

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the researcher discusses and presents a conclusion the main findings in relation to the research questions. Furthermore, limitation, applications of the main study, and suggestions for further research are given in the final sections of this chapter.

Discussion

The main study focuses on the comparison of English and Thai cohesion in **Bangkok Post** and **Post Today** local newspapers. The results revealed that even though English and Thai cohesion are similar, the discrepancies regarding the use of cohesion between two languages can be found. It can be said that both languages, English and Thai, have their own way for employing cohesive elements in the news articles. This idea is supported by many linguists and researchers; for example, James (1980: 113), Larson (1984: 394), Wipah (1986), and Jutamad (1998: 126). They also state that every language has its own cohesive devices and own usage rules for establishing textual cohesion. In the next section, the similarities and differences of cohesion used in English and Thai will be discussed.

The Similarities of English and Thai Cohesion in English and Thai News Articles

The similarities of English and Thai cohesion in English and Thai news articles are summarized as follows:

1. In terms of the frequency of occurrences, lexical cohesion is the most prominent type of cohesion applied, while substitution is the least frequently used type among five types of cohesion in both languages.

2. The ties between cohesive elements and presupposed items were found both immediate and non-immediate ties in English and Thai news articles chosen to be analyzed. As claimed by Halliday and Hasan (1976: 339), any cohesive tie may be immediate or non-immediate. This suggests that both English and Thai cohesive elements may have no intervening sentence which makes them connect with their presupposed items immediately. Moreover, the ties of cohesive elements with their presupposed items may have a distance because there is an intervening sentence between them.

3. References within the news articles are used as anaphoric and cataphoric references. Both anaphoric and cataphoric references help in creating ties in the news articles of both languages. However, references were mostly found as anaphoric reference.

4. In each category, the use of cohesion between English and Thai is similar and different in some aspects. As previously stated, each category of English and Thai cohesion is applied similarly and differently. The differences on the use of English and Thai cohesion mainly involve the grammatical features. The differences obtained from the comparative extracts are explained in the following section.

The Differences of English and Thai Cohesion in English and Thai News Articles

Cohesion in both languages are applied for the same purpose. They are used for creating links between elements within the news articles; however, some elements of cohesion between English and Thai are applied dissimilarly. The differences of English and Thai cohesion discovered in this study are discussed as follows:

1. English and Thai references differ in terms of possessive adjective. English uses possessive adjective for showing possessiveness. There is no possessive element in Thai; therefore, the researcher found that Thai uses the structure of *thing/object* + *ของ* (khǒng : of) + *pronoun/noun* or *thing/object* + *pronoun/noun*. This confirms Higbie and Thinsan's (2002: 28) theory. They suggest that Thai must

employ the structure *thing/object* + *ของ* (khǒ:ŋ : of) + *pronoun/noun* for showing possessiveness; however, sometimes *ของ* (khǒ:ŋ : of) is optional. To put it simply, although *ของ* (khǒ:ŋ : of) is not in the structure. It still shows possessiveness in Thai. Moreover, the researcher also found that pronouns in Thai include pronominally used noun because it establishes a tie by referring to the person mentioned in the preceding or following text. As proposed by many linguists and researchers such as Wipah (1986: 41) and Somsonge (1994: 126), pronominally used noun is a referential element which can be used for referring to the person within the text. Furthermore, zero pronouns cause English and Thai structures to be distinguished. To illustrate, it is obligatory to have a subject in English sentence, while the omission of noun or noun phrase may occur at the subject or object positions in Thai sentence. However, although there is no pronoun as the subject or object in Thai sentence, it still carries cohesive effect since the information can be retrieved from the previous sentence (Wipah, p. 48; Somsonge, p. 126). In case of article *the* (demonstrative reference), it is not obligatorily marked in Thai (Amara, et al., 2003: 30), but it is a specifying agent which is used for identifying a particular individual in English (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 70-71). Due to this grammatical rule, the researcher found that *the* increases the amount of referential ties in English news articles selected to be used in this study.

2. In Thai, verbal substitution is the use of words *ทำ* (tham : do) which occurs alone. In English, according to the data, substitution is created through the word *do so*. Generally, *do* and *do so* work as verbal substitution in the same way. However, *so* has the effect of explicitness because it combines anaphora with prominence. In other words, *so* helps *do* in increasing preciseness. This suggests that the verbal element mentioned earlier is the point of information shown by *do* (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 116). McCarthy (1991: 45) also mentions that when speakers want to give prominence to the substitute item *do*, they always combine *do* with *so*. Therefore, it can be concluded that the use of verbal substitution between English and Thai is similar, though the forms of expression between two languages are different.

3. In terms of verbal ellipsis, lexical ellipsis generally occurs in English, but it does not appear in Thai. As elaborated in chapter IV (p. 94), lexical ellipsis is the omission of verb, but an auxiliary verb still remains in the sentence. This structure occurs in English, but it cannot occur in Thai. Navavan (1982: 184) mentions that in Thai, an auxiliary verb or some types of adverbs cannot occur without the main verb because it will make the sentence grammatically wrong.

Ex. 1: พรุ่งนี้^๑น้อยจะอยู่บ้าน นิดก็^๒จะ Φ

‘Noi will stay at home tomorrow. Nid also will.’

- อยู่บ้าน (jù: bâ:n : stay at home), จะ (cà? : will) Φ

(Navavan, 1982: 184)

In Example 1, the structure of the second part of the sentence is wrong because there is no verb after the auxiliary verb จะ (cà? : will) which makes the second part of the sentence not perfectly complete.

However, verb can be omitted from the sentence if there is an adverb in the sentence. As can be seen in Example 2, the verbว่ายน้ำ (wâ:j ná:m : swimming) can be omitted from the sentence since there is the adverb ด้วยไหม (dûaj châj mǎj: as well) in the second part of the sentence.

Ex. 2: ตุ่มกำลังว่ายน้ำ^๑ ตี^๒ Φ ด้วยไหม

‘Tum is swimming. Is Til as well?’

- ว่ายน้ำ (wâ:j ná:m : swimming), Φ ด้วยไหม (dûaj châj mǎj : as well):

Verbal ellipsis (lexical ellipsis)

(Navavan, 1982: 183)

As can be concluded from these grammatical rules and the data, lexical ellipsis can only be found from English news articles collected in this present study.

4. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 238) mention that conjunctive relations are not logical: paratactic or hypotactic (More information on paratactic and hypotactic on p. 115), but they are textual because a connection happens between sentences. On the contrary, conjunction in Thai, according to Wipah (1986: 167), can be used to link clauses, sentences or even paragraphs. The researcher assumes that Thai conjunction connects within the same sentence, between clauses and between sentences because it makes the news discourse to be united. The researcher agrees with the idea stated by Khampee (2002: 165). Thai sentence boundary cannot be easily identified. The element helping writers in linking each idea in the text is conjunction. Therefore, there is a wide use of conjunction appearing in the news articles used in this thesis in order to form a large unit of the news discourse.

5. Besides using the definite article as demonstrative reference, this item followed by a lexical item also provides cohesive effect in terms of lexical cohesion. It can be said that a lexical item following the definite article performs a lexical tie called repetition. It is due to the fact that a lexical item refers to the same item previously mentioned. Additionally, the item following the definite article also creates relation with other lexical relations, for example, synonymy (a sense of synonymous), hyponymy and meronymy (the same lexical environment). As stated, the definite article *the* is not a grammatical rule in Thai; therefore, there is no article helping create a lexical tie in Thai, but demonstrative reference such as ^๓นี้ (ní: : this), ^๓นั้น (nán : that) and ^๓ดังกล่าว (daŋ klà:w : as mentioned) will appear along with a lexical item where it is necessary; otherwise, the researcher thinks that readers will have to rely on the context for the interpretation.

6. The same word used more than once is called repetition; however, whether the same word is repeated or not depends on the head word.

Ex. 3: *In a message of condolence, Their Majesties the King and Queen yesterday provided wreaths and bathing water for the **funeral** ceremonies...*

*Sub-Lt Winai's body is to be placed at Wat Laemsai in Songkhla's Muang district for **funeral** rites ...*

- **funeral**: Lexical cohesion (repetition, complete repetition)

(Royal wreaths sent to marines' funeral-Bangkok Post: 23/9/05, p. 2)

In Example 3, **funeral** used with the words *ceremonies* and *rites* is repeated. It is owing to the fact that the head words *ceremonies* and *rites* have the same meaning.

With the contrary to the above example, if the head words do not give the same or similar meaning, the word used as adjective is not repeated.

Ex. 4: *A **wildlife** deal between Thailand and Kenya will benefit rather than harm exotic animals, ...*

*Thailand and Kenya signed an agreement on park and **wildlife** management on Nov 9, ...*

(PM: Deal saves animals from cull-Bangkok Post: 11/11/05, p. 3)

From my standpoint, **wildlife** used with the head words *deal* and *management* is not repeated because *deal* and *management* refer to different things. Thus, **wildlife** is not counted as a case of repetition.

From the above discussion, the differences on the use of English and Thai grammatical features can be summarized in the following table.

Table 5.1 The differences in terms of grammatical features

Grammatical Features	English	Thai
1. Possessive Adjective	There is the use of possessive adjective (i.e. his, her, its) for carrying cohesive effect.	Thai can show possessiveness by employing the structure <i>thing/object</i> + <i>ของ</i> (khǒng : of) + <i>pronoun/noun</i>
2. Pronominally Used Noun	English uses personal pronouns and possessive adjectives as referential items	Besides using personal pronouns, Thai also uses pronominally used nouns for referring to someone within the text.
3. Zero Pronoun	It is obligatory to have a subject in English sentence structure.	Subject and/or object can be omitted from the Thai sentence.
4. Definite Article 'The'	Definite article 'the' is used to establish demonstrative reference and it also creates lexical ties.	Definite article 'the' is not a grammatical element in Thai.
5. Verbal Substitution	<i>Do so</i> is used as a substituted item in which <i>so</i> helps <i>do</i> in increasing preciseness.	Only the term <i>ทำ</i> (tham : do) occurs alone.

Table 5.1 (Continued)

Grammatical Features	English	Thai
6. Lexical Ellipsis	The main verb can be omitted; while auxiliary verb still remains the sentence.	An auxiliary verb or some types of adverbs cannot occur without the main verb.
7. Conjunction	The connections of English conjunctions occur between sentences and between paragraphs.	The connections of Thai conjunctions are not limited only between sentences and between paragraphs, but they also occur between clauses and within the same sentence.

Limitation of the Main Study

This present study has the following limitation.

According to Shlesinger (1996), in any text, there is the use of cohesive devices linking various parts of the text together. The cohesive ties enable the message receiver to process the text in a coherent way. This research was conducted on a limited source of data, twenty pieces of news articles of English and Thai. As a result, the findings and conclusion from this research cannot be generalized to all kind of written text including news articles. Nevertheless, the findings may reveal some interesting outcomes which may be applied in any kind of written texts.

Applications of the Main Study

The results of this study reveal many interesting points which can possibly be directly applied in two main areas.

Application for Pedagogical Remediation

The findings of this present study indicate the roles of cohesion in English and Thai news articles; therefore, they can be used as a guideline for language teaching, especially reading and writing in order to reduce the problems of cohesive errors. Clearly, many researchers have studied on cohesion in English used by Second Language (L2) learners. The results showed that L2 learners produce errors on the use of English cohesion. For example, Lee (2003) mentions that certain writing problems of ESL/ English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students are caused by the inadequate understanding of English discourse. Furthermore, ESL/EFL students share the same problems of cohesion in their writing. Their problems include the lack of connector varieties, inappropriate use of connectors, long distance between cohesive ties in a chain, and uncertain inference ties. It might be due to the fact that English is not their native language. According to Shu-min (1993), English as a Specific/Special Purposes (ESP) students have a limited knowledge of the TL. She also further states that when composing the text in English, students do not create the text, but they translate their thoughts word by word from their native language into English, often with the results of being grammatically wrong. This is due to the fact that there is a cultural interference due to the differences in their native language and the TL. This idea can also be supported by Ting (2003). She claims that how L2 learners produced cohesive errors may be caused by the lack of cohesive knowledge. Additionally, it may be influenced by the nature and the culture of their first language.

In terms of cohesion between English and Thai, the differences in cohesion between these languages may lead the difficulties for L2 learners. In case of English and Thai cohesion, the differences are generally caused by grammatical features. The awareness of the differences in the use of cohesion between two languages could help

learners in improving their writing abilities and overcoming mistakes in composition of the text. For example, they will be able to use an item to replace another in the same grammatical slot or use different lexes which are in the same lexical field in order to avoid repetition.

As for a reading comprehension, different readers get different amounts of meaning from the same text. To develop readers to be efficient in reading is a major task of an EFL reading course (Mei-yun, 1993). Furthermore, Hoey (1991: 222, cited in Jutamad, 1998: 127) asserts that “a reader has freedom to recognize or ignore individual linkage of sentences”. The differences in grammatical features between two languages and ignorance of individual linkage may pose and produce cohesive errors among learners. It could be said that teachers should raise learners’ awareness on certain points of cohesion which should not be ignored since these could help learners in interpretation of the text. Mei-yun mentions that in order to increase readers’ reading ability, teachers can help readers by showing them how to use cohesive devices as the signposts because these items are markers indicating what they should pay attention to, and key words important for the minimum use of visual information.

Application for Translation Process

Translation is a process of rendering written language produced in the SL into the TL (Richards and Schmidt, 2002: 563). According to Wikipedia (2006c), the goal of translation is to establish a relationship of equivalence between texts of the SL and the TL to ensure both languages provide the same message, and at the same time, translators have to take some constraints into account including the grammatical rules of the SL. Canadian Bible Society (2006) also states that the goal of translation is to convey the same message found in the source text with a new language. Different languages differ greatly in their structures; therefore, the message forms presented in the TL must be adjusted in order to maintain the same meaning as the message presented in the SL. In case of cohesion, the nature and numbers of cohesive ties would differ from the SL to the TL. Some languages prefer grammatical cohesion to

lexical cohesion while the others prefer lexical cohesion to grammatical cohesion. Some shifts are obligatory while the others are optional. As a result, it is very common to find cohesion shifts at any point in translation (Haribandi, 2005; Kirk, 2005).

The findings of this main study revealed the similarities and differences of cohesion used between English and Thai. These similarities and differences should be taken into consideration when translators deal with a translation task. The researcher believes that original information of either the First Language (L1) or L2 text may be distorted if translators are not aware of the differences of cohesion used between two languages. Moreover, Baker (1992: 190, cited in Querol, 2004) mentions that “every language has its own devices for establishing cohesive links. Language and text-type preferences must both be taken into consideration in the process of translation.” Translators should use the devices which are appropriate to the translated text rather than use the same device as the original one. As Larson (1984: 394) pinpointed, if translators translated one-for-one from the SL, the meaning intended by the original author may be distorted. Therefore, they should be aware of the differences in the use of cohesive devices between two languages and look for appropriate devices for use in the translation. As a consequence, they will be able to render the message from the SL to the TL properly.

Contribution of the Study

1. This present study presents the findings of how English and Thai cohesion are used in the written text, news articles and also gives the information on their similarities and differences.

2. The researcher believes that this study may provide a tool for teachers to identify some problems of cohesion in which learners may produce in a process of composing both English and Thai texts.

3. The results of this study can provide a useful source of information for learners; hence, they can use the information clarified in this study when they have to deal with writing, reading and/or translation tasks.

Suggestions for Further Studies

1. From twenty news articles of English and Thai, the researcher found that no instance of nominal substitution, e.g. *one/ones* appears in Thai news articles. In addition, there is no instance of clausal substitution, e.g. *so, not* in English news articles. Besides, the use of verbal ellipsis can only be found in English news articles. Therefore, the similarities and differences cannot be discovered between English and Thai cohesion in terms of nominal and clausal substitutions and verbal ellipsis. Hence, the research suggests that future studies should be conducted on these areas in order to find out how they are used as well as their similarities and differences.

2. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 238) state that conjunction leads cohesive effect only between sentences, as can be shown in Example 5.

Ex. 5: *We're having guests to night. So don't be late.*

- **So**: (Causal-general, simple) in the second sentence provides the result of the first sentence.

(Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 321)

However, this theory contradicts that of many famous linguists. Sanford (1979: 59) and Richards and Schmidt (2002: 107) previously state that conjunction can be used as the connector joining words, phrases or clauses together. There are two types of conjunction, coordinators (join linguistic units which are in the same rank) and subordinators (join linguistic units which are not equal in value). Therefore, these could raise another point for further study in the case that whether coordinating and

subordinating conjunctions can act as cohesive elements which help L1 and L2 texts develop coherently.

3. Reah (1998: 106) asserts that when comparing news articles with other kinds of written texts, the stories of news articles are found to follow the language patterns which are common with narrative, they normally refer to as stories. As the researcher conducted the research only on the news articles which is only one mode of writing; narrative (Richards and Schmidt, 2002: 337), the comparison of English and Thai cohesion used in other modes of writing, e.g. descriptive, expository and argumentative writings could be other interesting areas for carrying out additional investigations. The researcher believes that the outcomes possibly suggest other interesting results concerning various modes of writing between English and Thai.

In conclusion, the suggestions above are some interesting areas for further investigation. The results of these studies could reveal other salient issues on cohesion in English and Thai languages. These studies could help people and/or educators gain more cohesive knowledge which may be similar or different from this present study.