

THE USE OF SUBSTITUTION AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO THE TEXT COHESION IN STUDENTS' EXPOSITORY TEXTS

Hanif Nurcholish Adiantika*

Department of English Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Cirebon
hanifadiantika@gmail.com

Astri Dwi Floranti

Department of English Literature, STIBA Invada Cirebon
Astri.Floranti@gmail.com

To cite this article: Adiantika, H.N. & Floranti, A.D. (2018). The use of substitution and its contribution to the texts' cohesion in students' expository texts. *ELT in Focus*, 1(2), 44-51.

Abstract

The present study intends to investigate the use of substitution in students' expository texts. It covers the types of substitution used by the students in their expository texts and the contribution of substitution to the texts' cohesion. This study uses qualitative research through case study design. The participants in this study are nine students of twelfth grade in a public senior high school in Kuningan. The data in the present study are the documents of students' expository texts. The data are analyzed by using the frameworks of cohesive devices proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976). The findings indicate that there is only one substitution found in this study namely nominal substitution. The present study also delineates that the use of substitution contributes to the process of avoiding repetition and text redundancy. Furthermore, it can be concluded that the use and the contribution of substitution in students' expository texts are still considered low. Thus, the encouragement is very necessary for the students to use appropriate substitution to make their texts more cohesive.

Keywords: *Substitution, Cohesion, EFL students, Expository texts*

INTRODUCTION

In manifesting ideas in writing, students should be directed to ensure that their text flows through a sequence of sentence. Therefore, it is very crucial to guide them to the thoughts they are going to express along with the sentences they use to represent those ideas (Holloway, 1981). It is because a good text is not determined by its length or quantity but it depends on its unity and connectedness instead (Brostoff, 1981; But et al, 2006). Nevertheless, it is necessary for EFL teachers to guide students to compose cohesive texts in different genre.

A text, either in form of written or spoken, is defined as a complete linguistic

interaction from beginning to end as the result of any instance of language that makes sense to someone who is aware of language (Halliday and Hasan, 1976; Eggins, 1994; Mathiessen, 2004; Halliday and Mathiessen, 2004; But et al., 2006). In other words, it can be stated that what is fundamental in a text is not its length or quantity matter but its meaning or sense that can be recognized by the receivers/readers. Furthermore, in order to compose a text meaningful and easy to identify by the readers, the text should have texture that makes words 'hang together' in a unity (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). It is relevant with Eggins (1994) that texture refers to the interaction of two components namely cohesion and coherence. Therefore, those

minimum units should be fulfilled to compose a text in a coherent and cohesive way.

The text coherence is reached by the connection between its social and cultural contexts while on the other hand cohesion is realized through the elements of the text which are bound together as a whole. A text is considered to be meaningful as a unity with the existence of coherence and cohesion intertwined to each other inside it. Moreover, texture will help the receivers/readers to comprehend the semantic relation of the text. In addition, according to Thompson (1996), the readers' comprehension towards text is determined by the writers' knowledge of semantic relation. Therefore, it is a must for the writers to conduct a text by using the concept of texture. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), cohesion is defined as one of fundamental aspects of texture to improve the connectedness and unity of sentences in a text. In other words, it is very crucial for the students to connect or join ideas between sentences to create texture (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). Halliday and Hasan (1976) also assert that cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. Structurally, elements in the text can be in form of words, sentences, and paragraphs. Actually, examples to demonstrate cohesion, the relation between elements, are inclusively on the sentence level. Few examples of large-scaled texts can be found through the book. Therefore, it can be inferred that what cohesion really means in English context is the semantic relation within and between sentences. It can also be stated that cohesion is the local connection in the text that contributes to global organization of the text.

In general, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976), text cohesion is realized through cohesive devices which is divided into two categories i.e. grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion.

Grammatical cohesion consists of reference, ellipsis, substitution, and conjunction. Meanwhile, lexical cohesion consists of reiteration and collocation or, in other words, can be stated as the selection of vocabulary. Halliday (1994), later on, categorizes four types of cohesion i.e. reference, structural cohesion, logical cohesion, and lexical cohesion. Among them, reference and lexical cohesion are similar to those by Halliday, structural cohesion includes substitution, ellipsis, and co-structure and logical cohesion consists of such devices as adverbs, prepositions, and zero-form. Givon (1995) delineates the following conceptual categories of cohesion: referential, temporal, locational, causal, and structural.

Cohesion, therefore, is achieved through cohesive device domains, i.e. reference, ellipsis, substitution, conjunction, and lexical cohesion (Halliday and Hasan, 1976 as cited in Hoey, 1991). These domains intertwine the text together into a unified whole to help the readers understand the text and make the text more cohesive to be read by the readers.

Substitution

Substitution and ellipsis, unlike reference, are grammatical rather than semantic relationships. In substitution, an item is replaced by another item. Ellipsis is the substitution by zero. It involves the omission of an item. In other words, in ellipsis, an item is replaced by nothing. This is a case of leaving something unstated which is however understood.

Substitution occurs when one linguistic item is replaced by another that contributes new information in a text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976: 88). This new information differs from the information previously provided by the antecedent linguistic item. It is differentiated from reference in being concerned with wording rather than meaning (Akindele, 2011). Generally, substitution is a relation that

occurs inside the text. It is a kind of strategy used to avoid repetition. As a general condition, the substitute item should have the same structural function (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 88).

Since substitution is a grammatical category that depends on words resources rather than on semantics, three types of substitution categories are introduced based on the function of the substitute item: these types of substitution are defined as: nominal substitution, verbal substitution and clausal substitution (Halliday & Hasan, 1976: 90). It can be explained more detail as follow:

- a. Nominal Substitution/ellipsis of noun: the replacement of a noun or noun phrase with the substitutes such as *one*, *ones*, or *same*.
 1. *It seemed that his route to the covered island was not to be an epicurean one.*
 2. *There were many ways of doing this. The pleasantest (way) was to dine luxuriously at some expensive restaurant.*
 3. *Pete owns the black sedan. The blue one belongs to Mike.*
- b. Verbal Substitution/ellipsis of verb: the replacement of a verb or verb phrase with substitute *do* or *did*.
 1. *At that point in the story, no other words could break the heart of the reader as those words do.*
 2. *– Is john going to come?*
 3. *He might (come)*
 4. *– Has he had dinner yet?*
 5. *He must have done. There's no food in the fridge*
 6. *Its crockery and atmosphere were thick; its soup and napery (were) thin.*
 7. *The umbrella owner slowed his steps. Soapy did likewise.*
- c. Clausal Substitution/ellipsis of clause: the substitution in which the presupposed is a clause, realized through the lexical items “so” and “not”

1. “Of course you agree to have a battle?” Tweedledum said in a calmer tone.
“I suppose so,” the other sulkily replied, as he crawled out of the umbrella.
2. “May I give you a slice?” she said, taking up the knife and fork, and looking from one Queen to the other.
“Certainly not,” the Red Queen said, very decidedly: “it isn’t etiquette to cut anyone you’ve been introduced to. Remove the joint!”
3. “What are you doing here?” asked the officer.
“(I am doing) Nothing.” said Soapy.
4. Is there going to be an earthquake? – It says so.

The present study intends to examine the use and the contribution of substitution in students’ expository texts. It involves the variety of substitution used by the students to create a semantic relation; and to investigate the contribution of substitution to students’ expository texts. This study employs the framework of cohesive devices proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976). Therefore, this study attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. What type of substitution are identified in students’ expository texts?
2. How do the cohesive devices, in particular substitution and its type, contribute to the cohesion of students’ expository texts?

METHOD

The present study *puts an emphasis on the use of substitution in students’ expository texts and its contribution in the texts’ cohesion*. This study is *characterized as a qualitative study by using a case study design*. It is because the setting of the present study is natural which is carried out

in a natural setting (Merriam, 2009; Creswell, 2008; see also Guba and Lincoln, 1985: 39-43, as cited by Alwasilah, 2009) involving an EFL classroom consists of students and teacher. It is also considered as an interpretive research (see Denzin and Lincoln, 2000; Dunne, Pryor, & Yates, 2005: 50) because it is based on an interpretive paradigm where qualitative researchers investigate things in their natural settings, attempt to make sense of, or to interpret, phenomena with regard to the meanings people bring to them.

The data in the present study were documents from nine students' expository texts. They were asked to write an essay in two hours. The instruction for students to write an exposition text is attached in Appendix. The authentic forms of the writing documents were the students' handwriting about the topic given in expository genre. The authenticity of the students' texts resulted the fundamental data in this study. Students' authentic texts were the data in this study to answer the research questions.

The data in form of students' expository texts were analyzed by using theoretical frameworks proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) concerning the concept of cohesive devices analysis and Eggin's point of view (1994) regarding cohesive devices interpretation. In analyzing the data, this study proposed several procedures. Firstly, each text was chunked based on clause. It was very important to conduct a careful analysis. It was because the data were in form of students' expository texts which consist of several paragraphs. Secondly, identification was initiated to mark the cohesive devices found and identified in the clause. In this procedure, the words were

underlined and put to where they belong. Thirdly, classification was done to classify the underlined words and put to where they belong according to the frameworks proposed by Halliday and Hasan concerning cohesive devices i.e. reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. The last procedure was drawing a descriptive quantification. This procedure was crucial to calculate cohesive devices found and identified in students' expository texts. After the words were identified and classified, they were calculated and presented through the descriptive quantification. Moreover, it is beneficial to elaborate, enhance, and illustrate the results of the study.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Types of Substitution Identified in Nine Students' Expository Texts

Regarding the result of the present study, there are two substances covered in the analysis namely: (1) types of substitution identified in nine students' expository texts, and (2) the contribution of substitution in students' expository writing. This sub chapter presents the use of substitution in students' expository texts. The texts are analyzed by using the concept of cohesive devices underlined by Halliday and Hasan (1976) which covers nominal substitution, verbal substitution, and clausal substitution.

The occurrence of substitution identified in nine students' expository texts can be seen through descriptive quantification as described by Table 3.1 as follows:

Table 3.1. *The occurrence of substitution in students' expository texts*

| Types of substitution | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | T9 | Total |
|-----------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| 1. Nominal | | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| 2. Verbal | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Clausal | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 |

There is only one occurrence of substitution in nine students' exposition text which is categorized as nominal substitution. It is a kind of substitution where the noun or nominal group can be replaced by another noun. In other words, the use of substitution in written form is rarely found since only one student used it in their expository writing. It is identified in example #1.

Example #1

Excessive use of gadgets in schools makes us less communicative with close ones. Much closer and keep close. Yes, it is the impact of gadget use in the school environment. We become a person who is very individualistic and unconcerned with the same circumstance as the focus of gadgets that we hold. Excessive use of the internet makes us smarter, a lot of insight and knowledge in getting internet when replay. It is a big mistake. It will make us fail.

(Text #7, paragraph #3).

The use of nominal substitution is identified in example #1 above. It is taken from text #7 paragraph #3. Nominal substitution is indicated in the use of the word 'ones'. It is relevant with Halliday and Hasan (1976: 91-31) that nominal substitution is often found by using one/ones as the main function in the nominal group and replaces only item that have an identical aspect. The word 'ones' refers to people who may be students, teachers, and anyone in school environment. Furthermore, since the writer is one of the students, it can be ensured that the word 'ones' particularly refers to other students. It implies that one of the negative

impacts of gadgets is less communication with peers.

Furthermore, the writer tries to avoid repetition by substituting one item by another. And, it is also crucial to make the text more efficient and as a whole. Both substitution and ellipsis are commonly used in spoken form or speaking context (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). Therefore, it is inevitable that the use of both substitution and ellipsis are rarely applied in written form in particular students' expository writing. There is only one of nine students who use substitution in their writing.

According to the entire explanation above, it can be inferred that only one substitution found in the present study, that is nominal substitution. It is also relevant with Halliday and Hasan (1976:117) that the verbal substitution is used more in speech than in writing, and more in British than American English. In other words, in the academic writing, more specifically in expository writing, the use of substitution and ellipsis are rarely used by the writer. That might be the reason why substitution is rarely used by the students in the present study.

The Contribution of Substitution in Students' Expository Texts

Table 3. 2. *The contribution of lexical cohesion to students' expository texts*

| Contribution | Substitution | | | Total |
|---|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------|
| | Nominal Substitution | Verbal Substitution | Clausal Substitution | |
| Keeping track of the participant. | | | | |
| Avoiding repetition and text redundancy | 1 | | | 1 |
| Enhancing logical connection between parts of text systematically | | | | |
| Engaging the readers to the core argument of the text | 1 | | | 1 |
| Total | | | | 2 |

Based on Table 2, substitution occurs 1 time. It can be, in specific, inferred that substitution provides contribution in avoiding repetition and text redundancy. Avoiding repetition and text redundancy helps to make the text more efficient as a whole. This contribution to students' expository writing is realized through reference as a relation on the semantic level and substitution as a relation on the lexicogrammatical level. As Halliday and Hasan (1976: 89) say, "in terms of linguistic, reference is a relation on the semantic level, whereas substitution is a relation on the lexicogrammatical level, the level of grammar and vocabulary, or linguistic form."

Furthermore, substitution also provides a contribution in engaging the readers to the core argument of the text. Which is also, more precisely, realized by the occurrence of nominal substitution with 2 occurrences. Engaging the readers to the core argument of the text assists the readers to recognize the core entity in the text.

Therefore, it can be inferred that the occurrence of reiteration and collocation enable the readers to get engaged to the core argument of the text easily.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the research questions as aforementioned, the purposes of the present study are to identify the types of lexical cohesion in nine students' expository texts and investigate the contribution of lexical cohesion to students' expository texts according to the framework of cohesion underlined by Halliday and Hasan (1976). Firstly, only one type of substitution used in a student's text out of nine students' expository texts. In other words, only one student uses one type of substitution in his/her text. It can be seen from the occurrence of substitution employed by the students with total only one occurrence. More specifically, one student applies one type of substitution characterized as a nominal substitution. The use of substitution in students' expository

texts, therefore, are still considered very low. It is because they lack knowledge concerning how to compose more cohesive text. Furthermore, they are not aware of what substitution really means. In other words, their knowledge regarding cohesion are still limited. As a result, their texts tend to be redundant and apply many repetitions in most of their expository texts.

Secondly, one student employs one type of substitution in avoiding repetition and text redundancy and engaging the readers to the core argument of the text. These contributions are achieved by using a type of substitution namely nominal substitution. The absence of other types of substitution caused by the students' lack of the function of cohesive devices in the text's cohesion particularly substitution. As the result, their text is hardly understandable instead of easy to comprehend by the readers. There is a tendency, instead of putting an emphasis on the relations of meaning that exist between the text, the students only focus on the word and sentence level. The result of this tendency is the absence of connectedness that enables readers to comprehend the text. Hence, the students should be encouraged to apply proper lexical cohesion as many as possible to make more cohesive text.

In addition, this study suggests that the use of cohesive devices, for instance substitution, should be delivered either clearly or explicitly. It will provide students to obtain more understanding and knowledge concerning the use of substitution. There is also a tendency where teaching methods related to cohesive devices is only fulfilled in a small range. The present study suggests more effective strategies to present cohesive devices, in particular substitution, in English language teaching including the teaching methods in the larger unit of the discourse. Therefore, these efforts will assist EFL students to apply appropriate cohesive devices in

composing more cohesive text in different genres.

For the extended study, it is suggested to investigate the use of cohesive devices in different texts or genres i.e. argumentative, recount, etc. This study also suggests to examine the coherence in students' texts since it primarily emphasizes on the use and the contribution of cohesive devices predominantly substitution. Therefore, it will cover not only the contribution of cohesive devices but also the contribution of transitivity, mood, and thematic structure, and also context of culture.

REFERENCES

- Akindele, D.O. (2011). Linguistics landscapes as public communication: A study of public signage in Gaborone, Botswana. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 3(1), E39.
- <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v3i1.1157>
- Alwasilah, A. C. (2009). *Pokoknya kualitatif: Dasar-dasar merancang dan melakukan penelitian kualitatif*. Jakarta: PT Dunia Pustaka Jaya.
- Brostoff, A. (1981). Coherence: "Next to" is not "connected to." *College Composition and Communication*, 32(2), 278–294.
- Butt, D., Fahey, R., Feez, S., Spinks, S., & Yallop, C. (2006). *Using functional grammar: An explorer's guide*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE Publications.

- Dunne M., Pryor J., & Yates P. (2005). *Becoming a researcher: A companion to the research process*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- Eggins, S. (1994). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. London: Pinter Publisher.
- Givon, T. (1995). Coherence in text vs. coherence in mind. In M.A. Gernsbacher & T. Givon (Eds.), *Coherence in spontaneous text* (pp. 59-115). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *Introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M.A.K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd. ed.). London: Hodder Arnold.
- Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of lexis in text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holloway, D. W. (1981). Semantic grammars: How they can help us teach writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(2), 205–218.
- Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Thompson, G. (1996). *Introducing functional grammar*. London: Arnold.