

COHESION AND COHERENCE OF SPOKEN TEXT IN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL ELECTRONIC BOOK

Adip Arifin

STKIP PGRI Ponorogo

adiparifin@yahoo.com

Abstrak: Salah satu tujuan pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris di sekolah menengah atas adalah untuk mengembangkan/meningkatkan kompetensi siswa dalam berkomunikasi, baik secara lisan maupun tulis. Salah satu cara yang dapat dilakukan oleh guru dalam upaya peningkatan kompetensi tersebut adalah pembelajaran melalui teks. Namun, tidak semua teks yang ada di buku teks sekolah mengandung unsur koherensi dan kohesi, sebagai unsure pembentuk teks yang baik. Studi ini bertujuan untuk mencari tahu unsur kohesi dan koherensi dalam teks lisan, (i) bagaimana teks disusun, (ii) bagaimana negoisasi makna terjadi untuk menjaga percakapan agar tetap berjalan, dan (iii) apa saja fitur kebahasaan yang melekat pada teks? Obyek studi ini merupakan teks percakapan yang diambil dari buku buku teks SMA kelas 11. Analisis data menggunakan teori Thornburry (2005) meliputi kohesi, koherensi (makro dan mikro), dan fitur kebahasaan. Temuan studi ini menunjukkan bahwa (i) tekster struktur secara dinamis, karena terdiri dari satu topic pembicaraan, (ii) penutur lebih mengedepankan negosiasi aspek logicosemantik, daripada interpersonal, dan (iii) fitur kebahasaan yang muncul pada text ditandai oleh empat hal, spontanitas, interaksi, interpersonalitas dan coherensi.

Kata kunci: Koherensi, Kohesi, Teks Lisan

Abstract: One of the English teaching aims in senior high school is to develop the students' competence in communicating both oral and written language to solve their daily problems. One of the ways to develop it is through texts. But not all the included texts in the senior high school book display the coherence and cohesion aspect, as the important requirements of a good text. This study is aimed to find out the cohesion and coherence of the spoken text, including; (i) how the text is structured?, (ii) how negotiations are carried out to keep conversation going?, and (iii), what spoken language features characterize the text? The object of the study was the conversation text, taken from Senior High School electronic book, for students XI, 2008. The data analysis used in this study is based on the Thornburry's theory of analyzing spoken text (2005), involves cohesion, coherence (macro and micro), and linguistic features of spoken text. The findings showed that (i) in terms of text structure, it has dynamic structure because the speakers discuss more than one topic. The speakers also perform interactive staging during the conversation., (ii) the speakers negotiate most on logicosemantic aspect (4x), rather than interpersonal aspect (1x), and. (iii) the linguistic features which characterize the text are simply divided into four; spontaneity, interactivity, interpersonality and coherence.

Keyword: Coherence, Cohesion, Spoken Text

INTRODUCTION

In learning language, the study of text becomes very important, both in spoken and written. Why is it important? The appropriate answer could be, because we are producing text, both in written and spoken. Before moving further, it is better to define what the text is. According to Thornburry (2005: 7), the text is product of speakers or writers in communicative process which involves language. Widdowson (2007: 4) defined a text as an actual use of language, as distinct from a sentence which is an abstract unit of linguistic analysis. Anderson & Anderson (2003: 1) defined the text as the words that are put together to communicate a meaning. Adopted from those definitions above we may conclude that the text as an actual use of language in the form of spoken and written which carries specific purposes.

Based on its purposes, the texts are categorized into what so called as genre. Furthermore, genre differentiates the text types not only based on its purposes, but also implies to the different of linguistic features and the generic structure of each text. In short, each type of text has different characteristics, especially in terms of communicative purpose, linguistic features and its generic structure. Those differences can be easily identified in the most of written text types, such as narrative, recount, report, exposition, and so forth. But in terms of spoken style, those characteristics are more complicated to be identified rather than in written style. It is due to the spoken style has different linguistic features compared to the written style.

Text is not only the printed text, such as letter, newspaper, magazine, etc. text can be produced between speakers, between writer and (potential) readers (Martin and Rose, 2003). So, letter, magazine, speech, conversation can be said as text. This is supported by Celce-Murcia and Olsain (2000). They argue that text can be spoken and written. Both spoken and written language have different characteristics which can make them different. It can be seen in the speaking class and written class.

In fact, not all the texts can be classified into a good text. To be a good text there are criteria should be displayed within the text, such as cohesion and coherence. In terms of spoken text, the negotiation among the interlocutors becomes the important part which characterizes it. In this case, the analysis is focused on the text structure, negotiations, both in interpersonal and logicosemantic, linguistic features, and its cohesion.

In creating a text, there is a main problem faced by the speaker and writer. That is the lack of cohesion and coherence which has contribution substantially in the lower scores (Liu and Qi, 2007: 168). So that is why cohesion and coherence is important in creating a good text that can be spoken written. According to Povolna (2009: 94), both cohesion and coherence are important to know the quality of text, although they are not related to each other directly. This statement is supported by Widdowson (2007: 207) who declares that “one might derive a coherent discourse from a text with no cohesion in it at all. Equally, of course, textual cohesion provides no guarantee of discourse coherence”.

The definition of cohesion can be a formal link between sentences and between clauses that can make the text hang together. If the text hangs together and has a formal link, it will make the text has unity (Cook, 2001: 14). While according to Widdowson (2007: 45), cohesion is a link of the parts or elements of a text. In connecting each element, we need devices and it is called cohesive devices. Cohesive devices are important to note because by cohesive devices, the new content will be understood easily related to the content that has been explained before or after. Gerot and Wignel (1994:67) stated that cohesion can be seen in clause structure and clause complexes. So, in analyzing cohesion, we have to consider each clauses in the text. Cohesion can be grammatical and lexical cohesion (Halliday and Hasan, 1994). Grammatical cohesion is a link of each item from grammatical aspects and the lexical cohesion means that it is a link of items in the text from lexical aspects. There are several experts who divides cohesive devices in different classification. They classify cohesive devices into grammatical cohesion (reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction) and lexical cohesion (repetition, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, meronymy and collocation).

Cohesion can be said as the formal link while coherence can be said as the abstract one. Coherence cannot be identified in the same way like cohesion. Coherence is the mind of the writer and reader. So it is a mental phenomenon that makes it different with cohesion (Thompson, 1996). In this case, coherence is the capacity of a text to make sense. How does the text can make sense so it will make the text easy to be understood?

This study is aimed to find out the cohesion and coherence of the text, including; (i) how the text is structured?, ii) how negotiations are carried out to keep conversation going?, and (iii), what spoken language features characterize the text?

METHOD

The analysis used in this study is based on the Thornburry's theory of analyzing spoken text (2005: 63-83). The theory involves how to analyze the text in terms of cohesion, coherence, and linguistic features of spoken text. In terms of coherence, Thornburry suggests the two levels, micro and macro level of coherence. Conceptually, micro level of coherence includes theme and rheme, logical relation, nominalization, texture, rogue sentence, end-weight principle, active-passive construction and cleft sentence. While macro level of coherence includes topic, keyword, lexical chain, internal patterning, schema and script. The data of analysis is a spoken text taken from the senior high school electronic book (BSE) entitled "Interlanguage: English for Senior High School Studens XI" 2008, written by Priyanna, Riandi and Mumpuni.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this analysis are divided into three major parts, those are text structure, negotiations and linguistic features (*see appendices 1-6*). Firstly, this chapter discusses the findings on text structure. In terms of the text structure, the text has dynamic structure. It means that along the conversation, the speakers talk about more than one topic. .It can be seen from the linguistic evidences, in the beginning part of the conversation the speakers talk about the meeting with someone, but in the end of the conversation, they talk about the friendship (*see appendix 1*). The conversation is dominated by discussing Di's first meeting with someone, especially the chronological order of her meeting, started from that's how they met, and finally became friend. Based on the its structure, the text displays one of spoken text characteristics, that is dynamic structure.

Furthermore, the text also displays interactive staging among the speakers. It is indicated by a number of questions and answers along the conversation, but no question tag among the speakers. The speakers ask each other about the chosen topic during the conversation, such as;

Jessie : Had you seen a photo of him?

Di : Oh yeah, I had photos of him, photos...

In spoken language, this kind of interaction becomes one of its characteristics (*see appendix 1*). Actually, the interaction among the speakers shows that the conversation runs well. Even though the distribution of speaking is dominated by only one of them, that is Di, but the two of others, Jessie and Judy, also participate in the conversation. Actually, question and answer are functioned to build interactive staging between the speakers along the conversation.

In terms of open ended, the text doesn't display any open ended part. May be, it is happened because actually, the text is a part of the bigger conversation. So, the open ended part is explicitly unmentioned in this chapter. In most of common way, the conversation will be started by a kind of greeting, opening, etc. but in this case, the speakers directly talk about the topic.

Secondly, the next aspect of analysis is negotiation. Conversation unfolds because speakers respond to each other's utterances, when one is responding, one is negotiating. A response can only make sense when it is related to the previous utterance in terms of feeling (interpersonally) or in terms of content (logico-semantically). In order to make it detail, the negotiation is simply divided into two, interpersonal and logicosemantic negotiation. Interpersonal negotiation closely deals with negotiating someone's feelings or attitudes which are realized by the mood, subject and finite, while the logicosemantic negotiation closely deals with the negotiation of the message or news (content), which is realized in the rest of the mood (residue). In conversation, interpersonal negotiation is commonly realized by question tag. Based on the linguistic evidences, the conversation is dominated by logicosemantic negotiations, and there is only one interpersonal negotiation (*see appendix 2*). The number of logicosemantic negotiations signal that the speakers much concern on responding the content, rather than the feelings. This means the speakers really aware to the content of the conversation, that's why, the topic of conversation changes dynamically. The negotiations during the conversation are functioned to characterize the spoken language used.

Thirdly, the last aspect of analysis is linguistic features. In this case, it is simply divided into four sub-elements, those are spontaneity, interactivity,

interpersonality and coherence. Spontaneity involves filled pause, repetitions, incomplete utterance, frequent use of conjunctions, adverbials and vague expressions and chunks. Based on the linguistic evidences, there are some filled pauses which are told by the speakers along the conversation, such as *uh, um, shh* (see appendix 3). In this case, filled pauses signal that the speaker needs a moment to pause his/her speaking. Besides that, filled pauses also characterize the spoken language used.

The next aspect of spontaneity is repetition. Based on the linguistic evidences found in the text, the speakers (Di and Jessie) repeat some words during the conversation, such as in the Jessie's utterance *Right. Right and so when did you...* In this case, the repetition is functioned to emphasize that the speaker takes it as a serious thing. The other repetitions are as follows; *photos (2x), sort of (4x), great (2x)*, see appendix 3 for more detail.

Furthermore, during the conversation, there is no false start and backtracking utterance, but there is incomplete utterance told by Di, as follows; *Uh, well we sort of. I'm a sort of nervy person when I first meet people, so it was a sort of ...you know==just nice to him.* Di tells something incomplete, but then she shifts the utterance and ends it by a kinds of conclusion about her meeting, *just nice to him.* Even though Di tells incomplete utterance, but the other speakers (Judy and Jessie) can understand to what Di's mean, so the conversation runs smoothly, no gap at all.

During the conversation, the speakers frequently use 'and' and 'or' to link their utterances, such as in the example below:

Di : And um and then we called a truce and started again. And then we sort of became friends.

'and' (6x) is the most frequent of conjunct which is used by the speakers to link their utterances. In this case, 'and' functions to connect the utterances and adds specific information to the previous utterance, as well. Besides 'and', another conjunct which is used by the speakers is 'or' (2x). The detail linguistic evidence of conjunct can be seen in the appendix 3.1

The next spontaneity aspect found in the text is the use of adverbials. The speakers only use adverbial *actually (2x)* and *really (2x)* along the conversation. These types of adverbials are functioned to convey the speakers' attitudes when they are speaking (see appendix 3).

As the characteristic of spoken language, the use of chunks are found a lot, such as *come on, let's go, sort of* and *you know*. Chunks are multi-word units that behave as if they were single words and typically consist of formulaic routines that are stored and retrieved in their entirety. Besides chunks, the vague expression is also used by the speakers, such as *sort of*, which is repeated four times. The use of chunks and vague expressions emphasize that the language used in the conversation is spoken style.

The second aspect of spoken language features is interactivity, which involves turn taking, interruption, laughter/chuckles and discourse markers. Along the conversation the speakers do turn taking most, especially when a speaker asks something to other speaker, and then gives the answer (*see appendix 4*), for example;

Jessie : Right and so when did you== actually meet him?

Di : ==So we didn't actually meet until that night.

When Di gives the answer for Jessie's question, the other speakers keep silent to listen Di's words. It signals that they do turn taking and keeps silent when someone is speaking. Besides the presence of turn taking, the conversation is also marked by interruption, as in the utterance below:

Di : And he'd combed his hair and shaved his eyebrows==and

Jessie : Had you seen a photo of him?

In this context, Jessie interrupts Di's utterance she before finishing it. This kind of characteristic is commonly found in spoken language. Interruption signals the speaker's intention to cut off someone else utterance, such as disagreement, dislike, etc.

One of interactivity aspects which is found most is laughter, which functions to signal amusement. Conversation is actually not simply the exchange of information, but has a strong interpersonal function. It serves to establish and maintain group solidarity. I have noticed six times of laughter during the conversation (*see appendix 4*). Besides to signal amusement, the frequent use of laughter also signals the intimacy, friendship among the speakers. While to manage the cut-and-thrust of interactive talk smoothly, the speakers use some discourse markers to signal intentions or what they are going to say, such as *well, oh yeah, you know* (*see appendix 4*).

In the interpersonality aspect, the text displays some features, such as vague language, repeating other's words, exaggeration and strongly evaluative language. The vague language can be seen in the utterance which contains of '*sort of*' (*see appendix*

5). It is used in order not to sound too assertive and opinionated when delivering the utterances. Repeating other's words is a common feature which is found also in the text. It is happened when Jessie repeats Di's words, as follows;

Di : ==So we didn't actually meet until that night.

Jessie : Until that night.

When repeating other's words actually the speaker ensures him/herself that what has just been said is right. Furthermore, the speakers also use exaggeration and evaluative language in the conversation. It is used to harmonize the joint construction of talk; to flag the speaker's attitude; to minimize misunderstanding. Those features can be seen in the linguistic evidences below:

Judy : *Oh hysterical [laughing]*.

Jessie : *Great. Very close friends in fact [laughing]. Great.*

The last aspect of spoken language feature is coherence, which covers lexical repetition, lexical chain and referring expression. The coherence is achieved because speakers cooperate each other to make sure that what they say is relevant to what has been said before. In terms of lexical repetition, the text displays repeated words as follows; *photo* (3x), *meet* (3x), *sort of* (4x) and *friends* (3x). These repeated words help the reader to identify the topic of the conversation (*see appendix 6*). In terms of lexical chain, the text displays these following words; *meet* → *went out* → *nervous* → *photos* → *friends*. From the linguistic evidences of repetition and lexical chain, the writer can concludes that the topic of conversation is about the Di's first meeting with someone.

The next aspect of coherence is referring expression, which is only found one expression in the text, as in the utterance below:

Di : *Um and then I got sick. I had this Filipino flu, or Hong Kong flu, or whatever they like to call it, and then...*

It refers to 'sick, Filipino flu or Hong Kong flu', that has been mentioned before. It is classified into anaphoric reference, because refers backward to the previous word.

Substitution becomes the next aspect of coherence which is found in the text. in this case, the substitution is only found once times, as in the Di's utterance below;

*Di : ==Well I was hanging out of a window watching him in his car, and I
thought 'oh God what about this!'*

In this context, '*this*' substitutes the speaker's action as stated in the previous statement.

In the macro structure of coherence, the text doesn't display the use of adjacency pairs among the speakers, but the text contains question and answer, especially in negotiating the message of utterance. In terms of story structure, the conversation has no structure at all.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis and the linguistic evidences as presented above, the text displays some common features of spoken language style. Firstly, in terms of text structure, it has dynamic structure because the speakers discuss more than one topic. The speakers also perform interactive staging during the conversation. Secondly, the speakers negotiate most on logicosemantic aspect, rather than interpersonal aspect. I have noticed that the speakers negotiate logicosemantically four times, while interpersonally only once time during the conversation. Thirdly, the linguistic features which characterize the text are simply divided into four; spontaneity, interactivity, interpersonality and coherence. Spontaneity in the text is achieved by the presence of filled pauses, repetitions, incomplete utterance, adverbials, vague expressions and the use of chunks. Interactivity in the text is signaled by the presence of taking turns to speak and keeping silent when others are speaking, interrupting at times, signaling their amusement by grunts, laughs and chuckles, and discourse markers. Interpersonality in the text is displayed by exaggeration and evaluative language, repeating others' words and the use of vague language. In terms of coherence, the text displayed lexical repetition, lexical chain, referring expressions, substitution and linkers. Besides that, the coherence is achieved because speakers cooperate each other to make sure that what they say is relevant to what has been said before.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, M. and Anderson, K. 2003. *Text Types in English 1-2*. South Yarra: Macmillan Education Australia.

- Celce-Murcia, M. and Olsain E. 2000. *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching*. United States of America: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, G. 2001. *Discourse*. New York: oxford University Press
- Gerot, L. and Wignell, P. 1994. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Sydney: Antipodean Educational Enterprises (AEE).
- Halliday, M. A. K. and R. Hasan,. 1994. *Cohesion in English*. New York: Longman.
- Liu, L and Qi, X. 2010. A Contrastive Study of Textual Cohesion and Coherence Errors in Chinese EFL Abstract Writing in Engineering Discourse. *Intercultural Communication Studies XIX* pp 176-187(Online Journal). Available online on <http://www.uri.edu/iaics/content/2010v19n3/14LidaLiuXiukunQi.pdf> on June 15th, 2014
- Martin, J.R. and Rose, D. 2003. *Working with Discourse: Meaning beyond the Clause*. (Special edition for Semarang State University) Semarang: Unnes Press.
- Povolna, R. 2009. On Constative Relations in Academic Spoken Discourse. *Brno Studies in English Journal*. pp 95-105
- Priyanna, J., Riandi and Mumpuni, A. P. 2008. *Interlanguage: English for Senior High Students XI*. Jakarta: Grasindo.
- Thompson, G. 1996. *Introducing Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Thornbury, S. 2005. *Beyond the Sentence; Introducing Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Macmillan Publishers Limited.
- Widdowson, H. G. 2007. *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.