CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Reference

Halliday and Hasan (1976) defined that reference is the relation between an element of the text and something else by reference to which it is interpreted in the given instance. In line with the idea of Halliday, Eggins (1994) stated that referencing indicates how the writer introduces participants and keeps track of them throughout the text. The example of participants is people, place, and things that get talked about in a text. In brief, reference is two related elements spread throughout the text which one of them gives interpretation to the one referred.

Halliday and Hasan classified reference as part of grammatical cohesive devices. In looking for the origin of reference, as stated by Halliday and Hasan, there are two kinds of cohesion. They are *grammatical cohesion* and *lexical cohesion*. Lexical cohesion consists of *reiteration* and *collocation*, while grammatical cohesion includes four types: *reference, substitution, ellipsis,* and *conjunction*. In this chapter, reference is the only one discussed to maintain the focus of the study.

Reference as one of cohesive devices is closely related to the definition of cohesion itself because Halliday and Hasan defined cohesion as the set of possibilities that exist in the language for making text hang together, while Yule (2006) gives a description that texts must have a certain structure that depends on

factors quite different from those required in the structure of a single sentence. This is similar concept descended to reference since it is creating a text to hang together by creating relation between two elements.

In addition, the term cohesion also refers to the way of relating or tying together bits of the discourse. As Halliday and Hasan explained cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is setup, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are there by at least potentially integrated into a text. As stated, it can be elaborated as long as there is semantic tie between one with other item at certain point, there is cohesion to help decoding or understanding the item referred. This is sure another word for reference. Reference may occur at sentence level and text level. The example of reference occurring at sentence level is shown by Halliday and Hasan:

Three blind mice, three blind mice. See how they run! See how they run! (1976, p.31)

This sentence shows how the word *they* can be easily understood from the context given. *They* in that example shows the *three blind mice.* This kind of reference called endhoporic. And, next is the example of reference occurs at text level.

That's all my speech.

The word *that* may refer to the whole content that speaker already talked. It is not something problematic, since it is also part of endhoporic reference in specific as anaphoric reference. This has function to link a word to the previous sentence. It could be one previous sentence, or longer than that.

These occurrences may not have big difference in term of functionality. But, Halliday and Hasan believed cohesion that occurs at text level may create ambiguity or confuse the reader or listener. Since to understand the information from longer occurrence, the readers or listeners must have full capacity to remembering and staying focus to the speaker already mentioned.

2.1.1 Type of References

Combining the theory of Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Eggins (2005), there are four types of references: personal, demonstrative, comparative, and locational reference. As defined by Halliday and Hasan, personal reference has three classes. They are personal pronoun, possessive determiners, and possessive pronouns. Below is the example of personal reference:

"(a) John has moved to a new house. He had built it last year.

(b) John's house is beautiful. His wife must be delighted with it.

(c) That new house is John's. I didn't know it was his." (p. 55).

In the example (a), *he* is personal pronoun refering back to *John*, while in (b), *his* is possessive determiners refering back to to *John's*, and for the (c), *his* is possessive pronoun referring to *John's.*

While demonstrative reference as specified by Halliday and Hasan is used to keep track of information through location using proximity references like "this, these, that, those, here, there, then, and the" (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). In addition, Eggins (2005) stated that the word *the* is too obvious and usually appear in enormous quantity. Thus this study doesn't look for the word *the,* but still consider other demonstrative references. In defining the comparative reference, Halliday & Hasan stated that comparative reference keeps track of identity and similarity through indirect references using adjectives like "same, equal, similar, different, else, better, more", etc. and adverbs like "so, such, similarly, otherwise, so, more", etc.

As characterized by Eggins (2005), comparative reference occurs when the identity of the presumed item is retrieved not because it has already been mentioned or will be mentioned in the text, but because an item with which it is being compared has been mentioned. For example, she did not hear the story as many women have heard the same. The word "the same" is comparative in term of anaphoric reference to "the story". Therefore, the comparative reference is used to compare one item using adjective or noun. The definition of locational reference as defined by Eggins is kind of reference which involves not the identification of a participant in a text (a person or thing), but the identification of a location in time or space. In written and spoken language, locational referents such as here, there, then, above, below are usually retrieved endophorically, from surrounding text and discourse. For example, Eggins gives instance about Chopin that wrote:

"She went away to her room alone. There she stayed for many hours"
(2005, p.37)

This is easy to refer 'there' as 'her room'. In other occasions, locational reference could also happen anaphorically.

2.1.2 Type of Reference Relation

Eggins (2005) stated that there are three ways of finding the identity of presuming reference. They can be taken from different contexts which are a) from the general context of culture, b) the immediate context of situation, and c) from elsewhere within the text itself. On the other perspective, Halliday and Hasan (1976) called it as reference relation. The types of reference relation as follow: homophoric reference, exophoric reference, bridging reference, and endophoric reference

Homophoric reference is seeing the identity of presuming reference from the general context of culture. Eggins gave example:

"How hot the sun is today" (2005, p. 35).

From the sentence, readers will understand that is the exact *sun* that the readers get the shine: the sun that shared as members of this particular world.

The different thing happens in exophoric reference. As defined by Halliday and Hasan, exophoric reference could be seen from the immediate context of situation. Eggins give clear sample about this relation.

"I ask you to put <u>it</u> down next to <u>her</u>" (2005, p.35).

If the listener in the same place at the same time, audience will be able to decode the *it* as referring to whatever object that the speaker is pointing to, and the *her* as the female in that room. This is called exophoric reference when the identity of presuming reference is retrieved from shared immediate context. Halliday and Hasan (1976) stated that exophoric reference is not cohesive, since it does not bind the two elements together into a text. But in spoken discourse, speaker or presenter usually points something on his/her slide and called it as 'that'. So seen from the context, Halliday and Hasan stated the previous statement in the context of written text. They also emphasize that to understand fully the discourse, listener or hearer must be present at that place of speaker is speaking. Therefore, exophoric reference is still cohesive in this study since author is there to record and watch the presentation, hence author will know specifically the language of speaker.

There is also special reference called Bridging reference which has function to show when a presuming reference item refers back to an early item from which it can be inferentially derived (Eggins, 2005). The example sentence is:

"There stood, facing the open window, a comfortable, roomy arm chair" (p.35).

By looking this sentence, readers do not know which *open window* it is, but readers have no trouble to *bridging* the *open window* refers to the room property.

The last step how to find the identity of presuming identity is by looking at elsewhere in the text. There are three types of this relation: anaphoric reference, cataphoric reference, and esphoric reference. Endhoporic could be anaphoric which refers back to the earlier point in the text. For example, Halliday and Hasan (1976) gave an instance about this relation:

"John has moved to new house. He had built it last year" (p.54).

By looking at this sample, the word *He* refers to earlier point in which to refer *John*. This is what stated as anaphoric reference. While anaphoric reference refers to the previous sentence in a text, cataphoric reference refers forward to the following sentence, or will be provided subsequently. This is also the example from Halliday and Hasan:

"I wou1d never have believed it. They've accepted the whole scheme" (p.56).

From this case, the readers will understand what the *it* in first sentence refers to. *It* refers to *the whole scheme* in the following sentence. This is called as cataphoric reference. And the last, esphoric reference exists when the referent occurs in the phrase immediately following the presuming referent item (within the same nominal group / noun phrase, not in a separate clause). The example of this type is, "When the storm of grief had spent itself". Here the reader knows which *storm* from the immediately following prepositional phrase *of grief*.

2.1.3 Head of Reference and Texture

In tracing the reference, a reference must have a head. Head based on Halliday (1976) is typically expressed by a common noun, proper noun or pronoun. Usually only common nouns accept modification; pronouns and proper nouns tend to occur alone. Head stated by Eggins (2005) is more to the participants of the text. Participants could be text, people, places or anything that discussed in a text. Hence, this study will select a head of reference as three major components: speaker, audience, and the theme of speech, while it doesn't close the probability of other head if it is often mentioned through text.

The example of head in the following sentence is taken from Eggins:

"Knowing that Mrs.Mallard was afflicted with a heart trouble, great care was taken to break to her as gently as possible the news of her husband's death." (2005, p.52)

By having this sentence, the head of this text is Mrs. Mallard and the other words such as, *her and her husband's death* are regarded as her reference through this text.

There are three ways stated by Martin and Rose (2007) on how to track a person in a text. The methods are *by pronoun* (herself, she), *by name* (Helena), *by 'the'* (the Truth and Reconciliation Commission).

Martin and Rose also explained that the word 'a' is indefinite determiner, readers can't assume since the identity is not yet revealed while 'the' is definite determiner, hence readers can assume. That is a clear signal on how a word is already mentioned or not.

Beside person, Martin and Rose also give method how to identify objects. Object is categorized into concrete objects that can be touched, tasted, heard, seen, or felt. It is identified precisely like people. They are introduced, and then tracked with determiners like *the* or pronouns like *it*. The same way could also be applied in looking for the institutions and abstractions.

After identifying and having traced all the reference, it will create something called reference chains. Reference chain is used to tell the texture of the text (Eggins, 2005). Further, Eggins elaborated this by saying that "Reference chains show us who the major human participants in a text, and their relative importance." It will present who is dominant in the text. As mentioned earlier, this reference chain will not only touch human as participants, but the other major mentioned things, such as location and goods, are also included. Therefore,

reference chains will depict whether the speaker has already completed in explaining the major participant in a presentation or not.

Major Participants is a head that has many references linked in a text. It could be seen from how the length of the chain of reference exists. It usually deals with the dominant role in a text. Usually, major participants are the most important matters that speaker need to inform.

Eggins also explained that the combination of reference ties that covers the length of the whole text, the consistent focus on a small number of participants, the density of ties, and their endophoric retrieval together add up to create highly cohesive, self-contained text. It can be summarized that by how the speaker used small amount of participants but explained it in detail, the text will have highly cohesive and it creates good text.

The reference chains are also cohesive in that they contribute to the thematic and metaphorical meanings the text is making (Eggins, 2005). The following example will help to manifest the statement:

Chain 8:Mrs.Mallard's eyes
(I)Mrs.Mallard - (19) (B) her eyes – whose gaze - (20) It - (29) the vacant stare –her eyes - (30) they - (59) her eyes

The example shows that the writer emphasizes the body part of woman. As Eggins explained:

"The patterns of reference chains help to realize Chopin's suggestion that conventional marriage deprives women of self-possession of their own bodies." (2005, p.40)

This is what the reference chain is for in which to add the thematic and meaning into text.

2.2 Spoken Discourse

Van Dijk (1988) points out that discourse, in a wider sense, is a complex unit of language form, meaning, and action that might best be captured under the notion of a communicative event or communicative act. Then there are two discourse that can be classified: written and spoken. Halliday (1989) stated that spoken and written discourse differ for many reasons. Spoken discourse has to be understood immediately, written discourse can be referred to many times. In same book, he also characterized spoken discourse into some criteria: a) spoken discourse has variations in speed, but it is generally faster than writing, b) included technical manner such as gesture, intonation, body language, c) and equal in the complexity compare to written discourse. While the distinction between speech and writing is often referred to as channel or medium as speaking and writing involve different psychological processes (Dell Hymes, 1974). Thus, the only differences between written and spoken are in the medium, term of speed, and technical manner, while in general purpose it is same to convey a message.

Eggins (2005) added explanation to the differentiation of written and spoken discourse. She stated that spoken language is concerned with human

actors, carrying out action processes, in dynamically linked sequences of clauses, whereas written language is concerned with abstract ideas/ reasons, linked by relational processes (verbs of being), in condensed sentences. It is by mean an idea that in spoken discourse, the speaker tends to use human as actor of the action and used normally a verb to indicate the process while in written discourse it is applied that the subject could be anything (abstract ideas) and normally used relational process in long sentence.

The example of this statement could be seen below:

In speaking: I handed my essay in late because my kids got sick.

In writing: The reason for the late submission of my essay was the illness of my children.

As the example shows, it indicates what Eggins tried to say that in speaking, the speaker tends to use human as participant and presents the action process. But, in written text, the speaker tends to use abstract ideas and more to the relational process. Hence, spoken and written discourse could also be regarded different by this explanation.

2.2.1 Academic Spoken Discourse

Speaking is an important activity in the context of academic. Along there are many functions of speaking such as presenting idea, transferring knowledge, and making a connection, there are many forms of speaking in academic context. One of which is presentation.

Presentation as one of activities in the context of academic is kind of transferring idea from someone to audience. One of lesson in English department at State University of Jakarta is academic presentation that is compulsory to be taken in the fifth semester. In academic presentation, there are several things that need to be considered. It is not only a speaking without context. Everything spoken should be related to what the speaker has already written on their paper. As stated in The Research Report (n.d) these are aspects that need to be comprehensively understood by the speaker when giving presentation in front of academician: clarity, consciseness, coherence, proper emphasis, meaningful organisation of paragraph, appropriate transition from one topic to another, apt choice of words, and specificity. These all aspects are related to cohesion. Therefore, the use of cohesion is essentially needed in academic presentation in term of clarity, coherence, and consciseness.

The other example presentation in academic context is thesis presentation, conference presentation, and paper presentation. The main focus of this research will be on thesis presentation. As stated in The Research Report that the thesis should be organized in a manner that enhances the smooth flow of materials in a meaningful fashion as the reader progress.

Thesis presentation will reflect the clarity of the written text and clarity of the speaker's thought. The more that the speaker's talk understood, the clearer the speaker's thought it is.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

From earlier literature reviews of both ideas: cohesion and academic presentation, they have similar ground of understanding in which cohesion impacts clarity of speech and a speech needs cohesion to have clarity. So, to make a presentation better, the speaker must use properly the reference as part of cohesive devices. Besides avoiding any ambiguity, it also enhances the idea that speaker wants the audience to hear. It clears the speech and speaker is finally able to convey the message through coherent speech with proper cohesive devices.

Therefore, this study focused on analyzing reference in the academic spoken discourse of English department students. In the analysis, the theory used is the theory about reference proposed by Halliday and Hasan in 1976 as well as Eggins in 2005. In analyzing the reference, it is obligatory to remember that reference keeps the unity of meaning in the sentence in order to create texture. The method used to track the reference taken from Martin and Rose (2007).

All type of reference, reference relation, and whether the reference already create appropriate texture are analyzed, classified and identified in the presentation of participant thus the reference in spoken discourse can be figured out.