

**AN ANALYSIS ON COHESIVE DEVICES ENCOUNTERED IN
ARGUMENTATIVE COMPOSITIONS OF THE FIFTH SEMESTER
STUDENTS OF THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT OF WIDYA
MANDALA SURABAYA CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY**

A THESIS

By

**RUSLI DEWI
8212701010**



No. T. BUK	32.41 / 03
TGL	20-06-2003.
SKRIPSI	MPBI.

**UNIVERSITAS KATOLIK WIDYA MANDALA SURABAYA
PROGRAM PASCASARJANA
PROGRAM STUDI MAGISTER PENDIDIKAN BAHASA INGGRIS
JUNE 2003**

**AN ANALYSIS ON COHESIVE DEVICES ENCOUNTERED IN
ARGUMENTATIVE COMPOSITIONS OF THE FIFTH SEMESTER
STUDENTS OF THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT OF WIDYA
MANDALA SURABAYA CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY**

THESIS

**Submitted to Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University
Master's Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in TEFL**

by

**Rusli Dewi
8212701010**

**UNIVERSITAS KATOLIK WIDYA MANDALA SURABAYA
PROGRAM PASCASARJANA
PROGRAM STUDI MAGISTER PENDIDIKAN BAHASA INGGRIS
JUNE 2003**

APPROVAL SHEET (1)

This thesis entitled *An Analysis on Cohesive Devices Encountered in Argumentative Compositions of the Fifth Semester Students of the English Department of Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University*

prepared and submitted by Rusli Dewi (8212701010)

has been approved to be examined by the Board of Examiners for acquiring the Master's degree in Teaching English as A Foreign Language by the following advisor:



PROF. E. SADTONO, Ph.D

Thesis Advisor

APPROVAL SHEET (2)

This thesis entitled *An Analysis on Cohesive Devices Encountered in Argumentative Compositions of the Fifth Semester Students of the English Department of Widya Mandala Catholic University* prepared and submitted by Rusli Dewi (8212701010) was examined by the following Board of Examiners on oral examination with a grade of _____ on May 12, 2003



Dr. Ignatius Harjanto

Chairman



Dr. A. Ngadiman

Member



Prof. E. Sadtono, Ph.D

Member



Prof. E. Sadtono, Ph.D

Director of the Master's Degree Program

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all, I would like to thank Jesus Christ. Without His blessing, it is impossible for me to complete this thesis.

I would like to give my deepest gratitude to my great advisor, Prof. E. Sadtono, Ph.D., for his excellent advice throughout the process of completing this thesis. His meticulous proofreading and his patience with my repeated mistakes have made this thesis much better than it would otherwise have been. My deepest gratitude also goes to Prof. Abdul Wahab, my previous advisor and my wonderful teacher, for giving many valuable suggestions and lending many books.

I am also very grateful for the help of Dr. Ignatius Harjanto, Dra. Ruruh Mindari, M.Pd. and Dr. A. Ngadiman in the midst of writing this thesis. My sincere gratitude is also given to the Board of Examiners – Dr. Ignatius Harjanto, Dr. A. Ngadiman, and Prof. E. Sadtono, Ph.D – whom have spent their time to read and give many valuable critics.

I would like to thank all of my colleagues, the first generations of the Graduate Program of Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University, who have given me support and advice. My special thanks also go to Olivia for giving me the data and to Yenny Hartanto for her pray and suggestions. I would also thank the students of Group F and Group B who have spent their time to fill out my questionnaires.

Last but not least, I would like to give my deepest gratitude to my fiancé – Antonio Inoki – for his love, caring, and critics; and to all of my family for their encouragement and financial support.

ABSTRACT

Dewi, Rusli. **An Analysis on Cohesive Devices Encountered in Argumentative Compositions of the Fifth Semester Students of the English Department of Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University.** Thesis. Master's Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language. English Education Department. Graduate School. Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University. Advisor: Prof. E. Sadtono, Ph.D

Key terms: Cohesion, Cohesive Devices, Argumentative Compositions

Writing is not just simply speech down on paper. Learning to write is not the same as learning to speak. While speaking can be informal and repetitive, writing is more formal and compact. In speaking, someone may repeat his ideas, in writing, however, the writers must express their ideas logically with fewer digressions and explanations. In other words, the continuity of thought between one idea to another in writing is a must. This continuity of thought can be achieved when there is a cohesion between one sentence to the other sentences in each paragraph.

In spite of the important roles of cohesive devices, previous studies revealed that many university students made mistakes in cohesive devices. Therefore, in this thesis, the frequency of cohesive devices used and wrongly used by the fifth semester students of the English Department of Widya Mandala Catholic University was analyzed. However, unlike her previous study, in this research the writer did not only present and describe the number of cohesive devices used and wrongly used by the students, but also tried to assume the causes and suggest the possible teaching techniques to increase the students' competence in using cohesive devices.

This research was qualitative in nature. In this case, the writer analyzed deeply the Argumentative compositions of the fifth semester students of the English Department of Widya Mandala Catholic University and described the result. To get an objective result, the writer took the students' Mid-term and Final Tests as data. Furthermore, the writer distributed the questionnaires to find out the causes of the students' errors in cohesive devices.

Having analyzed the data, the writer found out that **Personal Pronoun** was the most frequently used both in the students' Mid-term and Final Tests, whereas, **Possessive Pronoun** and **Dismissive Adversative Conjunction** were the least frequently used in the *Mid-term Test*. Similarly, **Possessive Pronoun** and **Verbal Substitution** were the least used in the Final Test.

Furthermore, the most frequent errors in the *Mid-term Test* were **Personal Pronoun**, **Demonstrative Reference showing Neutral (article 'the')**, **Simple Additive Conjunction**, and **Causal Conjunction showing Reason**. In the *Final Test*, the most frequent errors were **Personal Pronoun**, **Demonstrative Reference showing Neutral (article 'the')**, and **Comparative Reference showing Particular Comparison**.

Having classified and interpreted the errors, the writer assumed eleven causes of the students' errors. They are as follows:

1. Interference of Indonesian language
2. Overgeneralization
3. Performance errors
4. Teacher Induced Errors

Based on the distributed questionnaires, the writer also assumed that the students' errors were caused not only by the four conditions but also by the following conditions:

1. The confusion of the parts of speech.
2. The un-internalized rules
3. The effort to recode the speech into writing
4. The students' over-dependence on the readers to find out what they refer to
5. Lack of reading
6. Lack of practice in writing
7. The students' inability to recall what they have written when they move to another part of sentence.

Finally, from the errors and the causes, the writer can suggest at least four teaching techniques to improve the students' competence in using cohesive devices, namely: by using pictures, reading texts, sentence combining exercises, and paragraph completion exercises.

ABSTRAK

Dewi, Rusli. **Analisa Piranti Kohesi Pada Karangan Argumentasi Yang Ditulis Oleh Mahasiswa Semester Lima Jurusan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya**. Tesis. Program Pascasarjana. Magister Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya. Pembimbing: Prof. E. Sadtono, Ph.D

Kata-kata kunci: kohesi, piranti kohesi, karangan Argumentasi

Menulis bukan hanya memindahkan perkataan atau ucapan diatas kertas. Belajar menulis tidak sama dengan belajar bercakap-cakap. Jika percakapan dapat dilakukan secara informal dan berulang-ulang, lain halnya dengan menulis. Seorang penulis dituntut untuk menyatakan ide-idenya secara lebih padat dalam bahasa yang lebih formal. Di dalam berbicara, seseorang diperbolehkan mengulang ide-idenya, akan tetapi di dalam menulis seorang harus dapat menyatakan ide-idenya secara logis dan dengan lebih sedikit penyimpangan. Dengan kata lain, kesinambungan antara ide yang satu dengan yang lainnya dalam suatu karangan adalah suatu keharusan. Kesinambungan ide tersebut dapat tercapai apabila terdapat kohesi antara satu kalimat dengan kalimat yang lain dalam setiap paragraf.

Walaupun piranti kohesi memegang peranan yang penting dalam suatu karangan, dalam penelitian-penelitian terdahulu ditemukan bahwa masih banyak mahasiswa universitas yang melakukan kesalahan dalam menggunakan piranti-piranti kohesi. Maka dari itu, di dalam tesis ini penulis menganalisa piranti kohesi yang digunakan oleh mahasiswa semester lima di Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya, beserta dengan jumlah kesilapannya. Namun, berbeda dengan penelitian penulis yang terdahulu, di sini dia tidak hanya menyajikan dan memaparkan jumlahnya saja, tetapi juga berusaha mengasumsikan alasannya mengapa mahasiswa yang bersangkutan melakukan kesalahan. Selain itu, penulis mencoba menyajikan beberapa tehnik-tehnik pengajaran untuk meningkatkan kemampuan pembelajar dalam menggunakan piranti kohesi.

Penelitian ini pada dasarnya adalah penelitian secara kualitatif. Dalam hal ini, penulis menganalisa secara mendalam karangan Argumentatif yang ditulis oleh mahasiswa semester lima jurusan Bahasa Inggris di Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala dan kemudian memaparkan hasil-hasilnya. Untuk memperoleh hasil yang objektif, penulis mengambil karangan yang ditulis mahasiswa pada saat Ujian Tengah Semester dan Ujian Akhir Semester sebagai data. Selanjutnya, untuk menemukan sebab-sebab mengapa mahasiswa tersebut membuat kesalahan dalam menggunakan piranti kohesi, penulis membagikan sejumlah kuisioner.

Setelah meneliti data-data yang telah diperoleh, penulis menemukan bahwa kata ganti orang (**Personal Pronoun**) paling sering digunakan baik pada karangan yang ditulis pada saat Ujian Tengah Semester (UTS) maupun pada karangan yang ditulis pada saat Ujian Akhir Semester (UAS). Sedangkan, yang paling jarang digunakan pada saat UTS adalah **Possessive Pronoun** dan **Konjungsi Adversative Pembebasan (Dismissive Adversative Conjunction)**.

Sama halnya dengan UTS, piranti kohesi yang paling jarang digunakan di UAS adalah **Possessive Pronoun** dan **Penyulihan Verbal (Verbal Substitution)**.

Selanjutnya, kesalahan yang paling sering dilakukan pada saat UTS adalah **kata ganti orang (Personal Pronoun)**, **Pengacuan Demonstrativa Netral (article 'the')**, **Konjungsi Aditif Sederhana (Simple Additive Conjunction)**, dan **Konjungsi Kausal Akibat (Causal Conjunction showing Reason)**. Sedangkan pada saat UAS, kesalahan yang paling sering terjadi adalah dalam hal penggunaan **kata ganti orang (Personal Pronoun)**, **Pengacuan Demonstrativa Netral (article 'the')**, dan **Pengacuan Komparatif yang menunjukkan Perbandingan Tertentu (Comparative Reference showing Particular Comparison)**.

Setelah menggolong-golongkan dan menginterpretasikan kesalahan-kesalahan yang ditemukan pada data, penulis kemudian dapat mengasumsikan sebelas alasan mengapa mahasiswa yang bersangkutan membuat kesalahan-kesalahan tersebut. Alasan-alasan itu adalah sebagai berikut:

1. Pengaruh Bahasa Indonesia
2. Overgeneralisasi
3. Performance errors
4. Teacher Induced Error

Kemudian berdasarkan angket yang telah dibagikan, penulis menemukan bahwa kesalahan-kesalahan tersebut tidak hanya disebabkan oleh keempat faktor di atas tetapi juga oleh kondisi-kondisi sebagai berikut:

1. Siswa tidak mampu membedakan bagian-bagian suatu kalimat.
2. Siswa kurang memahami atauran-aturan sintaktis secara mendalam.
3. Siswa berusaha untuk memindahkan secara langsung apa yang ingin mereka ucapkan ke dalam bentuk tulisan.
4. Siswa terlalu menggantungkan pembaca untuk mengetahui sendiri apa yang dimaksudkan oleh penulis (dalam hal ini siswa).
5. Siswa kurang membaca.
6. Siswa kurang berlatih dalam menulis.
7. Siswa tidak mampu mengingat apa yang telah mereka tulis ketika mereka berpindah ke bagian kalimat yang lain.

Pada akhir kata, berdasarkan kesalahan-kesalahan yang telah ditemukan beserta dengan sebab-sebabnya, penulis dapat menyarankan empat tehnik pengajaran yang dapat digunakan untuk meningkatkan kemampuan pembelajar dalam menggunakan piranti kohesi, yaitu: dengan menggunakan gambar, teks atau bacaan, latihan penggabungan kalimat, dan latihan melengkapi paragraf.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title (1).....	i
Title (2).....	ii
Approval Sheet (1).....	iii
Approval Sheet (2).....	iv
Acknowledgement.....	v
Abstract (English).....	vi
Abstract (Indonesian).....	viii
Table of Contents.....	x
List of Tables.....	xiv
Illustration.....	xvi
List of Appendices.....	xvii

Chapter I INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statements of the Problems.....	6
1.3. The Objectives of the Study.....	6
1.4. The Scope and Limitations of the Study.....	7
1.5. The Significance of the Study.....	7
1.6. The Assumptions.....	8
1.7. The Theoretical Framework.....	8
1.8. The Definitions of the Key Terms.....	10
1.9. The Organization of the Thesis.....	10

Chapter II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. The Theory of Cohesive Devices.....	12
2.1.1. The Nature of Cohesive Devices.....	12
2.1.2. The Types of Cohesive Devices.....	16
1. Reference.....	16
A. Personal Reference.....	19
B. Demonstrative Reference.....	25
C. Comparative Reference.....	27
2. Substitution.....	30
A. Nominal Substitution.....	31
B. Verbal Substitution.....	32
C. Clausal Substitution.....	33
3. Ellipsis.....	34
A. Nominal Ellipsis.....	35
B. Verbal Ellipsis.....	36
C. Clausal Ellipsis.....	39
4. Conjunction.....	41
A. Additive Conjunction.....	42
B. Adversative Conjunction.....	44
C. Causal Conjunction.....	46
D. Temporal Conjunction.....	47

5. Lexical Cohesion.....	48
A. Reiteration.....	48
B. Collocation.....	50
2.2. Argumentation.....	52
2.2.1 Fallacious Arguments.....	57
2.2.2 Logical Indicators in Argumentation.....	61
2.3. Contrastive and Error Analysis.....	63
2.3.1. Contrastive Analysis.....	63
2.3.2. Error Analysis.....	65
2.4. Techniques of Teaching Cohesion.....	69
2.4.1. Teaching Reference.....	70
A. Anaphoric Reference.....	70
B. Exophoric Reference.....	73
C. Cataphoric Reference.....	74
2.4.2. Teaching Ellipsis and Substitution.....	75
2.4.3. Teaching Conjunction.....	77
2.4.4. Teaching Lexical Cohesion.....	78
2.5. Summary and Conclusion.....	80

Chapter III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Method and Design.....	89
3.2. Subjects.....	93
3.3. Data Collection.....	93
3.4. The Research Instruments.....	95
3.5. Data Analysis Technique.....	98
3.6. Triangulation.....	101

Chapter IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1. Frequency of the Cohesive Devices.....	102
4.1.1. Reference.....	104
4.1.2. Conjunction.....	105
4.1.3. Ellipsis.....	107
4.1.4. Substitution.....	108
4.1.5. Lexical Cohesion.....	109
4.2. Frequency of the Errors in Cohesive Devices.....	110
4.2.1. Errors in Reference.....	111
4.2.2. Errors in Conjunction.....	114
4.2.3. Errors in Ellipsis.....	116
4.2.4. Errors in Lexical Cohesion.....	117
4.3. Description of the Errors and Their Causes.....	118
4.3.1. Errors in Personal Reference.....	118
A. Personal Pronoun.....	118
B. Possessive Determiner.....	127

4.3.2.	Errors in Demonstrative Reference.....	131
	A. Demonstrative Neutral (article 'the').....	131
	B. Demonstrative Participant.....	133
	C. Demonstrative Circumstances.....	135
4.3.3.	Errors in Comparative Reference.....	136
	A. General Comparative.....	136
	B. Particular Comparative.....	138
4.3.4.	Errors in Additive Conjunction.....	143
	A. Simple Additive.....	143
	B. Complex Additive.....	148
	C. Comparative Additive.....	149
	D. Appositive Additive.....	149
4.3.5.	Errors in Adversative Conjunction.....	151
	A. Simple Adversative.....	151
	B. Contrastive Adversative.....	153
	C. Corrective Adversative.....	154
	D. Dismissive Adversative.....	154
4.3.6.	Errors in Causal Conjunction.....	155
	A. Causal Conjunction showing Reason.....	155
	B. Causal Conjunction showing Result.....	159
	C. Causal Conjunction showing Purpose.....	162
	D. Causal Conjunction showing Conditional.....	163
4.3.7.	Errors in Temporal Conjunction.....	165
	A. Temporal Specific.....	165
	B. Temporal Sequential.....	166
	C. Temporal Conclusive.....	168
4.3.8.	Errors in Ellipsis.....	168
	A. Nominal and Clausal Ellipsis.....	168
	B. Verbal Ellipsis.....	169
4.3.9.	Errors in Lexical Cohesion.....	170
	A. Repetition.....	170
	B. Synonym.....	172
	C. Collocation.....	173
4.3.10.	Other Common Errors.....	174
4.4.	Suggested Techniques in Teaching Writing.....	177
	4.4.1. Reading Texts.....	178
	4.4.2. Paragraph Completion.....	179
	4.4.3. Sentence Combining.....	179
4.5.	Conclusion of the Findings.....	184
 Chapter V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS		
5.1.	Summary and Conclusion.....	195
5.2.	Suggestions.....	200
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....		202

APPENDICES

1. Mid-term Test Problem Sheet.....	205
2. Final Test Problem Sheet.....	206
3. Questionnaire.....	207
4. Result of the Questionnaire.....	210
5. Examples of the Students' Compositions.....	214
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	224

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2 – 1	The Types of Personal Reference.....	21
2 – 2	The Difference between Reference, Substitution, and Ellipsis.....	35
2 – 3	The Types of Personal Pronoun in Indonesian.....	71
2 – 4	The Types of Conjunctive Relations.....	78
2 – 5	The Types of Reference.....	85
2 – 6	The Types of Substitution.....	86
2 – 7	The Types of Ellipsis.....	86
2 – 8	The Types of Conjunction.....	87
2 – 9	The Types of Lexical Cohesion.....	88
4 – 1	The Frequency of Cohesive Devices Used in the Mid-term Test.....	103
4 – 2	The Frequency of Cohesive Devices Used in the Final Test.....	103
4 – 3	The Frequency of Reference Used in the Mid-term Test.....	104
4 – 4	The Frequency of Reference Used in the Final Test.....	105
4 – 5	The Frequency of Conjunction Used in the Mid-term Test.....	106
4 – 6	The Frequency of Conjunction Used in the Final Test.....	107
4 – 7	The Frequency of Ellipsis Used in the Mid-term Test.....	108
4 – 8	The Frequency of Ellipsis Used in the Final Test.....	108

4 – 9	The Frequency of Substitution Used in the Final Test.....	109
4 – 10	The Frequency of Lexical Cohesion Used in the Mid-term Test.....	109
4 – 11	The Frequency of Lexical Cohesion Used in the Final Test.....	109
4 – 12	The Frequency of Cohesive Devices Errors in the Mid-term Test.....	110
4 – 13	The Frequency of Cohesive Devices Errors in the Final Test.....	111
4 – 14	The Frequency of Reference Errors in the Mid-term Test.....	112
4 – 15	The Frequency of Reference Errors in the Final Test	113
4 – 16	The Frequency of Conjunction Errors in the Mid-term Test.....	114
4 – 17	The Frequency of Conjunction Errors in the Final Test.....	115
4 – 18	The Frequency of Ellipsis Errors in the Mid-term Test.....	116
4 – 19	The Frequency of Ellipsis Errors in the Final Test.....	116
4 – 20	The Frequency of Lexical Cohesion Errors in the Mid-term Test.....	117
4 – 21	The Frequency of Lexical Cohesion Errors in the Final Test.....	117
5 – 1	The Frequency of Cohesive Devices Used.....	196
5 – 2	The Frequency of Cohesive Devices Errors.....	197

ILLUSTRATION

Figure	Page
Data Comparison for Analyzing the Argumentative Compositions.....	92

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1.	Mid-term Test Problem Sheet.....	205
Appendix 2.	Final Test Problem Sheet.....	206
Appendix 3.	Questionnaire.....	207
Appendix 4.	Result of the Questionnaire.....	210
Appendix 5.	Examples of the Students' Compositions.....	214