

A Study of the Use of Grammatical Cohesive Devices  
in *Sawasdee* Magazine Articles and Their Thai Translations

วริษฐา ศรีช่วย<sup>1</sup> และสุจรรยา วิลาวรรณ<sup>2</sup>  
Warittha Srichuay<sup>1</sup> and Sujunya Wilawan<sup>2</sup>

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อศึกษาประเภทของลักษณะวจนะสัมพันธ์ (cohesion) ในรูปแบบการเชื่อมโยงโครงสร้างทางไวยากรณ์ (grammatical cohesion) และศึกษาเปรียบเทียบความเหมือนและความต่างของการใช้ตัวเชื่อมโยงความในบทความภาษาอังกฤษและภาษาไทย กลุ่มตัวอย่างที่ใช้ในการศึกษานี้ คือ บทความภาษาอังกฤษและบทแปลภาษาไทยจากนิตยสาร สวัสดิ์ ตามวิธีการของ Halliday and Hasan (1976) ผู้วิจัยใช้โปรแกรม Microsoft Excel 2010 วิเคราะห์ข้อมูลอัตราความถี่ (ร้อยละ) ของประเภทรูปแบบการเชื่อมโยงโครงสร้างทางไวยากรณ์แต่ละประเภท และนำมาศึกษาเปรียบเทียบลักษณะการใช้ตัวเชื่อมโยงความทั้งในบทความภาษาอังกฤษและบทแปลภาษาไทยเพื่อให้เห็นถึงความเหมือนและความต่าง

ผลการวิจัยพบว่า บทความภาษาอังกฤษใช้การเชื่อมโยงความโดยการอ้างถึง (reference) มากที่สุด และ บทแปลภาษาไทยมีอัตราความถี่การใช้การเชื่อมโยงความโดยการใช้คำเชื่อม (conjunction) ปรากฏมากที่สุด ขณะที่มีการใช้หน่วยแทน (substitution) น้อยที่สุดทั้งในบทความภาษาอังกฤษและบทแปลภาษาไทย เมื่อเปรียบเทียบการเชื่อมโยงโครงสร้างไวยากรณ์ทั้งบทความภาษาอังกฤษและบทแปลภาษาไทย พบว่า มีทั้งความเหมือนและความต่างอันเป็นผลมาจากความต่างทางด้านไวยากรณ์

คำสำคัญ : วจนะสัมพันธ์, การเชื่อมโยงโครงสร้างทางไวยากรณ์, การแปล

ABSTRACT

The study aims to explore the types of English and Thai grammatical cohesive devices and analyze the similarities and differences between English and Thai grammatical cohesive devices used in the articles. Ten English articles and their Thai translations from *Sawasdee* in-flight magazine were analyzed by using Halliday and Hasan's (1976) framework of cohesion. All the identified grammatical cohesive devices in the sample texts were categorized and the occurrence frequencies of the grammatical cohesive devices were calculated by Microsoft Excel 2010 program. The similarities and differences between English and Thai grammatical cohesive devices were analyzed.

The findings reveal that reference is the most common used cohesive device in English texts, and conjunction is the most preferable grammatical cohesive device in Thai, while substitution is least frequently used among the four types of grammatical cohesion in both languages. Both English texts and Thai texts share both similarities and differences in some aspects due to the effect of grammatical features.

**Keywords:** cohesion, grammatical cohesive devices, translation

<sup>1</sup> Graduate student in English for Specific Purpose Program, Graduate School, Kasetsart University

<sup>2</sup> Asst. Prof. Ph.D. Lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Humanities, Kasetsart University

## Introduction

Humans have communicated their expression, information, and news and conveyed their ideas and feelings to other people through their languages. In general, this basic communication is not based on words or isolated sentences, but we normally communicate in a *discourse*.

The term *discourse* is the sequence of sentences or utterances which seems to *hang together* (Crystal, 1992; Nunan, 1993, cited in Kohkeaw, 1998). As Crystal claims, a text must be organized in order to create a coherent discourse. This organization can be achieved through what we called *Discourse Forming Devices* or *Cohesion*.

Every language has its own particular cohesive devices for creating links between textual elements. As James (1980: 190) states, “while every language has at its disposal a set of devices for maintaining textual cohesion, different languages have preferences for certain of these devices and neglect certain others.” In a descriptive approach to translation, one major concern is to identify these kinds of linguistic knowledge that are used by the translator in both the Source Languages (SL) and Target Languages (TL) (Bell, 1991, cited in Silveira, 2007). Translators should be aware of the differences of cohesion devices between two different languages and they should look for cohesive items which are appropriate for TL. If the translators used the functions of the cohesive devices appropriately, the readers will understand what the translators need to convey (Callow, 1974 cited in Baker, 1992). “Without cohesion, the semantic system cannot be effectively activated at all” (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 27). For this reason, the topic of cohesion has always appeared to be the most useful constituent of discourse analysis or text linguistics applicable to translation (Newmark, 1987, cited in Rahimi, 2012).

Halliday and Hasan (1976) have divided cohesion into grammatical and lexical cohesive devices. This study however, focuses on grammatical cohesion. It includes reference,

substitution, ellipsis and conjunction. Grammatical cohesion is a surface relation connecting two adjacent text units together. It presupposes that all the individual parts of a sentence are linked together and thus, they contribute to the construction of a text. Grammatical cohesive relations established by various ties across sentences help the readers to perceive the meaning of individual sentences presented as a single entity – textual meaning. What makes it possible for readers to understand textual meaning is the continuity of semantic relationships that is described as a necessary element in the interpretation of text (Halliday and Hasan, 1976 cited in Tsareva, 2010). With reference to this, it is interesting to study the types of grammatical cohesive relations that are displayed in English and Thai texts.

Based on cohesion theory proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976), this present study was designed to explore the types of English and Thai grammatical cohesive devices and to analyze the similarities and differences between English and Thai grammatical cohesive devices used in English articles and their Thai translations from *Sawasdeein-flight* magazine.

## Theoretical Description

### Text, Texture, Ties, and Cohesion.

Halliday (1978) cited in Akindele (2011) notes that we cannot discuss cohesion without mentioning *text*, *texture*, and *tie*. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), the word *text* is used in linguistics to refer to any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that forms a unified whole. They further claim that a text is a unit of language in use. It is not a grammatical unit, like a clause or a sentence; and it is not defined by its size. To achieve this, it is necessary to know what makes text coherent in order to create a text as a unified whole.

A text has *texture*, and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text. It derives this texture from the fact that it functions as

a unity with respect to its environment. A text without texture would be a group of unrelated sentences.

Besides, the most important feature of texture is the cohesive relation called *a tie*. The concept of *tie* makes it possible to analyze a text in terms of its cohesive properties and gives a systematic account of its patterns of texture. Akindele (2011: 101) further stated that *tie* can further show the relationship between cohesion and organization of written text into sentences and paragraphs. However, cohesion occurs in texts where the interpretation of some elements in the discourse is dependent on that of another.

#### Cohesion in English

Cohesion was widely introduced to linguists, many researchers have different understandings of cohesion; for example, Baker (1992: 190) regards cohesion as a surface relation. "It connects together the actual words and expressions that we can see or hear". Likewise, Carter (1987:72) cited in Silveira (2007) defines cohesion as "the term that embraces the means by which texts are linguistically connected." Bell (1991: 155) places cohesion within the seven standards of textual function making use of formal surface feature (syntax and lexis) to interact with underlying semantic relations or underlying functional coherence to create textual unity.

There are many definitions of cohesion given by different linguists. Cohesion is a visible connector which is used to link and relate between two clauses or sentences in a text. However, the most extensive and comprehensive description of cohesion is from the publication of *Cohesion in English* in 1976 presented by Halliday and Hasan which marked the establishment of the cohesion theory, to the present day.

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976: 4), the concept of cohesion is a semantic one; it refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that defines it as a text.

"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 set up, and two elements, the presupposing and presupposed, are thereby at least potentially integrated into a text."

There are two different types of cohesive relations: grammatical and lexical cohesion. Reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction are the various types of grammatical cohesion. Lexical cohesion is realized through repetition of lexical items, synonyms, superordinates and general words. Table 1 presents the division of the types of cohesion (based on Halliday and Hasan, 1976).

Cohesion			
Grammatical Cohesion			Lexical Cohesion
Reference	Exophoric [situational]		Reiteration
	Endophoric [textual]		
	Anaphoric [to preceding text]	Cataphoric [to following Text]	
Substitution			General word
Ellipsis			Collocation
Conjunction			

Table 1 Types of Cohesion

Source: Adapted from Tsareva (2010: 10)

## Principles of Grammatical Cohesion

### Reference

Reference is traditionally used in semantics for relationship between a word and what it points to in the real world: the identity of the particular thing or class of things that is being referred to. In general, there are three types of reference: personal, demonstrative, and comparative. (1) Personal reference is reference by means of function in the speech situation, through the category of person (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). The category of reference includes the three classes of personal pronouns like “*he, him, she, her*”, etc. , possessive determiners (usually called possessive adjectives) and possessive pronouns like “*mine, yours, his, hers*”, etc. (Ahmed, 2008).

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

(Baker, 1992: 181)

Demonstrative reference is reference by means of location, on a scale of proximity (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). Chalker (1987) mentions that demonstrative reference is essentially a form of verbal pointing like “*this, these, that, those, here, there, then, and the*” as exemplified in (2) (Baker, 1992: 182).

(2) Mrs. Thatcher visited *Tokyo* last week. This city impressed her.

And (3) Comparative reference is an indirect reference by means of identity or similarity (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). The system of comparative reference differs from the first two types of reference as it is not based on identity of reference. The interpretation of this type of reference depends on the comparison of two items which usually involves identity, similarity and difference as well as numerical and qualitative comparisons (Puprasert, 2007) like “*same, equal, similar, different, else, better, more*”, etc. and adverbs like “*so, such, similarly, otherwise, so, more*”, etc.

(3) It is the same cat as the one we saw yesterday.

(Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 78)

### Substitution

Substitution is the replacement of one item by another (or item). It is grammatical relation rather than semantic relation. There are three types of substitution: nominal, verbal, and clausal. (4) Nominal ellipsis is the substitution of a noun or noun group. The substitutes *one/ones* and *the same* always functions as head of a nominal group (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 91).

(4) *My axe* is too blunt. I must get a shaper one. (*One* replaces *axe*)

(Baker, 1992: 187)

*One* and *ones* presuppose nouns which function as head in the nominal group; while *the same* can substitute the whole nominal group including modifying elements. In (5) verbal substitution, the most commonsubstitute is the verb *do* and is sometimes used in conjunction with *so* in *do so* and substitute verbs.

(5) You think Joan already *knows*? – I think everybody does.

(Baker, 1992: 187)

In English, The terms *do/does, did, doing* and *done* operate as head of a verbal group in the place that is occupied by lexical verbs (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 112).

Clausal substitution is the replacement of a noun by another clausal item in a sentence. The words used as clausal substitutes are *so* and *notas* exemplified in (6) (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 130).

(6) Is there *going to be an earthquake*? – It says so.

### Ellipsis

According to Bloor and Bloor (1995: 96), substitution and ellipsis is used when “a speaker or writer wishes to avoid the repetition of a lexical item and is able to draw on one of the grammatical resources of the language to replace the item”. Though substitution and ellipsis are similar in their functions as the linguistic link for cohesion, ellipsis differs in that it is “substitution by zero”. (p. 142). Ellipsis involves the omission of an item. In other words, in ellipsis, an item is replaced by nothing. Baker (1992) states that ellipsis does not include every instance, in which the hearer or reader has to supply missing information, but only those cases where the grammatical structure itself points to an item or items that can fill the slot in question. As it is a structural link, ellipsis operates through nominal, verbal and clausal levels. For nominal ellipsis, Halliday and Hasan (1976) further classify ellipsis in systemic linguistic terminology as *deictic, numerative, epithet, classifier, and qualifier*. Some examples are shown in (7) and (8).

(7) Three *members* of staff went there and yet another three.

(Akindele, 2011: 102)

(8) These *apples* are delicious. Let's buy some.

(Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 159)

According to example (7), *another three* presupposes the noun *members* (*another* is a post-deictic). By the way, *some* in Example (8) presupposes the noun *apples* (*some* is a numerative).

### Conjunction

Conjunction is the last type of grammatical cohesive relation which Halliday and Hasan (1976: 238) describe. They claim that conjunction leads cohesive effect only between sentences. Conjunction is rather different in nature from the other cohesive relations. “Conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue

of specific meanings; they are not primarily devices for reaching out into preceding (following) text, but they express certain meaning which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse.” Therefore, among four types of grammatical cohesive devices within text, conjunction is the least directly identifiable relation (Crane, 2010: 135). Conjunction acts as a semantic cohesive tie within text in five categories: additive, adversative, causal, temporal and continuative. Additive conjunction (9) acts to structurally coordinate or link by adding to the presupposed item and is signaled through *and, also, too, furthermore, additionally*, etc. Additive conjunction may also act to negate the presupposed item and is signaled by *nor, and...not, either, neither*, etc.

(9) For the whole day he climbed up the steep mountainside, almost without stopping. And in all this time he met no one.

(Ketabi, 2012: 364)

Adversative conjunctions (10) act to indicate “contrary to expectation” (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 250) and are signaled by *yet, though, only, but, in fact, rather*, etc.

(10) All the figures were correct; they had been checked. Yet the total came out wrong.

(Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 250)

Causal conjunction (11) expresses “result, reason and purpose” and is signaled by *so, then, for, consequently, because, for this reason, as a result, in this respect*, etc.

(11) He was insensitive to the group's needs. Consequently there was a lot of bad feeling.

(McCarthy, 1991: 47)

Temporal conjunction (12) gives a sequence in time: one is subsequent to the other.

Some sample temporalconjunctive signals are *then, next, after that, next day, until then, at the same time, at this point*, etc.

(12) "It is always happens" said the Gnat.  
After this, Alice was silent for a minute or two, pondering.

(Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 261)

The last conjunctive category is continuative conjunction(13) which expresses continuity from one sentence to another sentence in a context. Continuative conjunction includes *now, of course, well, surely* and *after all*.

(13)They will think you are serious. Nobody could be so stupid as to think that, surely.

(Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 270)

Due to previous researches investigating how cohesion was used in Thai texts; between English and other languages or between English and its translation into another languages, every language has its own battery of certain cohesive devices for creating links between textual elements and there are different devices in different languages for achieving cohesive effects. For example, some of those studies were from Puprasert (2007)'s work, *A Comparative Study of English and Thai Cohesion in News Articles*, examined how English and Thai cohesive devices have been used in news articles, and Noonkhan (2003)'s work, *Cohesion Shifts in Translation: A Comparative Study Between Thai and English*, compared the frequency of cohesion used in five Thai written texts and their five English translated texts from *Kinaree* magazines, and gave explanations of the cohesion shift. Both Puprasert (2007) and Noonkhan (2003) revealed the same results that lexical cohesion was the most prominent type of cohesion applied, while substitution was the least frequently used type among five types of cohesion in both languages; however, in each category, the use of cohesion between English and Thai was similar and different

in only some aspects. In contrast to Theppreeda (1998)'s study, she selected three English and Thai short stories by following the practical method of cohesion proposed by Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model. The result of this comparative study revealed that reference was the most preferable cohesive device used by both English and Thai writers. According to the result, the researcher explained that its own natural characteristics of each language could make a difference in the use of cohesion.

In addition to the fact that every language has its own devices for establishing cohesive links (Baker, 1992). There are also specific preferences for certain cohesive devices that are sensitive to text types. Different genres and registers are characterized by particular kinds of cohesive devices and may make different uses of those cohesive devices. For example, it is much less likely for reference, substitution and ellipsis to occur in texts such as legal texts, while lexical cohesion is generally considered for scientific and technical texts.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) and other scholars mainly use literary texts in their study. For the specific preferences for certain cohesive devices in literary texts have also attracted attention of another group of researchers (Chanawangsa, 1986; Kohkeaw, 2003; Vyšniauskiene, 2010; Zhao et al., 2009). Chanawangsa (1986) focused on cohesive devices in different literary texts. Similarly, Vyšniauskiene (2010) mainly studied cohesive devices in the opening paragraphs from short stories. Zhao et al. (2009) examined cohesive devices in English medical texts and their Chinese translations in textbooks. Nevertheless, the study of cohesive devices in literary texts still needs further investigation.

Another influential kind of literary works is in-flight magazine which are typically magazines designed for the entertainment of airline passengers. According to Small et al. (2008), cited in Pathumratanathan (2012), the common roles of in-flight magazines are to cement the airline in the eyes of travelers as a national carrier, a vital public

service, critical to national infrastructure and even a national treasure. *Sawasdee* is a Thai monthly in-flight travelled magazine published in Bangkok. It is a very well-known magazine because the magazine represents Thailand's high standard airline namely *Thai Airways International Public Company Limited*; hence, both Thais and foreigners are familiar with *Sawasdee* magazine.

Tourism text is another type which has not been much investigated. Although this research may reveal some similar results compared to the related studies, the present study is expected to reveal some additional findings of grammatical cohesive devices employed in English and Thai texts.

**Methodology**

**Sample**

Twenty articles; ten English articles and ten Thai translated articles, were collected and used for

analyzing English and Thai grammatical cohesive devices. All articles were purposively selected by considering to the consistency between English articles and their Thai translations.

**Method**

Halliday and Hasan define four types of grammatical cohesive devices in their book *Cohesion in English* (1976), which are reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. In this present study, all grammatical cohesive devices in English articles and their Thai translation from *Sawasdee* magazine were identified based on their classifications.

As mentioned, there were four types of grammatical cohesive devices: reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. Halliday and Hasan propose a coding scheme (1976: 333-339) which the researcher adapted to categorize the grammatical elements and coded them as shown in Table 2.

**Table 2** Coding scheme of grammatical cohesive devices

Reference	Personals	Demonstratives	Comparatives		
R	R1	R2	R3		
Substitution	Nominal	Verbal	Clausal		
S	S1	S2	S3		
Ellipsis	Nominal	Verbal	Clausal		
E	E1	E2	E3		
Conjunction	Additive	Adversative	Causal	Temporal	Continuative
C	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5

Source: Adapted from Ketabi (2012: 367)

After the screened samples from both English and Thai texts were categorized and coded for every single use of grammatical cohesive devices. Each type of grammatical element found was counted, and the percentage of each type of grammatical cohesive device was calculated by applying the Microsoft Excel 2010 program for this study because this program is systematic (Linoff, 2008).

In order to examine the differences and similarities between English and Thai grammatical

cohesive devices found in the articles, contrastive linguistics was applied to investigate the differences in the use of cohesive devices between English and Thai in the selected *Sawasdee* articles. In this process, the researcher compared and contrasted cohesive items used between the two languages in order to see their f and how they have been used in the context. By doing this, the researcher compared the pairs of English and Thai grammatical cohesion by analyzing the translation of those cohesive devices which appeared in the texts in order

to explore the similarities and differences between English and Thai.

In order to ensure the reliability of the results, in this study, intra-rater reliability was used to ensure the reliability of the result. It is used to assess the consistency of a measure from one time to another. In other words, a coder categorizes the same content on a later occasion and the coding outcomes are similar to how he or she coded it on an earlier occasion. According to Krippendorf (2004: 406 cited in Whitley & Kite, 2012), it is also important that a coder or rater has the ability to understand the concept of content coding and the coding system itself. In this regard, the researcher, as a graduate student majoring in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) at Kasetsart University, is considered as having appropriate qualifications for the position of coder.

In order to improve the intra-rater reliability, the researcher conducted data analyses on two different occasions. The first analysis was done in December, 2014; the researcher coded a set of content into categories. In the second

analysis which was performed in March, 2015, the researcher randomly selected 30% of the data from both English and Thai articles and coded them once again. Gwet (2014) contends that the intra-rater reliability can be calculated using the formula for estimating the inter-rater reliability.

In the process of calculation, the number of agreements was divided by the total number of agreements and disagreements, then multiplied by 100. 30% of the data from both English and Thai articles was calculated for intra-coder reliability on both occasions. The total number of agreements and disagreements was 816. And the number of agreements of both occasions was 788. The intra-rater reliability of this study was 96.5 %, which could be interpreted as almost perfect agreement (Miles and Huberman, 1994).

#### Findings and Discussion

##### Comparison of overall grammatical cohesive devices in English and Thai from *Sawasdee* magazine

**Table 3** Frequency and percentage of four types of grammatical cohesive devices

Corpus	English	Thai
Cohesive devices	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)
Reference	391 (57%)	325 (30%)
Substitution	15 (2.18%)	13 (1.2%)
Ellipsis	66 (9.6%)	64 (5.9%)
Conjunction	216 (31.4%)	683 (63%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>688</b>	<b>1,085</b>

As shown in Table 3, the results revealed that the total count of English grammatical cohesive devices was 688. The frequencies of different types of grammatical cohesive devices are as follows; reference, 391 (57%), conjunction, 216 (31.4%), ellipsis, 66 (9.6%) and substitution, 15 (2.18%). The total frequency of Thai cohesive devices found in the ten Thai translated texts was 1,085. The

frequencies of different types of Thai grammatical cohesive devices are as follows; conjunctions, 683 (63%), references, 325 (30%), ellipses, 64 (5.9%), and substitutions, 13 (1.2%) respectively. According to the data, it can be said that the reference type was the most frequently used in English articles and conjunction was the most preferred cohesive type in Thai articles.

As mentioned, reference and conjunction are consistently the two frequently used devices in the parallel corpus. The distribution of grammatical cohesive devices manifested some similarities in the preference of grammatical cohesive types. By the way, among four kinds of grammatical cohesion, substitution and ellipsis were used least in both English and Thai articles. The reason is that only written material has been analyzed in this study. As Thompson notes (2004: 184) cited in Tsareva (2010: 99), "ellipsis is typically more fully exploited in speech than in writing". Moreover, the number of articles has been restricted. Thompson (1996) also regards

substitution as a kind of ellipsis whereas Halliday (1994/2004) treats ellipsis as a special type of substitution.

#### Comparison of reference devices in English and Thai

As a prominent cohesive device, reference can be divided into three subcategories; personals, demonstratives, and comparatives. Table 4 illustrated the occurrence frequencies and percentages of the three referential subcategories in English and Thai texts.

Table 4 Frequency and percentage of subcategories of references

Corpus	English	Thai
Cohesive devices	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)
Personals	204 (52.2%)	70 (21.5%)
Demonstratives	181 (46.3%)	237 (73%)
Comparatives	6 (1%)	18 (5.5%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>391</b>	<b>325</b>

According to Table 4, three types of reference (personals, demonstratives and comparatives) were used in both English and Thai articles. The most frequently used type in English articles was personal reference (52.2%). The most frequently used type in Thai articles was demonstrative reference (73%).

In the types of reference, it is important to discuss personal and demonstrative references because there are some features causing English and Thai to be different in some aspects. Both English and Thai writers use some types of references in different ways. First, in term of showing possessiveness, possessiveness in English is expressed through *his*, *her*, *its*, and *their* (possessive adjectives), *his*, *hers*, *its*, and *theirs* (possessive pronouns). However, Thai does not have any possessive elements to show their possessiveness as English does. According to the results, the researcher agrees with Puprasert (2007)

and Higbie and Thinsan (2002) who mention the difference of English and Thai possession. When Thai writers want to show that someone possesses something, the thing's owner will be put after the object, and *ของ* (of) is located between two words (the object and the owner) as demonstrated in Example (14).

(14) Its origins are explained at the Museum of Africa, while the period of the gold discoveries is the subject of the themed Golden Reef City.

Translation: จุดกำเนิดของเมืองนี้บรรยายไว้ที่พิพิธภัณฑ์แห่งแอฟริกา ในขณะที่ยุคการค้นพบทองจะจัดแสดงที่ Golden Reef City

They further state that Thai possession is normally created through the word of *ของ* (of). With reference to these studies, *ของ* (of) plays an important role in

order to show the possessiveness in Thai. In and Thai possessive structures to be: conclusion, the researcher found the use of English

**English:** Noun's thing/object or thing/object + of + pronoun/noun

OR

The Possessive adjective + Thing/object

**Thai:** Thing/object + ของ (of) (optional) + pronoun/noun or thing/object + pronoun/noun

**Figure 1** English and Thai possessive structures

Second, pronominally used nouns are found, including personal name, nickname, kinship term, occupational term and social status (Chanawangsa, 1986; Burusphat, 1994). This is another special feature in the Thai language which does not exist in English causing difference between English and Thai personal pronouns. This feature forms a cohesive link by referring to the same person mentioned in the foregoing sentence or in the following sentence. Cooke (1965: 13) state that pronominally used form and meaning or pronominal forms include personal pronouns (I love you: ผมรักคุณ – man speaking to woman), kintype nouns (mother loves child: แม่รักลูก – mother speaking to child) and name nouns (Jane loves Dan: เจนรักแดน – older girl named Jane speaking to little boy named Dan), while English personal pronouns include only three classes of personal pronouns, possessive determiners (possessive adjectives), and possessive pronouns.

Another special referential type which causes English and Thai structures to be different is the zero pronoun. The zero pronoun is a type of personal reference in which the subject in Thai texts is frequently omitted; by the way, ellipses were used instead as shown in Example (15).

(15) *Johannesburg* is already connected in this way with Tambo OR International Airports, and the link will later be extended to Pretoria, Durban and Cape Town.

There will be 350 special buses in operation, and **it** is also planned to create a citywide broadband network.

**Translation:** โจฮันเนสเบิร์กมีเส้นทางเชื่อมกับ สนามบินนานาชาติ Tambo OR แล้ว และจะขยายเส้นทาง เชื่อมไปยัง Pretoria, Durban และ Cape Town ต่อไป

โดยจะมีรถประจำทางพิเศษ 350 คันให้บริการ นอกจากนี้ (...)ยังมีการวางแผนสร้างเครือข่ายบอร์ดแบนทั่วทั้งเมือง

Example (15) illustrates that after the first subject *โจฮันเนสเบิร์ก (Johannesburg)* identified in Thai, it has been omitted while the subject — *Johannesburg* — in the English version can be found in the form of the pronoun reference **it**. Example (15) reveals cohesion shifts from nominal ellipses to pronoun references. In Thai, the subsequent subject of *Johannesburg* is deleted; it can be said that pronouns are omitted while in the English version the pronoun **it** is used to refer to *Johannesburg*. In short, there is a discrepancy of using ellipses between the two languages. In the Thai text, the first subject is identified. After that, the subject pronouns are omitted. Although the pronoun is usually omitted, the readers still understand the context by retrieving information from the previous sentence. These major differences are confirmed by many Thai researchers' findings (Chanawangsa, 1986; Kohkaew, 2003; Theppreeda, 1998; Noonkhan 2003, Puprasert, 2007) which reveal that zero pronouns establish a cohesive effect when references have been

previously mentioned or can be inferred from the text.

Finally, English predominantly uses *the*s demonstrative reference in order to specify definiteness when the same noun is mentioned again. *The* is used to identify a particular individual or subclass within the class designated by the noun. For Halliday and Hasan (1976:71), *the* merely indicates that the item in question is specific and identifiable that somewhere the information necessary for identifying it is recoverable. In the present study, the researcher found that *the* increases the number of referential ties in English articles.

However, *the* does not exist in Thai. When Thai writers want to show the definiteness of nouns, it can be done by combining a lexical item with selective demonstratives นี้ (this), นั้น (that), เหล่านี้ (these), เหล่านั้น (those) and ที่นี่ (here) or ดังกล่าว (as mentioned); for example, ผู้หญิงคนนี้ (this woman), บ้านหลังนั้น (That house), สุนัขเหล่านี้ (these dogs), โต๊ะเหล่านั้น (those tables) etc. This combination becomes a noun phrase. The use of *the* in different languages causes the different occurrence of demonstrative reference as supported by Ahmed (2008) and Zhao, Yan, and Zhou’s (2009) studies. The absence of the definite article *the* also contributes to the difference of demonstrative references between English and Chinese. *The* is limited to the structure type, unlike the selective demonstratives (this, these and here).

The reason is that *the* can never refer forward cohesively and it can only refer to a modifying element within the same nominal group as itself. It could be a challenge for the translator to translate this type of cohesive device while maintaining the same meaning of the original text.

A connection of the use of personal and demonstrative references can be obtained by Larson (1998). He points out that “it is quite common in English to introduce a new participant with a noun phrase and then refer to this participant by a pronoun throughout the rest of the paragraph”. However, this is not the case in Chinese and Thai where personal or demonstrative pronouns are often omitted or substituted by a noun phrase that the pronoun presupposes.

#### Comparison of conjunction devices in English and Thai

As seen in Table 5, the total number of Thai conjunctions is dramatically higher than those in English articles in all categories. As for the type of conjunction used in the articles collected, the researcher found five types of conjunctions applied in both English and Thai articles; additive, adversative, causal, temporal and continuative conjunctions. However, continuative conjunctions were rarely found in English, but this type of conjunction seems to be utilized in Thai.

Table 5 Frequency and percentage of subcategories of conjunctions

Corpus	English	Thai
Cohesive devices	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)
Additive	94 (43.5%)	214 (31.3%)
Adversative	43 (19.9%)	83 (12.2%)
Causal	18 (8.3%)	93 (13.6%)
Temporal	59 (27.3%)	84 (12.3%)
Continuative	2 (0.9%)	209 (30.6%)
Total	216	683

According to the results, Thai language tends to use conjunctions more often than English language does, especially the additive (และ or and). However, this occurrence of the use of conjunctions was not only found in the researcher's data, but this result was also consistent with the other studies (Theppreeda, 1998; Noonkhan, 2003; Kohkeaw, 2003; Puprasert, 2007 and Petchprasert, 2011). According to the number of conjunctions used by both English and Thai writers, these studies revealed that Thai uses a greater number of conjunctions compared to English. As can be seen, the redundancy of conjunctions was found, but this does not occur in English. The data of the present study showed that the connection of Thai conjunctions is not limited only between sentences and between paragraphs, but they also occur between clauses and within the same sentence, especially continuative conjunctions in order to make the article discourse related. However, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 238) state that conjunctions produce a cohesive effect only between sentences.

Furthermore, there were many Thai words conveying the same meaning when compared to only one English conjunction; for example, the contrastive sense of *then* which has been classified as both causal and temporal conjunction. *Then* in causal conjunctions introduces the next item in a series of actions, while *then* in temporal conjunctions expresses sequence of time. There were many Thai words which are equivalent of the English causal element *then*; for example, จึง, ก็จึง, เลย, ก็เลย, ดังนั้น which caused the researcher difficulty in classifying them into the proper categories of conjunction proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976)'s framework.

In terms of using continuative conjunction as a cohesive device between English and Thai, English continuative conjunction was normally used in a spoken discourse (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 267).

Thai continuative conjunction, however, often appeared in written discourse. According to

the data, there were some differences in the use of continuative conjunction in English and Thai. The researcher found that many Thai continuative conjunctions were used in the articles. The items ซึ่ง (which, that), โดย (by) and ก็ (signal link between two elements in a discourse) were found to be used in order to link two parts of a discourse without showing any specific relation. To put it simply, one part of the text connects to another in meaning rather than creating a link to the given information, especially the use of ซึ่ง (which, that). The researcher noticed that ซึ่ง (which, that) is mostly used to connect the main clause with the adjective clause as shown in Example (16).

(16) A more affordable option, also ideally situated in the trendy Shibuya area, is the Granbell Hotel. The rooms, modest in size by Western standards have been designed in a pop-art fashion.

**Translation:** อีกทางเลือกหนึ่งซึ่ง (1) ไม่เกินกำลังกระเป๋า แถมนั่งตั้งอยู่ในย่านชิบูย่าซึ่ง (2) เป็นแหล่งช้อปปิ้งยอดนิยมก็คือโรงแรมแกรนเบลซึ่ง (3) มีห้องพักขนาดปานกลางตามมาตรฐานขนาดของประเทศตะวันตก ได้รับการออกแบบด้วยศิลปะสมัยนิยม

According to the Example (16), it can be noticed that ซึ่ง (1) ไม่เกินกำลังกระเป๋า is an adjective clause for ทางเลือกหนึ่ง, ซึ่ง (2) เป็นแหล่งช้อปปิ้งยอดนิยม is an adjective clause for ชิบูย่า, and ซึ่ง (3) มีห้องพักขนาดปานกลางตามมาตรฐานขนาดของประเทศตะวันตก is an adjective clause for โรงแรมแกรนเบล.

## Conclusion

On the basis of qualitative content analysis, we can draw the following conclusions:

The purpose of this study was to find the similarities and differences of the grammatical cohesive devices used in the English texts and their Thai translations and how they were used. The data used in the analysis were taken from *Sawasdee*, an in-flight magazine which has both English and Thai texts. Twenty written texts (ten English and ten Thai counterparts) were selected. Halliday and Hasan's (1976) theoretical framework was adopted.

The results of this study reveal similarities and differences in the use of grammatical cohesive devices in English articles and their Thai translations. First, the similarities between four types of grammatical cohesive devices are comparative reference, verbal substitution, clausal substitution, clausal ellipsis, and adversative conjunction. These devices were used in a similar way by both English and Thai writers. Besides, in the types of conjunctions, both internal and external conjunctions were found in English and Thai *Sawasdee* articles. As categorized by Halliday and Hasan (1976), internal conjunctions are those used to organize discourse itself, while external conjunctions are those used to organize events in an activity sequence (Martin and Rose, 2007: 117).

The researcher also noticed that the functions of English and Thai nominal ellipses are similar. To be more specific, they are the omission within a nominal group in which the modifying elements are upgraded to be the head noun (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 148; Chanawangsa, 1986: 88-94; McCarthy, 1991: 43). In English articles, the researcher found the modifying elements used as head were *specific deictic*, *non-specific deictic*, *post-deictic* and *numerative*, while two types of modifying elements used as head in Thai were found: *non-specific deictic* and *numerative*. These similarities can be attributed to the informative function and stylistic features of magazine articles.

Second, there are some differences between English and Thai texts in the use of specific devices of reference and conjunction devices, in terms of their occurrence frequencies, reference type was the most frequently used in English articles and conjunction was the most preferable cohesive type in Thai articles. Personal and demonstrative references are more frequently used in English articles, while Thai prefers the omission of personal reference. Besides, the redundancy of conjunctions was found in Thai in order to make the article discourse related, but this does not occur in English. To put it simply, one part of the text connects to another in meaning rather

than creating a link to the given information, especially the use of continuative conjunction *ซึ่ง* (which, that). Such discrepancy is mainly due to the specific features and language nature of the two languages.

The findings of this present study reveal many interesting points which can possibly be directly applied in teaching areas. First, the present study presents the findings of how English and Thai grammatical cohesive devices are used in written text (i.e., magazine articles) and also provides information on their similarities and differences. EFL teachers should emphasize the cohesive discrepancies between both languages. For example, a teacher may assign students to find cohesion shifts from many types of texts such as magazines, newspapers, textbooks, or novels from both English and Thai languages, and show how the linkage in those writings are different. This activity can help create linguistic awareness of cohesion in different languages to see how English and Thai cohesive devices are used.

Second, the awareness of cohesive characteristics of each language can help a teacher in improving a student's writing ability. A teacher may provide alternatives in the use of cohesive devices for learners. For example, a teacher teaches a student how the article *the* can also function as a demonstrative reference in English instead of just using demonstrative adjectives (this, that, these, those) when translating Thai texts to English texts.

Third, the results of this study can be a useful source of information for learners. Hence, they can use the information clarified in this study when they have to deal with passage/story writing, reading and/or translation tasks; for example, when the writers need to translate some tasks and they have no idea what type of grammatical cohesive devices should be added. They can apply the knowledge gained from the present study to employ the appropriate grammatical cohesive devices.

Fourth, this study provides knowledge about the types of grammatical cohesive devices and

presents some major differences in the use of grammatical cohesion between English and Thai. The differences gained from the present study raise awareness of using the grammatical cohesive devices appropriately for their own languages. For example, there may be problems of repetition if the Thai translator transfers every occurrence of personal reference from the original English text to the Thai translation. When Thai translators have an awareness of natural characteristics in the use of grammatical cohesion of English and Thai, they should be able to avoid making cohesive mistakes in translation.

#### Suggestions for future studies

This study is about grammatical cohesion in magazine articles from *Sawasdee* magazine, employing Halliday and Hasan's (1976) work as the framework. The researcher believes that their framework can be applied to the study of cohesion in English and Thai to more extensive topics and areas, such as:

First, the study of cohesion in other types of discourse is recommended, such as procedurals (how-to books, cooking books, etc.), hortatory (sermons, addressees of important people), law documents, interviews of famous people on television or radio, etc. The researcher believes that the outcomes may yield different results concerning various modes of writing between English and Thai.

Second, in this research, grammatical cohesive devices were analyzed in general, so specific types of grammatical cohesive devices such as ellipses, conjunctions, or references should be studied further individually. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 238) state that conjunctions produce a cohesive effect only between sentences, as can be shown in Example (17).

(17) She failed, however she has tried her best.

However, as mentioned, there are other studies contradicting the findings that conjunctions

can be used as a connector joining words, phrases or clauses together (Sanford, 1979: 59 and Richards and Schmidt 2002: 107, cited in Puprasert: 159). Therefore, these could raise another issue for further study; whether coordinating (join linguistic units which are in the same rank) and subordinating (join linguistic units which are not equal in value) conjunctions can act as cohesive elements.

#### References

- Ahmed, A. R. (2008). **Reference as a Cohesive Device**. Department of Translation 52, 43-68.
- Akindede, J. (2011). **Cohesive Devices in Selected ESL Academic Papers**. African Nebula 3, 99-112.
- Baker, M. (1992). **In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation**. London: Routledge.
- Bell, R. T. (1991). **Translation and Translating: theory and practice**. London and New York: Longman.
- Bloor, T. and Bloor, M. (1995). **The Functional Analysis of English**. London: Arnold.
- Burusphat, S. (1994). **Discourse Analysis (In Thai)**. Bangkok: Sahathammik.
- Chalker, S. (1988). **Current English Grammar**. London: Macmillan.
- Chanawangsa, W. (1986). **Cohesion in Thai**. Doctor of Philosophy Thesis in Linguistics, Georgetown University.
- Cooke, J. (1975). **Personal Reference in Thai, Burmese, and Vietnamese**. Doctor of Philosophy Thesis in Linguistics in the Graduate Division, University of California, Berkeley.
- Crane, Paul A. (1994). **Texture in Text: A Discourse Analysis of a News Article Using Halliday and Hasan's Model of Cohesion**. Retrieved November 9, 2009 from <http://library.nakanishi.ac.jp/kiyou/gaidai%2830%29/08.pdf>.
- Gwet, K. (2014). **Handbook of Inter - Rater Reliability (4<sup>th</sup> ed.)**. Advanced Analytics: the United States of America.

- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). **An Introduction to Functional Grammar**. New York: Routledge.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. (1976). **Cohesion in English**. London: Longman.
- Higbie, J. and Thinsan, S. (2002). **Thai Reference Grammar**. Bangkok: Orchid Press.
- James, C. (1980). **Contrastive Analysis**. Essex: Longman.
- Ketabi, S. (2012). **A Corpus-based Study of Conjunction Devices in English International Law Texts and its Farsi Translation**. International Journal of Linguistics4(4), 362-371.
- Kohkeaw, S. (2003). **Cohesion in Economic Articles from the Thai Newspaper 'Phujatkan'**. Master of Arts Thesis in Linguistics, Mahidol University.
- Larson, M. L. (1998). **Meaning-based Translation: A Guide to Cross-language Equivalence**. New York: University Press in America.
- Linoff, G. (2008). **Data Analysis Using SQL and Excel**. Retrieved May 4, 2013 from <http://www.temida.si/~bojan/MPS/materials/Data%20Analysis%20Using%20SQL%20and%20Excel.pdf>.
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2007). **Working with Discourse (2nd ed.)**. New York, NY: Continuum.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). **Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miles, B. M. and Huberman, M. A. (1994). **An expanded sourcebook: qualitative data analysis. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)**. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publication.
- Noonkhan, K. (2002). **Cohesion Shifts in Translation: A Comparative Study between Thai and English**. Master of Arts Thesis in English, Srinakharinwirot University.
- Pathumratanathan, P. (2012). **An Investigation on Figurative Language Employed in English Advertisements in In-flight Magazine**. Master of Arts Thesis in English for Specific Purposes, Kasetsart University.
- Petchprasert, A. (2001). **A Study of Cohesive Markers Used in L1 and L2 Essay Writing: Translation versus Direct Composition**. 3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies 19 (1), 19-33
- Puprasert, N. (2007). **A Comparative Study of English and Thai Cohesion in News Article**. Master of Arts Thesis in English for Specific Purposes, Kasetsart University.
- Silveira, R. (2007). **Translation and Cohesion**. Retrieved March 13, 2014 from [www.periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/traducao/article/download/.../4628](http://www.periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/traducao/article/download/.../4628), March 13, 2014.
- Rahimi, A. (2012). **Lexical Cohesion in English and Persian Texts of Novel**. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences3(11), 569-577.
- Theppreeda, J. (1998). **An Analysis of Cohesion in English and Thai Short Stories: Comparative Study**. Master of Arts Thesis in Applied Linguistics, Mahidol University.
- Thompson, G. (1996). **Introducing Functional Grammar**. London: Edward Arnold.
- Tsareva, A. (2010). **Grammatical cohesion in argumentative essays by Norwegian and Russian learners**. Master of Arts Thesis in Literature, Area studies and European Languages, the University of Oslo.
- Vyšniauskiene, R. (2010). **Cohesive Devices in the Opening Paragraph of Short Stories in English and Lithuanian**. Master of Philosophy Thesis in English Philosophy, Vilnius Pedagogical University.
- Whitley, B. and Kite, M. (2012). **Principles of Research in Behavioral Science**. New York: Routledge.
- Zhao, J., Yan, W., and Zhou, Y. (2009). **A Corpus-Based Study of Cohesion in English Medical Texts and its Chinese Translation**. International Journal of Biomedical Science 5(3), 313-320.