studies cohesion in argumentative discourse, whereas Khalil (1989) studies cohesion in expository discourse.

Another study of cohesion in different types of discourse seems necessary to conduct in order to broaden the available knowledge of cohesion. Since the study of cohesion in descriptive discourse have never been conducted, it is important now to conduct a study of cohesion in this type of discourse.

In an attempt to search for the states of cohesion in learners 'language, a decision is made to conduct a study of cohesion in descriptive discourse written by the students of the English Department of FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang. This decision is taken for some consideration. First, the students of this level are supposed to be able to write a short descriptive essay. Second, studies of cohesion have never been conducted to these students. And, third, the writers are teaching staffs at the institute so that it is not too difficult for them to conduct the research.

The present study tries to explore the states of cohesion in descriptive discourse written by English language learners. The main problem of the study, therefore, can be defined as follows: "What is the states of cohesion in descriptive discourse written by the sixth semester students of the English Department of FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang?"

The specification of the states of cohesion leads the writers to formulate the research problems into three points as follows:

- a. What types of cohesion occur in the descriptive discourse written by english language learners?
- b. What is the frequency of occurrence of each type of cohesion in descriptive discourse written by the English language learners?
- c. What is the cohesive harmony of the descriptive discourse written by English language learners?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Discourse

Discourse and text are, indeed, two similar terms. Discourse is a formal and orderly and usually extended expression of thought on a subject. It may be spoken or written and usually consists of more than one sentence. A text, according to Halliday and Hasan (1980:23), is a passage of discourse. As a passage of discourse, it can be of any length. But, most often it consists of more than one sentence.

2.2. Cohesion

The term 'cohesion' has been defined differently by some writers. Some definitions are presented then. Halliday and Hasan (1980) maintain that cohesion refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text. The relations are established through the use of cohesive devices including reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical item.

Similar definition is mentioned by Widdowson (1980). He contains that cohesion refers to relations of meaning among sentences in a text. Cohesion is realized by the presence of cohesive devices. de Beugrande (1980) states that cohesion is useful to provide the effectiveness of a text. Cohesion is established through: the use of many kinds of cohesive devices including recurrence, definiteness, co-reference, anaphora, cataphora, ellipsis, and conjunction. The text effectiveness exists because of the presence of cohesive devices binding the meaning and the order of a text. As a result, the text is easy to interpret.

3. Research Method

This study employs a descriptive method of research known as content analysis. Descriptive research, according to Say (1979: 76) and Moore (1983:174), involves the collection of data for the purpose of describing existing conditions as accurately as possible. This type of research includes some specifications one of which is content analysis. Content analysis is concerned with the explanation of the status of some phenomenon at a particular time or its development over a period of time. One source of data that can be used in content analysis is compositions, Best (1981: 107)

The study describes a particular condition about a particular type of discourse. The study deals only with the description about the states of cohesion in descriptive discourse written by the students of the English Department of FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang. The study is concerned with the analysis of the states of cohesion in the student's discourse. It implies that the source of data is the students' compositions. Referring back to the characteristic of descriptive research mentioned above, it is clear that the present study can be categorized as a descriptive research, specifically, as a content analysis.

The data analysis is conducted in reference to the theory of cohesion analysis and cohesive harmony analysis suggested by Halliday and Hasan (1980) and Hasan (1984; 1989). The first and the second problems, the type and the frequency of cohesion, were solved following the theory of cohesion analysis developed by Halliday and Hasan (1980); whereas the third problem, following the theory of cohesive harmony analysis suggested by Hasan (1984; 1989).

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Types of Cohesion

Analysis of data to describe the types of cohesion used in the students' discourse is intended to provide the answer to the first question, that is, "What types of cohesion do the students use in their discourse?" The results of the analysis concerning with the question are illustrated in the Figure 1 and Figure 2.

Figure 1 and Figure 2 displays the data concerning the question. Figure 1 explains the number of each type of cohesion in each text as well as the total number of cohesions in all texts under analysis. Figure 2 explains the proportion of each type of cohesion expressed in percent. From both figures, some description concerning the first question are presented. The description includes two points: first, the types of cohesion found in the students' discourse; and second, the cohesion variation. One additional point reported afterwards is the problems of cohesion that the students encounter writing the discourse.

Table 1
 The Distribution of Cohesion in Students' Discourse
 (N : 28)

Text Number	Number of Cohesion	Number of Each Type of Cohesion																
		PR	DR	CR	NS	VS	CS	NE	VE	CE	AC	AVC	CC	TC	OC	LR	LC	
1	81	20	7	2				2			1	1						
2	20	8	2								3	3						
3	38	12									3							
4	21	10									1	2	2					
5	11	4	1					1	1		1	1						
6	13	9																
7	53	6	1					2			2	1	1					
8	30	1			6			1			1	1						
9	32	11	1		2						3	5		1				
10	10	11	1								4	1	1					
11	108	4	3							1	3	3	1	1				
12	56	6			1			1	1		3	3		1				
13	106	22	14					1			6	2	2	2				
14	48	1									1	2	2					
15	38		5								3	3	3	5	2			
16	7	14									2	3	5	1	1			
17	9	14									3	2	2		1			
18	63	7	1								1	1			1			
19	8	9	2					3			1	3						
20	32	9										1						
21	63	16	1		1							1						
22	7	15																
23	97	16	7								2	3						
24	52	10	9								3	4						
25	69	24	15								4	1	1					
26	69	18	17	1	1						1	1						
27	38	6	1								3	1	1					
28	62	28	4					1			1	5					27	
Total	2138	520	225	30	11	8	13	2	1	52	45	13	10	5	1223			
Average	76.36	18.57	18.08	11.07	10.39	10.2857	0	10.46	10.0	10.03	11.85	11.60	10.46	10.35	10.17	143.67		

Figure 1. The Distribution of Cohesion in the Students' Discourse

Table 2

The Proportion of Cohesion in Students' Discourse
 (N = 28)

Text Number	Type of Cohesion															
	PR	DR	CR	NS	VS	CS	NE	VE	CE	AC	AVC	CC	TC	OC	LR	LC
1	24.69%	8.64%	2.46%				2.46%			1.23%	1.23%	1.23%				59.06%
2	22.73%	9.09%	2.27%							3.41%	3.41%					60.22%
3	39.67%	12.24%								3.06%						50.00%
4	22.89%	10.87%								1.02%		2.17%		1.02%		63.04%
5	12.50%	4.54%	1.14%				1.14%	1.14%				1.14%				98.41%
6	24.53%	16.98%								3.77%						54.32%
7	11.24%	6.74%		6.74%			2.25%			1.12%		1.12%				58.53%
8	34.04%		1.12%	2.13%	1.12%					3.19%	1.06%					55.32%
9	25.88%	12.94%	1.06%		3.19%					1.10%	5.88%		1.17%			51.77%
10	10.75%	11.83%	1.17%							4.30%		1.75%				67.74%
11	10.71%	5.35%	1.75%	1.78%	0.00%		1.75%						1.78%			75.00%
12	20.75%	13.21%			1.88%		0.94%	0.94%		5.36%	1.86%					53.77%
13	66.67%	2.08%				2.08%				5.66%	4.17%	2.08%				22.72%
14	41.77%						1.26%			2.08%	6.33%		2.53%			44.30%
15	44.66%		2.91%				0.77%			3.80%	2.91%		0.97%			43.69%
16	7.29%	14.58%					2.08%			1.41%	5.21%	4.17%		1.04%		63.54%
17	16.71%	25.00%								2.08%	3.57%		1.78%	1.78%		46.43%
18	14.28%	11.11%								5.36%	1.59%		1.59%			68.25%
19	11.59%	13.04%	2.89%				4.35%			3.59%	4.35%					62.32%
20	12.50%	28.12%								1.45%						90.63%
21	25.39%	14.29%	1.56%	1.58%							1.58%					55.56%
22	8.43%	18.07%						71.08%					2.41%			71.08%
23	28.07%	15.78%	12.30%							2.51%						40.35%
24	19.23%	3.85%								5.77%						71.15%
25	20.92%	18.07%								1.20%		1.20%				45.78%
26	26.08%	24.64%	1.45%	1.45%						1.45%	1.45%		1.80%			43.47%
27	30.11%	5.45%								2.72%	0.91%	0.91%	1.61%			53.63%
28	37.06%	6.45%			1.61%					1.61%	8.06%					48.55%
TOTAL	673.1012%	312.962%	32.102%	13.682%	9.892%	17.092%	2.082%	1.192%	68.152%	53.592%	15.772%	15.642%	8.752%	522.632%		
AVERAGE	24.042%	11.182%	1.152%	0.492%	0.352%	0.612%	0.072%	0.042%	2.432%	1.912%	0.562%	0.562%	0.242%	57.952%		

Figure 2. The Proportion of Cohesion in Students' Discourse.

Notes:
 Number of Texts under analysis
 PR: Pronominal Reference
 DR: Demonstrative Reference
 CR: Comparative Reference
 NS: Nominal Substitution



VS: Verbal Substitution
CS: Clausal Substitution
NE: Nominal Ellipsis
VE: Verbal Ellipsis
CE: Clausal Ellipsis
AC: Additive Conjunction
AVC: Adversative Conjunction
TC: Temporal Conjunction
LR: Lexical Reiteration
LC: Lexical Collocation

a. Types of Cohesion Found

As shown in Figure 1, the data maintain that fourteen of the sixteen types of cohesion described by Halliday and Hasan (1980) occur in the students' compositions. The fourteen types are as follows:

- 1) Pronominal Reference (PR);
- 2) Demonstrative Reference (DR);
- 3) Comparative Reference (CR);
- 4) Nominal Substitution (NS);
- 5) Verbal Substitution (VS);
- 6) Nominal Ellipsis (NE);
- 7) Verbal Ellipsis (VE);
- 8) Clausal Ellipsis (CE);
- 9) Additive Conjunction (AC);
- 10) Adversative Conjunction (AvC);
- 11) Causal Conjunction (CC);
- 12) Temporal Conjunction (TC);
- 13) Other Continuative Conjunction (OC); and
- 14) Lexical Reiteration (LR).

Two types of cohesion that are not found in the students' compositions include Clausal Substitution (CS) and Lexical Collocation (LC).

b. Cohesion Variation

In more details, the evidences reveal the variation of cohesion found in the students' discourse. The evidences maintain that the cohesion variation the students use in their compositions involves three to nine types of cohesion. In other words, the simplest variation of cohesion in the student's compositions is composed of three types of cohesion and the most complex variation is composed of nine types. The variation of cohesion found is described as follows:

1) Three-type variation

The variation of cohesion composed of three types is found in one of twenty-eight (3.57%) of the compositions under analysis. The variation occurs in text 20 and is composed of PR, DR, and LR.

2) Four-type variation

The variation composed of four types occurs in two of twenty-eight (7.14%) of the compositions under analysis. However, the members of the variation are partly different from one to the other composition. As a matter of fact, the variation involves as follows:

- PR, DR, CC, LR as found in text 6;
- PR, DR, TC, LR as found in text 22.

3) Five-type variation

The variation composed of five types of cohesion occurs in four of twenty-eight (14.29%) of the compositions under analysis. The variation involves;

- PR, DR, LR as found in text 3;
- PR, DR, CC, LR in text 4;
- PR, DR, CR, AC, LR in text 23; and
- PR, DR, AvC, CC, LR in text 24.

4) Six- Type variation

The variation composed of six types occurs in six of twenty-eight (25%) of compositions under analysis. The variation involves:

- PR, DR, CR, AC, AvC, LR as found in text 2;
- PR, DR, CR, NE, CC, LR in text 5;
- PR, DR, CR, AC, AvC, TC, LR in text 9;
- PR, DR, CR, AC, CC, LR in text 10;
- PR, NE, AC, AvC, TC, LR in text 15;
- PR, DR, CR, NS, AvC, LR in text 21; and
- PR, DR, AC, AvC, TC, LR in text 24.

5) Seven-type variation

The variation of cohesion composed of seven types occurs in nine of twenty-eight (32.14%) of the compositions under analysis. This variation involves:

- PR, CR, NS, VS, AC, AvC, LR as found in text 8;
- PR, CR, AC, AvC, TC, OC, LR in text 11;
- PR, DR, AC, AvC, TC, OC, LR in text 17;
- PR, DR, CR, AC, AvC, TC, LR in text 18;
- PR, DR, CR, NE, AC, AvC, LR in text 19;
- PR, DR, CR, NS, AC, AvC, LR in text 26;
- PR, DR, VS, AC, AvC, TC, LR in text 28;
- PR, DR, NS, NE, AC, TC, LR in text 12; and
- PR, DR, AC, AvC, TC, OC, LR in text 15.

6) Eight-type variation

This variation occurs in four of twenty-eight (14.29%) of the compositions under analysis. This variation involves:

- PR, DR, CR, NE, AC, AvC, CC, LR as found in text 1;
- PR, DR, VS, NE, AC, AvC, OC, LR in text 13;
- PR, DR, NE, AC, AvC, CC, OC, LR in text 16; and
- PR, DR, CR, AC, AvC, CC, TC, LR in text 27;

7) Nine-type variation



This variation occurs only in one of twenty-eight (3.57%) of the compositions analysed. This occurs in text 7 and involves PR, DR, CR, NS, VS, NE, AC, CC, and LR. The description above displays two important points:

First, the cohesion variation in the students' discourse involves three to nine types of cohesion in their written descriptive discourse; second, the cohesion variation in each composition under analysis is different from one to another, but two particular types of cohesion, that is, PR and LR, exhibit in any variation.

The analysis of cohesion also reveals the average proportion of types of cohesion in the students' discourse. This maintains that some particular types are found in very large numbers, some are in small numbers, and some in very small numbers. From the largest to the least, the proportion of each type of cohesion is exposed completely on the list of The Average Proportion of Cohesion in Students' Discourse as follows:

The Average Proportion of Cohesion in Students' Discourse

1) Lexical Reiteration	57.95%
2) Pronominal Reference	24.04%
3) Demonstrative Reference	11.18%
4) Additive Conjunction	2.43%
5) Adversative Conjunction	1.91%
6) Comparative Reference	1.15%
7) Nominal Ellipsis	0.61%
8) Causal Conjunction	0.56%
9) Temporal Conjunction	0.56%
10) Nominal Substitution	0.49%
11) Verbal Substitution	0.35%
12) Other Continuative Conjunction	0.24%

The list above displays that Lexical Reiteration exhibits the largest proportion. Pronominal Reference and Demonstrative, though much less than Lexical Reiteration, exhibit large proportion, whereas the other types exhibit small proportion. In other words, Lexical Reiteration, Pronominal Reference, and Demonstrative Reference appear the common types of cohesion to the students.

c. Problems of Cohesion

Another point described from the analysis of cohesion is the problem the students encounter in using cohesion. The analysis reveals that the students encounter some various problems in using cohesion. Some of the problems investigated are reported in the following section.

Pronominal Reference (PR)

PR is one type of cohesion that occurs in all compositions, though, in a relatively small number. As displayed in Figure 2, the proportion of PR in each composition ranges from 7.29% (text 16) to 44.66% (text 11) of all cohesion identified. The average proportion in all compositions is 24.04%. This implies that all of the students under the study are familiar with this type of cohesion. In spite of their familiarity, they still encounter difficulties in using the cohesion. The examination of their discourse provides evidences that they still make some errors in an attempt to use the cohesion. Some examples of the errors in the use of PR are presented below. Examples:

- 1) ... (9) *Usually, people go there on holiday or vacation.* (10) *On that day we can find visitors from other villages.* (text 22).

In an endeavor to use PR 'we' in (10), the writer uses an inconsistent form of PR. When this PR refers to 'people' in (9), he should use 'they' instead of 'we'.

- 2) ... (12) *Other things that most interest me are some beautiful butterflies with colony Rings, fly to and from the river. (13) It seems like some beautiful flowers which are flown by the Rind. (14) From ...* (text 20).

This text contains an error in the use of PR. In (13) the use of PR 'It' presents confusion because there are no preceding elements to which 'It' may refer. What the writer intends to use may be the PR referring to 'some butterflies' Thus, the appropriate PR he should use is 'They'.

- 3) ... (7) *There is a river. (8) The river has a cold water. (9) It's make me very miss to enjoy there ...* (text 25).

An error of PR in this text is the use of 'It's' in (9). This reflects inability in choosing the right form of pronoun functioning as the subject. Instead of 'It's' the writer should use 'It'.

Demonstrative Reference (DR)

As shown in Figure 1 and 2, this type of cohesion occurs in 21 of the 28 compositions under analysis. This implies that most of the students are familiar with the use of DR in producing written discourse. In the compositions under analysis, DR constitutes 0 % (texts 3; 4; 6; 12; 13; 14; 15; 16; 24; 25; 27; and 28) to 28. 12% (text 20) of all cohesion. The average proportion of DR in the student's compositions under analysis is 11. 18%. In the compositions constituted by DR, some errors are investigated. The examples of errors in the use of DR are presented below.

Examples:

... (4) *The place is covered by some trees that make the weather at that place fresh and enjoyable for the visitors. (5) Waterfall is falling its cold water from a top of a big stone to the bottom of the river. (6) The water ...* (text 20).

Demonstratives 'the' in (4) and (5) as underlined are not necessary because the writer has not yet mentioned the preceding nouns 'visitors' and 'river' in the preceding sentences. The presence of these demonstrative references in these contexts will only lead the readers to quest which visitors and which river the writer means. Thus, to avoid this, the references should be omitted.

Comparative References (CR)

CR occurs in a small number (1.15% of the whole cohesion) in 12 of the 28 compositions or in 42.85% of the compositions under analysis. This may indicate that the students are not familiar yet with this type of cohesion. Moreover, an error in the use of CR is found as presented below.

... (16) *Bissappu is surrounded by hill with green trees in Every edge. (17) That is still other reason of mine why I like to visit the place ...* (text 8).

The use of comparative reference 'other' in (17) leads the reader to find the reason mentioned before. As a matter of fact, the writer has not described it. Thus, the use of this reference here is not necessary.

Nominal Substitution (NS)

This type of cohesion occurs in a very small number (0.49% of the total cohesion) in 5 of the 28 (17.85%) of the compositions under analysis. Such a condition may imply that most of the students are not familiar with the use of nominal substitution.

Verbal Substitution (VS)

Like nominal substitution, this type of cohesion also occurs even in a smaller number (0.35% of the total cohesion). It also occurs in only 17.85% of the compositions under analysis. Most of the students may be unfamiliar with the use of VS.

Clausal Substitution

This is one of the two types of cohesion that do not occur at all in the compositions under analysis. The fact may indicate that the students are not familiar with this type of cohesion.

Nominal Ellipsis (NE)

NE also occurs in a very small number (0.61%). It occurs in 32.14% of the compositions under analysis. Therefore, we may interpret that most of the students are not familiar with NE.

Verbal Ellipsis (VE)

VE occurs in even much smaller number (0.07 X of the total cohesion). It occurs only in 7% of the compositions under analysis. As such, we may interpret that the students are not familiar with the use of VE.

Clausal Ellipsis (CE)

CE only occurs once (0.04% of the total cohesion) in the compositions under analysis. Thus, it occurs only in 3.57% of the compositions. This implies that the students are not familiar with this type of cohesion.

Additive Conjunction (AC)

This type of cohesion occurs in a small number but in most of the compositions under analysis. The proportion of AC is 2.43% of the total cohesion. AC occurs in 78.57% of the compositions. This implies that most of the students are familiar with the use of AC in their written discourse.

Adversative Conjunctions (AC)

This type of conjunction cohesion occurs in a small number in most of the compositions. The proportion of AC is 1.91% of the total cohesion and it occurs in 75% of the compositions under analysis. This also implies that most of the students are familiar with this type of cohesion.

Causal Conjunction (CC)

CC occurs in a small number in only a few compositions under analysis. The proportion of CC is only 0.56%. It occurs in 32.14% of the compositions. We can interpret that some of the students are familiar with CC but most of them are not yet.

Temporal Conjunction (TC)

TC is almost the same as CC. It occurs in a small number. The proportion of TC is also 0.59% and it occurs in 35.71% of the compositions. Thus, like CC, TC may only be acquired by some of the students but not by most of them.

Other Conjunction (OC)

OC only occurs in a very small number in a few compositions. The proportion of OC is only 0.24% and it occurs only in 14.28% of the student's compositions. As such, we may interpret that only a few students are familiar with the use of this type of cohesion.

Lexical Reiteration (LR)

The largest proportion of the types of cohesion in the students' compositions is the proportion of LR. This type of cohesion is spread in large numbers in every composition under analysis. It is seen in Figure 1 that LR constitutes dominantly in every composition. The range of the proportion of LR in the students' compositions is 22.72%. 63% of the total cohesion in every composition. The average proportion is 57.28%. Thus, we may say that this type of cohesion is very common to the students. In spite of the familiarity with the use

of LR, the students seem to have some problems in it. Some errors in the use of LR are found in their compositions. An example of the errors is presented below.

Example:

... (23) *The water is quite calm.* (24) *But, sometimes people find a dead person drift in the water.* (25) *People considered that he sank ...* (text 26).

Here, the three sentences are cohesively related each other by lexical reiteration. ‘water’ in (23) relates to ‘water’ in (24). ‘People’ in (24) relates to ‘people’ in (25); and ‘drift’ in (24) relates to ‘sank’ in (25). The last lexical reiteration, however, is an ungrammatical form. Instead of ‘sank’ the writer should use ‘be sunk’.

Lexical Collocation (LC)

LC in the other type that does not occur at all in the compositions under analysis. The students may be unfamiliar with the use of this type of cohesion in their discourse.

4.2. Frequency of Occurrence

The second question formulated in introduction concerns with the frequency of occurrence of cohesion in the students’ discourse. As described in research method, the frequency of occurrence of cohesion refers to the occurrence of cohesion in each T -unit. Data analysis to provide evidences to the question yields findings expressed in a Figure 3. The findings maintain that the frequency of occurrence of each type of cohesion is different from one to another. Lexical reiteration occurs much more frequently than the others. It occurs 1.99 times per T -Unit. Pronominal reference is the second frequent type. It occurs 0.55 times per T -Unit; and demonstrative reference is the third. It occurs 0.36 time per T -Unit. The other types occur very rarely. From the most frequent to the least, all of the types of cohesion in the students’ compositions are ordered as displayed in the Figure 3.

Table 3
The Frequency of Cohesion in Students’ Discourse
(N = 28)

Text Number	Number of																			
	Cohesion	T Unit	F COH	F PR	F DR	F CR	F NS	F US	F CS	F NE	F VE	F CE	F AC	F RC	F CC	F TC	F OC	F LR	F LC	
1	81	27	3	0.74	0.30	0.07					0.02									
2	89	25	3.52	0.80	0.32	0.08								0.40	0.04	0.04				1.74
3	98	25	3.92	1.32	0.48									0.11	0.11					2.12
4	92	21	4.38	1.00	0.48									0.12				0.04		1.96
5	88	27	3.26	0.41	0.15	0.04					0.04	0.04		0.05		0.10				2.76
6	53	18	2.94	0.70	0.50									0.11		0.04				2.52
7	89	22	4.05	0.45	0.27	0.05					0.09			0.05						1.61
8	94	25	3.76	1.28	0.04	0.04	0.45	0.27						0.11		0.04				2.77
9	85	26	3.27	0.28	0.42	0.04								0.12	0.04	0.05				2.08
10	93	23	4.04	0.85	0.48	0.04								0.05			0.04			1.69
11	103	23	4.48	0.43	0.13						0.04			0.17						2.74
12	56	12	3.73	0.20	0.20						0.04			0.09	0.13	0.04		0.04		2
13	106	30	3.53	0.40	0.47		0.07							0.20	0.07		0.07	0.03		2.8
14	49	22	2.18	0.50	0.05						0.03	0.03		0.20	0.07			0.04		1.9
15	79	15	4.16								0.05			0.05	0.05	0.05				0.45
16	96	31	4.57	0.45	0.45						0.07			0.20	0.33		0.13			2.33
17	56	25	2.24	0.56	0.56						0.06			0.06	0.16	0.13				1.97
18	63	19	3.32	0.37	0.37	0.05								0.12	0.08		0.04			1.04
19	69	18	3.83	0.50	0.50	0.11								0.05	0.05		0.05			2.26
20	32	18	1.78	0.50	0.50						0.17			0.06	0.17					2.39
21	63	17	3.71	0.53	0.53	0.06	0.06								0.06					1.61
22	83	25	3.32	0.60	0.60												0.08			2.36
23	57	20	2.85	0.45	0.45	0.35								0.10						1.15
24	53	15	3.53	0.20	0.20		0.04								0.27	0.07				2.6
25	83	19	4.37	0.79	0.79									0.21	0.05		0.05			2.06
26	69	24	2.88	0.71	0.71	0.04								0.13	0.04					1.25
27	110	24	4.58	0.25	0.25												0.08			2.46
28	62	23	2.7	0.17	0.17						0.04			0.04	0.22		0.04			1.17
Total	2231	830	9.77	15.4	10.20	1.10	0.70	1.18			0.54	0.07	0.04	2.68	2.14	0.52	0.58	0.15		55.79
Average	79.68	29.64	3.50	0.55	0.36	0.04	0.03	0.04			0.02	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.08	0.02	0.02	0.01		1.99

Figure 3. The Frequency of Cohesion in the Students’ Discourse

Besides that, the findings maintain that the average frequency of in all compositions under analysis is 3.50. This means that in general, cohesion in the students’ discourse occurs 3.50 times in each T -Unit.

Types of Cohesion	Frequency of Occurrence
Lexical Reiteration	1.99
Pronominal Reference	0.55
Demonstrative Reference	0.36
Additive Conjunction	0.10
Adversative Conjunction	0.08
Comparative Reference	0.04
Nominal Substitution	0.04
Verbal Substitution	0.03
Causal Conjunction	0.02
Nominal Ellipsis	0.02
Temporal Conjunction	0.02
Other Continuative Conjunction	0.01
Ellipsis	0.00
Clausal Ellipsis	0.00

4.3. Cohesive Harmony

The third question concerns with the states of cohesive harmony of the students' discourse. Data analysis to provide evidences to the question is displayed in Figure 4 on the following page. The evidences maintain that the ratio of central tokens (CT) to the total tokens (TT) expressing the degree of cohesive harmony of the students' discourse ranges from 0.20 to 0.63. The ratio of more than 0.50 occurs only in 6 of the 28 (21.43%) compositions under analysis. Thus, most of the compositions (78.57%) have lower degree than the lowest

degree for a coherent text. And, the average degree of cohesive harmony of the student's compositions is only 0.40 or lower than the degree required for a coherent text. In appendices, an example of cohesive harmony analysis is presented.

Table 4
Cohesive Harmony (CH) in Students' Discourse

Text Nbr	TT	RT	CT	CH(CT:TT)
1	117	80	48	0.39
2	103	94	44	0.45
3	105	85	58	0.55
4	104	87	46	0.44
5	85	51	25	0.29
6	80	52	19	0.37
7	99	82	37	0.37
8	134	111	63	0.47
9	111	92	51	0.46
10	120	104	32	0.27
11	160	123	88	0.55
12	85	43	18	0.20
13	108	79	36	0.32
14	85	52	17	0.20
15	74	53	47	0.63
16	91	70	34	0.37
17	71	55	25	0.35
18	90	80	36	0.40
19	74	55	23	0.30
20	83	52	17	0.20
21	72	62	21	0.29
22	110	82	46	0.41
23	68	54	31	0.45
24	86	71	35	0.37
25	71	47	20	0.28
26	95	67	33	0.37
27	101	80	41	0.41
28	77	58	31	0.40
TOTAL				11.25
Average				0.40

Notes:
 N = Number of texts under analysis
 TT = Total Tokens
 RT = Relevant Tokens
 CT = Central Tokens
 CH(CT:TT) = Cohesive Harmony, obtained from CT:TT

Figure 4. Cohesive Harmony (CH) in Students' Discourse.

4.4. Discussions

The findings have been described. In this chapter, discussions of the findings are presented. The purpose of the Discussion presentation is to provide the answers to the problems discussed and relate the findings of the present study to the findings of the previous studies of cohesion. In an attempt to meet the purpose, the discussion includes the brief representation of some points: (a) the problems discussed, (b) the answers to the problems, (c) the inter pretention of the findings, and (d) the comparison of the findings of the present study to those of the previous studies.

a. Problems Discussed

It has been stated in chapter I that there are three problems of cohesion discussed in the present study. The first concerns with what types of cohesion occur in descriptive discourse written by the sixth semester students of the English Department of FPBS I KIP Ujung Pandang, the second concerns with the frequency of cohesion, and the third concerns with the degree of cohesive harmony.

b. Answers to the Problems

1). Types of Cohesion (Problem 1)

In an attempt to solve the first problem, a cohesion analysis has been conducted to the twenty-eight pieces of descriptive compositions written by the sixth semester students of the English Department of FPBS I KIP Ujung Pandang. Like some other previous studies, such as Connor (1984), Neuner (1987), and Khalil (1989), the analysis of cohesion was conducted in reference to Halliday and Hasan (1980). The findings, then, maintain that fourteen of the sixteen types of cohesion described by Halliday and Hasan (1980) occur in the students' discourse. The fourteen types include pronominal Reference (PR.), Demonstrative Reference (DR), Comparative Reference (CR), Nominal Substitution (NS), Verbal Substitution (VS), Nominal Ellipsis (NE), Verbal Ellipsis (VE), Clausal Ellipsis (CE), Additive Conjunction (AC), Adversative Conjunction (AvC), Causal Conjunction (CC), Other Continuative Conjunction (DC), and Lexical Reiteration (LB.). Two other types absent from the students' discourse are Clausal Substitution (CS) and Lexical Collocation (LC)

Of the fourteen types, the students use three to nine types of cohesion in their compositions. But, most of them use six to seven types. The proportion of the students who use six types of cohesion is 25% and those who use seven types is 32.14%

Another interesting finding of cohesion maintains that some particular types of cohesion seem to be very common to the students. Lexical Reiteration, for instance, occurs in a large number in all of the students' compositions under analysis. As exposed in Figure 1 and Figure 2, the proportion of this type of cohesion in the compositions ranges from 22.72% to 90.63%. And, its average proportion is found 57.95%

The other types that seem to be common to the students are Pronominal Reference and Demonstrative Reference. Pronominal Reference also occurs in all compositions under analysis, although, in a smaller number. The proportion of Pronominal Reference ranges from 7.29% to 37.08%, and its average proportion is 24.04%. Demonstrative Reference, in addition, occurs in almost all (85, 71%) of the compositions under analysis. Its proportion ranges from 0% to 28.12% and its average proportion is 11. of the whole cohesion.

Based on the findings mentioned above, the first problem can be solved. The answer to the problem maintains that the types of cohesion that the students use in their descriptive discourse include fourteen types described above. But, of the fourteen types, most of the students use only six to seven types. Three types are, then, found to be common to the students. The three types are Lexical Reiteration, Pronominal Reference, and Demonstrative Reference. The other types, on the other hand, are not very common to the students.

An additional answer to the first problem maintains that the students still encounter some problems in even using the common types of cohesion. As exemplified in chapter IV, for instance, the students still use inappropriate forms of personal references leading to ambiguity; use unnecessary demonstrative reference of definite article 'the' and overuse lexical reiteration instead of using ellipsis or substitution

2). Frequency of Occurrence (Problem 2)

The second problem discussed in the present study concerns with the frequency of occurrence. The problem is answered through the same cohesion analysis. Following Eiler (1983) and Khalil (1989), the frequency of occurrence is obtained using the formula described in chapter III. The analysis yields a finding expressing some points. First, the frequency of cohesion in general is 3.5. It means that cohesion occurs 3.5 times in each T-unit. Second, the frequency of each type of cohesion is different from one to another. A particular type, that is Lexical Reiteration, occurs very frequently. It occurs 1.99 times in each T-unit. Some other types, Pronominal Reference and Demonstrative Reference, occur frequently. Pronominal Reference occurs 0.55 time, whereas Demonstrative Reference occurs 0.36 time in each T unit. Some others occur rarely, not more than 0.1 time in each T-unit.

3). Cohesive Harmony (Problem 3)

The third problem concerns with the degree of cohesive harmony of the students' discourse. The problem is solved following the analysis of cohesive harmony suggested by Ruqaiya Hasan (1984; 1989). Based on the findings, the answer to the problem is stated as follows: first, the degree of cohesive harmony of the students' discourse ranges from 0.20 to 0.63 and the average degree of cohesive harmony is 0.40; and second, the proportion of the composition with the degree of cohesive harmony of more than 0.50 is 21.43% of the compositions under analysis. The rest (78.57%) have less than 0.50 degree of cohesive harmony.

c. Interpretation

Based on the answers to problems discussed, some interpretation can be described. The interpretation of each answer is, therefore, presented one by one in the following section.

Language performance can be used to measure language ability. The language performance of language learners is a clear indication of their language ability. In relation to this, the fact that most of the students use only six to seven types of cohesion may imply that most of them have been familiar with the use of six to seven types of cohesion.

Of the six to seven types of cohesion they have been familiar with, it seems that there are only three types that most of the students have been familiar with. The three types are Lexical Reiteration; Pronominal Reference; and Demonstrative Reference. The first two are found in all of the students' compositions; whereas the third is found in most of the compositions.

Despite the students' familiarity with the three types of cohesion, however, they still encounter problems in using the types of cohesion. Consequently, it is not wise to say that the students have no more difficulties in using the three types of cohesion although they have been familiar with them.

The rare use or even the absence of the other types of cohesion (Comparative Reference, Nominal Substitution, Verbal Substitution, Clausal Substitution, Nominal Ellipsis, Verbal Ellipsis, Clausal Ellipsis, Additive Conjunction, Adversative Conjunction, Causal Conjunction, Other Continuative Conjunction, Temporal Conjunction, and lexical Collocation) may indicate, at least, two possibilities. First, it may indicate that the students have not been familiar with them. Due to their limited knowledge about these types of cohesion, they did not use them in their compositions. Second, it may indicate that the students do not necessarily use the types of cohesion in their compositions. This is due to

the fact that the topic of the assigned discourse may account for variation in types of cohesion (Tierney and Mosenthal, 1981). Thus, to search for which possibility is true, an evaluation essay to conduct.

The frequency of occurrence of cohesion in the students discourse as found in the present study may reveal the characteristics of cohesion in English learners' discourse. The high frequent occurrence of Lexical Reiteration, for instance, is typical in learners' discourse. Learners' discourse seems to be typically constituted mostly by Lexical Reiteration

The high frequency of the use of Lexical Reiteration in learners' discourse is probably due to the characteristics of Lexical Reiteration itself. This type of cohesion seems too broad. As mentioned earlier in chapter II, the classification of cohesion suggested by Halliday and Hasan (1980) maintains that Lexical Reiteration includes the relationships of a lexical item to its repetitions, synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms, and metonyms; or even the relationships of a particular lexical item to another lexical item of the same class. Thus, this type of cohesion can be indeed classified into some subtypes. In other words, Halliday and Hasan's classification of cohesion as used in the analysis of cohesion in the present study can be revised, especially in the case of Lexical Reiteration. Lexical Reiteration would be better sub classified into the relations of synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms, metonyms, or the relation of a lexical item to another belonging to the same class.

The states of the cohesive harmony indicate how well the cohesion in the students' discourse serves its function as the foundation of coherence. According to Hasan (1984), the degree of cohesive harmony of a coherent text should not be lower than 0.50. Thus, the average degree of cohesive harmony 0.40 as exhibited in the students' discourse can be interpreted that, in general, the cohesion of the students' discourse does not serve well enough as the foundation of coherence. This may reflect that the students in general do not stay long enough on the similar things they are on about. They describe some different points that are not related to each other. As a result, too many tokens or lexical items do not enter in either identity chains or similarity chains.

Referring to the evidences that the proportion of the students' compositions with degree of cohesive harmony lower than 0.50 is 78.57%, we may interpret that most of the students under the study cannot yet operate cohesion well. On the contrary, there are a small number of the students that operate the cohesion well in their discourse.

d. Comparison to other Studies

A scientific study is always conducted with some limitations. The present study, for instance, is limited to several aspects. It is limited in its subjects, in its problems discussed, and in its source of data. The subjects of the present study only include small number of English learners at a particular institute of education, that is, 28 sixth semester students of the English Department of FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang. The problems discussed cover only three aspects of the states of cohesion: the types of cohesion, the frequency of occurrence of cohesion, and the cohesive harmony. And, the source of data includes only 28 pieces of descriptive compositions.

Due to the limitations, the findings of a particular study cannot be absolutely true. To understand the truth, therefore, the findings of a particular study is necessary to be compared to the findings of other similar studies. To meet the necessity, a comparison is presented in the following section.

5. Conclusions

From the findings of the present study, some conclusions can be drawn. The conclusions cover several points.

First, since the students use three to nine types of cohesion in their discourse, they may have been familiar only with those restricted types of cohesion. Even, most of the students are only familiar with five to seven types of cohesion as most of them use five to seven type

variation of cohesion. The types that all of the students have been familiar with include three: Lexical Reiteration, Pronominal Reference, and Demonstrative Reference. On the contrary, the students have not been familiar with the other types, two types that the students are not familiar with at all are Clausal Substitution and Lexical Collocation.

Second, it seems typical that Lexical Reiteration exhibits the most frequent type of cohesion in the student's discourse. This conclusion is drawn from the facts that this type of cohesion occurs very frequently in every student's discourse.

Third, cohesion in the students' discourse do not function well as the foundation of coherence. This conclusion is drawn from the degree of cohesive harmony of the students' discourse. As mentioned before, the degree of cohesive harmony of the students' discourse is low. The low degree of cohesive harmony expresses that the cohesion of the discourse does not function well as the foundation of coherence. It reflects that, in general, the students do not stay long enough on the similar things they are on about.

References

- Azis, Y. Y. (1986). *Textual Cohesion in Written Arabic*. Adab Al Muntasyiria.
- Best, J. W. (1981). *Research in Education*. Englewood Cliffs: Little-Hall, Inc.
- Breereton, J. C. (1982). *A Plan for Writing*. New York: Holt, Remehart and Winston.
- Brown, G., and Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carrel, P. L. (1984). Cohesion is not Coherence. *TESOL Quarterly* 18, 479-488.
- Cherry, R., and Cooper, C. (1980). Cohesive Ties and Discourse Structure: A Study of Average and Superior Texts at Four Grade Levels. Unpublished Manuscript. Department of Learning Instruction. State University at Buffalo.
- Connor, U. (1984). A Study of Cohesion and Coherence in English as a Second Language Students' Writing. Papers in Linguistics: *International Journal of Human Communication* 17, 301-318.
- Crowhurst, M. (1981). Cohesion in Argumentative Prose. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA.
- De Beugrande, R. (1980). *Text Discourse and Process*. Noor-wood: Ablex.
- FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang. (1981). Silabi Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang. FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang.
- Halliday, A. K., and Hasan, R. (1980). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman Inc.
- Johns, A. M. (1986). Coherence and Academic Writing: Some Definitions and Suggestions. *TESOL Quarterly* 20, 247-265.
- Johnson, P. (1982). Cohesion and Coherence in Compositions in Malay and English. *RELC Journal* Vol. 23 Number 2 p. 1-17.
- Khalil, A. (1989). A Study of Cohesion and Coherence in Arab EFL College Students' Writing. *SYSTEM* 17, No. 3, 359-371.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leggett, G., et al. (1982). *Handbook for Writing*. Englewood Cliffs. New York: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Moore, G. W. (1983). *Developing and Evaluating Educational Research*. Boston, Toronto: Little, Brown Company.
- Neuner, J. L. (1987). Cohesive Ties and Chains in Good and Poor Freshman Essays. *Research in the Teaching of English* 21, p. 92-105.
- Ommagio, A. (1986). *Language Teaching in Context*. New York: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Oshima, A., and Hague, A. (1983). *Writing Academic English*. California: Addison-Wesley.

- Pangaribuan, T. (1988). Hubungan antara Pengenalan Kohesi dan Koherensi dengan Kemampuan Membaca pemahaman oleh Pembelajar Bahasa Inggris. Thesis. FPS IKIP Malang.
- Richards, J. C. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language teaching: A Description and Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Samsuri. (1988). Analisis Wacana. Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Pasca Sarjana. Proyek Peningkatan/ Pengembangan Perguruan Tinggi. IKIP Malang.
- Sax, G. (1979). *Foundations of Educational Research*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Sutama, I. M. (1981). Pengaruh Pengetahuan Topik dan Penguasaan Kohesi terhadap Kemampuan Mengkoherenkan Paragraf. Thesis. IKIP Malang.
- Tierney, R. J., and Mosenthal, J. H. (1981). The Cohesion Concepts Relationship to the Coherence of Text. Technical Report No. 221. Illinois: University of Illinois.
- Van Dijk, T. (1977). *Text and Context*. London: Longman.
- Wahab, A. (1991). *Isu Linguistik Pengajaran Bahasa dan Sastra*. Surabaya: Airlangga University Press.
- Witte, S. P., and Faigley, L. (1984). Cohesion, Coherence, and Writing Quality.
- Graves, R. L. (1984). *Rhetoric and Composition*. New Jersey: Boynton/ Cook Publishers Inc.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1980). *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.