COHESION : A REVELATION OF CULTURAL PRACTICES

Cecilia Fortuno Genuino
Cavite State University

ABSTRACT

The study examined the interplay between language and culture based on the cohesive devices employed by the writer in three speech communities: Singapore, the Philippines, and the US. Specifically, it sought to answer the following: (1) what cohesive devices are commonly employed by the three speech communities in written discourse; (2) what prevail as the norms of written discourse in these speech communities in terms of cohesive device use; (3) at what points are the norms in these speech communities parallel/contrasting; and (4) what cultural features are revealed by the prevailing norms?

Data analyzed were 30 selected articles from Views/ Comments/Analysis/ Opinions section of The Straits Times *(Singapore),* Philippine Daily Inquirer *(Philippines), and* The International Herald Tribune *(US), published from July-August 2002. Frequency and percentage counts were employed to determine the patterns.*

Results revealed that the rhetorical pattern of the three speech communities in the genre examined were built on adversative relations. Further, cohesive devices occupied three positions in discourse: within the sentence, between sentences and between paragraphs. Structural and semantic relations were also identified. Finally, the three speech communities were found to be analytic rather than accumulative, individualist rather than collectivist.

1. INTRODUCTION

The interplay between language and culture has been one of the major concerns in contrastive rhetoric particularly after the publication of Kaplan's (1966) "Cultural Thought Patterns" which claimed that the rhetorical organization is a reflection of one's thought and cultural practices. However, "language neither drives culture nor is driven by it" because the relationship between language and culture is not a cause and effect but a realization: that is, "language and culture co-evolve in the same relationship as that in which, within language, meaning and expression co-evolve" (Halliday, 1993, quoted in Kachru, 1999, p. 75). In her paper, Kachru (1999) focuses on the interaction of cultural meaning and rhetorical style across languages and traditions in literacy. Using the socially realistic linguistics of Labov (1972), she looks at the writing in the Outer Circle English exploiting the notion of "meaning potential" (Halliday, 1973, in Kachru, 1999, p. 76) of rhetorical styles in different literacy traditions. She claims that cultural considerations play a role in the development of linguistic structures and rhetorical patterns. For instance, institutionalized varieties of English in the Outer Circle "have developed their own grammar and textual forms to express their contexts of culture" (Kachru, 1999, pp. 77-78). Hence, the rhetorical organization of those in the

Outer Circle may be meaningless from the perspective of those who are in the Inner Circle but meaningful and standard within the context of those who are in the Inner Circle. Kachru (1999) explains that what are labeled as "basic, inexperienced, unskilled and developmental" by the Inner Circle English are considered standard to the Outer Circle English because of their cultural underpinnings.

For instance, Thatcher (2000) reports that South American writers use too many details and historical accounts on their business manual which to the native speakers of US are considered sloppy. However, within the South American context, the construct is necessary to promote business in South America to the US audiences. Further, Thatcher (2000) interprets such result as an influence of the socio-historical forces: that is, South America's rhetorical pattern is directly influenced by the Spaniards whose rhetorical pattern is "elaborate" (Simpson 2000), South America being a former colony of Spain.

Mohamed and Omer (2000), in examining the direct effect of cultural differences in rhetorical organization between Arabic and English, concludes that the Arabic rhetorical pattern is context-based, generalized, repetition-oriented and additive, because of its having a collectivist, high-context, high-contact and reader-responsible culture. On the contrary, English rhetorical pattern is text-based, specific, change-oriented and non-additive because of its being an individualist, low-context, low contact and writer-responsible culture. In the same manner, Simpson (2000) confirms that Spain's rhetorical pattern is elaborative by nature, hence, he saw the need to extend Lautamatti's (1987) sequential progression to extended sequential progression.

Basically, there is no clear-cut evidence as to whether it is culture that determines the rhetorical organization of one speech community nor is language the determinant of culture. However, taking into account that 'meaning potentials' can be best interpreted based on the context of culture and context of situation, this study attempted to examine cohesion and its meaning both in the Outer Circle English (i.e. the Philippines and Singapore) and the Inner Circle English (i.e. the US).

In general, the study aims to examine the interface between language and culture based on the cohesive devices employed by the writers in three speech communities: Singapore, the Philippines, and the US. Specifically, it aims to answer the following: (1) What cohesive devices are commonly employed by the three speech communities in written discourse; (2) What prevail as the norms of written discourse in the three speech communities in terms of using cohesive devices; (3) At what points are the norms in the three speech communities parallel/contrasting; and (4) What cultural features are revealed by the prevailing norms identified?

1.1 Culture Defined

Culture has different meanings across disciplines. Thompson (1990, quoted in Kachru, 1999, p. 77) views culture as "the pattern of meanings embodied in symbolic forms, including actions, utterances, meaningful object of various kinds by virtue of which individuals communicate with one another and share their experiences, conceptions and beliefs". It is a body of shared knowledge...which people "must know in order to act as they do, make things they make, and interpret their experience in the distinctive way they do" (Quinn and Holland, 1987, quoted in Kachru, 1999, p. 77). To anthropologists, culture is seen as everything which members of the society must know and believe in order to act in accordance with the manner acceptable to every member of the speech community. It consists of the end product of learning, i.e. knowledge. It is an organization of people,

behavior, emotions and other phenomena. It also includes what people think, say and do (Goodenough, 1964, cited in Connor 1996).

In this study, culture is viewed as that which people say through verbal (symbolic) behavior and interpret them as they are.

1.2 Framework: Halliday and Hasan's (1976) Concept of Cohesion

Cohesion is built on the concept of RELATION - structural and semantic - between elements in the text. Cohesive relations are realized through lexis and grammar by the selection of structures and lexical items at the structural level (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). On the semantic level, cohesive relations are based on "meaning" and the continuity within the text. This suggests the "tie" existing between the elements in discourse – i.e. the interpretation of one element (the presupposed) is dependent on the other (the presupposing) (Halliday and Hasan, 1976).

In other words, cohesion may be grammatical or lexical. Grammatical cohesion includes reference, substitution, and ellipsis - all of which are regarded as closed system since they include simple options such as person, number, proximity of degree or comparison etc. On the other hand, lexical cohesion is regarded as open-ended because it involves selection of lexical items which are related to the previously occurring element. On the borderline of grammatical and lexical cohesion is conjunction because some elements of conjunction are interpreted grammatically in terms of system, whereas others involve lexical cohesion (Halliday and Hasan, 1976).

Conjunctive relations are encoded not in the form of grammatical structures but in the looser more pliable form of linkages between the components in a text. The specific conjunctive relations that are semantically represented in the linguistic system are as follows: additive, adversative, causal, and temporal. Such conjunctive relations are lexicogrammatically represented in the linguistic system by discourse adjuncts, adverbial groups, and prepositional groups (Halliday and Hasan, 1976).

Additive relation is best embodied in the form of coordination which regards the pair coordinated as a single unit that can be delineated into a constituent. It can also be in the form of cohesive relations where the meaning of the elements connected is dependent on the other. Adversative relations basically means "contrary to expectation" where the expectation is derived from the content of what is being said or from the communication process - the speaker-hearer situation. Causal relations suggest result, reason, or purpose. Temporal relations refer to the sequence in time: one is subsequent to the other (Halliday and Hasan, 1976).

In Mohamed and Omer (2000) the concept of conjunction (i.e. additive vs. non-additive) is discussed only to a limited extent. The present paper, in contrast, focuses on conjunctions as a means of maintaining cohesion in the text.

Halliday and Hasan's (1976) categorization of conjunctions based on cohesive relations (additive, adversative, causal, temporal) have been used to determine the rhetorical patterns of Singapore, Philippine, and US speech communities. In other words, cohesion was examined on both the structural and semantic levels.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Sources of Data

The data used in the study were 30 articles obtained from the Opinion/Commentary section of the three newspapers: *The Straits Times* (TST), *Philippine Daily Inquirer* (PDI) and *The International Herald Tribune* (IHT), published daily in Singapore, the Philippines, and the US, respectively, in July-August 2002.

The date of publication varied for purposes of comparability of text, i.e. articles dealing with foreign relations are religiously published in the *Views, Commentary* and *Analysis* section of the IHT, but not in the *Commentary /Analysis* and *Opinion* sections of the TST and the PDI, respectively. Hence, some issues of the TST were not included, while there was a need to use other issues of the PDI from July to August that contained articles discussing the same issue (i.e. foreign relations). This is in keeping with Kachru's (1999) suggestion for CR research to consider the comparability of texts.

2.2 Coding and Analysis of Data

Since it was found that the "Commentary and Analysis" of the TST and the "Opinions" from the PDI were relatively longer than the "Views, Comments or Analysis" of the IHT, the total number of paragraphs for each article were counted. Only 50% of each article was analyzed to ensure that the texts being studied were indeed comparable based on length. Consequently, only the first few paragraphs constituting one-half of each article (e.g. the first five paragraphs, if the article had 10 paragraphs) were coded and analyzed.

The conjunctions which suggested cohesive powers/relations within the selected text were underlined. Then, they were coded based on the cohesive relations they implied within the text: i.e. ADD if additive, ADV if adversative, CAU if causal and TEM if temporal.

Coded portions of the articles were counted to determine the most commonly employed cohesive devices in the three speech communities. Hence, cohesive devices that showed additive, adversative, temporal and causal relations, were grouped together in each of the broadsheet. Frequency was converted into percentage and presented in tabular form.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Commonly Used Cohesive Devices

Table 1 presents the types of conjunctions commonly employed by the three speech communities in the genre examined (i.e. *Views/Opinions/Comments*). It also summarizes the frequency of occurrences of the conjunctions in the texts.

Results reveal that among the additives, 'and' was the most commonly used among the three speech communities, comprising 34% of the total number of additive conjunctions in Singapore English (SE), 23% in Philippine English (PE), and 17% in US English (USE). Other types of conjunctions were used in one speech community but not in the other two. For instance, 'furthermore' constituted 8% in the SE text, but it was not used in the PE and USE texts. The conjunctions 'or' and 'also' were used once in PE, each accounting for 3% of the total, but they were not used in the SE and USE texts.

Among the adversatives, the simple conjunction 'but' was the most commonly employed constituting 19% of the total number in SE, 39% in PE and 38% in USE. The other types of adversatives occurred minimally in one or two speech communities but not in the other. The conjunction 'though' was not used in the SE text, but it constituted 3% and 17% in the PE and USE texts, respectively. Similarly, *whether* and *however* constituted 15% and 12%, respectively, in the SE text and 3% each in the PE. They were not found in the USE text. The conjunction *yet* constituted 3% and 8%, respectively, in the PE and USE texts. *Although* occurred once both in SE and USE but it is preceded by *but* (i.e. *but although*) in PE.

Table 1. Types of conjunctions employed in Singapore English (SE), Philippine English (PE), and US English (USE)

TYPES OF CONJUNCTIONS	SE Text		PE Text		USE Text		TOTAL	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Additive								
and	9	34%	7	23%	4	17%	20	25%
furthermore	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	2	3%
or	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	1	1%
also	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	1	1%
Total	**11**	**42%**	**9**	**29%**	**4**	**17%**	**24**	**30%**
Adversative								
but	5	19%	12	39%	9	38%	26	32%
though	0	0%	1	3%	4	17%	5	6%
whether	4	15%	1	3%	0	0%	5	6%
however	3	12%	1	3%	0	0%	4	5%
yet	0	0%	1	3%	2	8%	3	4%
although	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
but although	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	1	1%
Total	**13**	**50%**	**17**	**54%**	**15**	**63%**	**45**	**55%**
Causal								
because	1	4%	3	10%	1	4%	5	6%
so	0	0%	1	3%	3	12%	4	5%
hence	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
for this reason	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	1	1%
otherwise	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	1	1%
Total	**2**	**8%**	**5**	**16%**	**5**	**20%**	**12**	**14%**
GRAND TOTAL	**26**	**32%**	**31**	**38%**	**24**	**30%**	**81**	**100%**

Causal conjunctions were minimally used in the three speech communities. Among them, *because* was the most commonly employed constituting 4% in the SE text, 10% in PE and 4% in USE. *Hence* constituted 4% in SE but not found in the PE and USE texts; *for this reason* constituted 3% in PE but not found in SE and USE texts. In the same manner, *so* was not found in the SE sample, but it constituted 3% and 12% respectively in the PE and USE texts. *Otherwise* was not used in the SE and PE texts but it constituted 4% in the USE text.

To sum up, in all the 30 articles analyzed, adversative conjunctions were the most commonly employed in the genre (i.e. Commentary/Views/Analysis/Opinions), constituting more than one-half of the total cohesive devices identified in the texts. Additive conjunctions were the next frequently used conjunctions, accounting for 30% of the total. Causal conjunctions were minimally used, constituting only 14% of the total. No temporal conjunctions were identified in the 30 articles.

3.2 Perceived Norms of Cohesive Device Use

Patterns were identified regarding the structural positions and the semantic relations established by the cohesive devices employed in the texts. Structurally, cohesive devices appeared within the sentence connecting words, clauses and other elements. Some were found between sentences and/or paragraphs. Semantically, cohesive devices established either structural (i.e. coordinator) or cohesive relations in the texts. Halliday and Hasan (1976) stated that there is a difference between structural relations which hold *within* sentence and cohesive relations which hold *between* sentences. The hold within sentences is usually coordination rather than cohesion.

Cohesive Devices WITHIN the Sentence

Additive Relations

And
SE: (1) *Singaporeans abroad know about the strengths and weaknesses of the system here; and they understand what works and what does not work in the countries to which they live.*
PE: (1) *Today, Malaysia especially Kuala Lumpur as it is popularly called is a modern, vibrant, bustling, and prosperous country gleaming with steel and and touches of Arabian Nights.*
USE: (1) *The US, Europe and Japan spend $350 billion each year on agricultural Subsidies - seven times as much as global aid to poor countries - and this money creates gluts that lower commodity prices and erode the living standard of the world's poorest population.*

In the PE text, *and* connects two clauses - *what works* and *what does not work* - which function as complement of the verb phrase (Radford, 1997) headed by 'understand.' Hence, *and* in the PE text establishes structural relation (i.e. coordinator) rather than cohesion. The same pattern is illustrated in the USE text where *and* coordinates two adjectival clauses: *that lower commodity prices* and *erode the living standard of the world's poorest population*, which taken as a whole modifies the nominal *gluts*. Halliday and Hasan (1976) cited that the *and* logical relation is structural rather than cohesive. It is incorporated in linguistic structure in the form of coordination and the coordinated items function as a single whole constituting a single element in the structure of a larger unit.

6

In the PE text *and* connects a series of adjectives - *modern, vibrant, bustling, prosperous* - which functions as a single unit, i.e. modifier of the noun *country*. Halliday and Hasan (1976) stated that there is no fixed limit as to the depth and extent of the coordinating structures which *and* can connect if it functions to establish structural relations.

Adversative Relations

But
SE: (1) *Dr. Huskein's stance reflects Australia's desire to have a higher profile in the ARF but it is a view shared by other countries as well.*

In the excerpt, *but* connects two clauses: *Dr. Huskein's stance reflects Australia's desire to have a profile in the ARF* and *it is a view shared by other countries as well.* Though *but* connects two clauses within the sentence, it establishes adversative cohesive relations suggesting the meaning "contrary to expectations" since the second clause functions independently and not as modifier or predicate. Adversative relation basically means "contrary to expectations" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, p. 93) where the "expectation may be derived from the content of what is being said or from the communication process - the speaker-hearer situation" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, p. 93).

Causal Relations

Because
Because was minimally used in the texts, yet it was found in all the three speech communities.

SE: (1) *During the Cold War, nuclear command officers in America and its allies and their counterparts in the erstwhile Soviet Union could have virtually changed places seamlessly, because both knew each other's systems.*
PE: (1) *Beijing has argued that its system is so decentralized that the government does not know about or cannot control arms sales, but the US officials said that transfer halted over the past year were stopped because Beijing acted.*
USE: (1) *South Korea has argued that it is sacrosanct largely because North Korea initially did not challenge it, but this is wrong.*

In the three excerpts above, *because* is found heading the second clause, thus connecting it to the main clause. It explicitly indicates that the second clause it heads is the reason for the act expressed in the main clause. In the SE text, *because both knew each other* explains why the officers could have virtually changed places; in the PE text, *because Beijing acted* explains why Beijing has argued; and in the USE text, *because North Korea did not challenge it* explains why South Korea has argued. In other words, the sense of the second clause is tied to the first through the cohesive device *because*.

As an alternative to *because*, the USE text used the cohesive device *so* to connect the first clause with the second clause whose thought is tied to the main clause.

So
USE: (1) *By coincidence, that's about the same as the total of rich countries aid to poor countries, so, we take back with our left hand every cent we give with our right.*

Cohesive Devices BETWEEN Sentences/Paragraphs

Cohesive devices which hold within the sentence may also hold the tie between sentences in the paragraph as illustrated below.

Additive Relations

And
SE: (1) *Through the 1990's, surging capital inflows were the mirror image of rising current account deficits. The former financed the latter. And the bulk of these inflows were into equities.*
PE: (1) *The 1951 MDT was signed by Carlos P. Romulo, Joaquin Elizalde, Vicente Francisco and Diosdado Macapagal for the Philippines and by Dean Acheson, John Foster Dulles, Tom Conally and Alexander Willey for US. And the VFA by Foreign Secretary Domingo Siazon Jr. and US Ambassador Tomas Hubbard.*
USE: (1) *Not surprisingly, the world they're trying to create looks on awful a lot like the European Union, where rules and laws were more important than military power. And not surprisingly, they're none too happy about the military dominant US placing itself above or outside their new interactional legal system before it's even begun.*

Structurally, *and* is found initially in the succeeding sentences within the paragraph. In the SE text, the subject of the first sentence *surging capital inflows* is also the subject in the third, as suggested by the phrase *these inflows*. The tie between the two is explicitly indicated by *and* which heads the last sentence within the paragraph. In the same manner, the last sentence in the PE context, *And the VFA by Foreign Secretary Domingo Siazon Jr. and US Ambassador Tomas Hubbard* has no sense in itself. However, the cohesive device *and* suggests that it is connected with the first sentence. In the USE text, the expression *not surprisingly* is repeated in the second sentence suggesting that the two are connected. The tie between them becomes more explicit by using *and* initially in the second sentence.

In these excerpts, *and* functions not to coordinate but semantically to maintain cohesive relations since it explicitly expresses the tie between the sentences in the paragraph. That is, the sense of the second sentence is connected to the sense of the sentence which precedes it.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) stated that the cohesive relation expressed by *and* at the beginning of a new sentence suggests an additive relation that is quite different from coordination. In cohesion, the cohesive pair is not a pair at all but a succession of two independent elements where the second is tied to the first. This has been well illustrated by the function of *and* in the excerpts provided above.

Also/Or

The additive relations can also be expressed by *also* and *or* as used in the PE and USE contexts. *Also* is specifically used in the PE; whereas *or* is used in USE as shown below:

PE: (1) *The only drawback is that you have to live up for the free tickets early in morning and return in the afternoon when the sky bridge is open. Also, Kuala Lumpur continues to outdo itself with all these futuristic buildings Sprouting like mushrooms; it risks being that 'old world chance.'*

Cohesion between the two sentences is maintained explicitly by using *also* which suggests additive relation. In the same manner, the simple conjunction *or* which implies an alternative relation contributes to text cohesion as used in the USE context.

USE: (2) *To defend other nations threatened by invasion – like South Korea, and Saudi Arabia, or not so long ago Germany. Or to defend people threatened by genocide or ethnic cleansing, as in Bosnia and Kosovo.*

Or in the excerpt is not only positioned initially in the sentence but also within the sentence connecting nouns in a series. This suggests that *or* functions both to coordinate and to maintain cohesive relation between two independent elements (i.e. the two sentences in the excerpt). Halliday and Hasan (1976) stated that *or*, if associated with statements, takes on the internal sense. It means "an alternative interpretation" or "another possible opinion, explanation, etc. in place of the one just given." Further, they cited that the range of object alternatives is largely confined to questions, requests, permissions and predictions.

Adversative Relations

But
USE: (1) *Americans are hardly hostile to international law—the UN was their idea. But the US has a special problem, one that its European allies ought especially to appreciate.*

However
SE: (1) *In Chinese legal tradition, these are "counter revolutionary" crimes that are liable for capital punishment. However, some are alien to common law tradition in Hong Kong.*
PE: (1) *...Beijing has argued that its system is so decentralized that the government often does not know about or cannot control arms sales, but the US official said, the transfers halted over the past year were stopped because Beijing acted. He acknowledged, however, that China has still not done enough and there are still serious transfers going on.*

But occurs initially in the second sentence of the USE text explicitly signaling the adversative relation of the two sentences. In the SE text, the adversative relation is explicitly indicated by *however* which is positioned initially in the succeeding sentence. In the PE extract, *however* is also used to show adversative relation, but is positioned before the subordinate clause introduced by the complementizer *that*.

Causal Relations

Cohesive relations may also be causal which may be explicitly signaled by the causal cohesive devices as indicated below:

For this reason
PE: (1) ...*That is the core issue, and the people, not Ms. Macapagal alone, should decide. For this reason, the MLSA need not be downgraded into a mere memorandum and agreement but two defense departments.*
For this reason explicitly maintains the tie between the sentences in the paragraph.

Cohesive Devices BETWEEN Paragraphs

Cohesive devices also hold relation between paragraphs. This implies that the tie within the text may be explicitly illustrated by the cohesive devices positioned initially in the first sentence of the succeeding paragraph as shown below.

Additive Relations

And
USE: (1)*No, he's got to go ahead of the curve, find a few villain, ride a fresh news cycle. Are you getting this all down? You can use a recorder. And the new villain should be?*

The *and* in the excerpt is initially positioned in the sentence. However, the cohesive relation which it suggests is not between sentences but between paragraphs where the sense of the second paragraph is tied with the first. Halliday and Hasan (1976) stated that cohesion is semantic since it refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as a text.

Furthermore
Whereas USE used *and* to develop the tie between paragraphs, SE had double occurrences of *furthermore*, while PE and USE did not have such occurrences.

SE: (1) *As for stocks, the current valuation average of around 18 times estimated earnings is still expensive relative to the historic average in low teens. Furthermore, faced with a low profit or profitless recovery, even lower price to earning valuation ratios may not bring out the buyers. And unattractive stock valuations against·a backdrop of low earnings growth spell big trouble for the US dollar.*

(2) *Mr. Bush put Mr. Sharon on notice that the US like the rest of the civilized world considers the West Bank and Gaza to be under occupation. Furthermore, he declared that this "corrupting" occupation must end, as must the suffering and impoverishment of the Palestinian people.*

In the two examples, the relation between the paragraphs is maintained by the use of *furthermore* rather than *and*. Like *and*, it occurs initially in the sentence. This implies that the complex conjunction *furthermore* which Halliday and Hasan (1976) classify as "additive complex emphatic" can be an alternative to *and* since it also suggests additive relation.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) claim that *furthermore* is a specifically emphatic form of *and* relation occurring only in the internal sense, i.e. there is yet another point to be taken in conjunction with the previous.

Adversative Relations

But
But does not only hold cohesive relations within the sentence nor between sentences but also between paragraphs as illustrated by the following:

SE: (1) *Certainly, there is acknowledgement among ARF members that defense officials, even defense ministers should be more involved in the forum which is helmed by foreign ministers.*
But it is evident that the ARF- the region's only security forum- is under siege. The hands are snapping at its heals.

PE: (1) *Military planners have flirted with the possibility of repeating the US success in Afghanistan, where special forces and air power helped a local opposition oust the ruling Taliban.*
But that strategy does not seem applicable to Iraq, where the opposition groups have not fielded the sort of credible unified force that Afghanistan's Northern alliance had deployed a short distance from Kabul.

USE: (1) *...the vision is not Bush's first choice. It is his last resort.*
But the vision of the Saudi peace plan of Israeli military strikes and of Secretary Colin Powell's diplomacy to stabilize the Middle East after nearly 2 years of turmoil deprives Bush of options.

The second paragraph in each of the texts is headed by *but* which is initially positioned in the first sentence to explicitly signal the adversative relation between the two consecutive paragraphs.

In all of the given examples, *but* expresses the meaning "contrary to expectation." In the SE context, the idea of holding a forum at the ARF is contradicted by the idea that ARF is under siege which is expressed in the succeeding paragraph. Hence, the sense of the second paragraph is tied to the one that precedes it. The same cohesive relation is found in the PE and USE texts. In the PE text, the possibility of repeating the US strategy in Afghanistan is contradicted by the idea that such strategy is not applicable to Iraq. In the USE text, the second sentence expresses that contrary to expectation, Bush's option has not been effective. Halliday and Hasan (1976) stated that *but* occurs initially in the sentence to express external relations and to suggest contradiction to what is expected.

The use of *but* initially in the sentence in the three speech communities to maintain cohesive ties between paragraphs shows that at some points, the rhetorical patterns of the three speech communities are parallel.

Other cohesive devices that conveyed adversative relation were found in the texts. Among them were *though, whether, however, yet, although, but other*. Some of them were used in one speech community but not in the others.

Though/Although/But although

PE. (1) *...without the Selamat Datang signs, you'd think you were in Berlin
and Munich.*
*Though it now takes a full hour to reach downtown, compared to
just several minutes in earlier times when the international airport was in
its old location it's worth the trip.*
(2) *Since Bush declared in a speech that Iraq was part of an "axis of
evil," speculation has swirled over whether he planned to finish
where his father left off at the end of the Gulf War, and remove the
Iraqi leader from power. But although, US officials have put
themselves under strong political pressure to take military action
against Iraq, their plans may fall short of ousting Saddam at least for
now.*

USE: (1) *...If this new generation is not to grow up angry and impoverished
in already overcrowded cities, the Arab world will have to overcome its
poverty - which is not a poverty of resources but a poverty of capabilities
and poverty of opportunities, the report argues.*
*Though the report pays homage to argument that the Arab-Israeli
Conflict and Israel occupation have been both a cause and an excuse for
lagging Arab development, it refuses to stop with the explanation.*
(2) *Thanks to rapid economic growth for more than 15 years, Chile
has cut its poverty rate by more than half, from 45-21 per cent and
within extreme poverty rate has fallen to 2/3. Though almost all of the
20th century Chileans were far poorer than Argentines.*

In the PE text, *though* is used only between paragraphs. In USE, *though* is used both in between paragraphs and sentences within paragraphs. In the two texts, however, *though* appears initially in the sentence suggesting an internal relation. Halliday and Hasan (1976) stated that *though* may occur initially. It is cohesive only if it occurs in writing after a full stop. Its normal position is as tailpiece at the end of the clause. In both the PE and USE texts, *though* occurs after one sentence or after one paragraph, which suggests a full stop as indicated by a period. Hence, *though* as used in the two contexts maintains cohesive relations either between sentences in the paragraph or between paragraphs in the discourse.

But although suggests cohesive relation between paragraphs since the sense of the paragraph which it introduces is tied in the paragraph that precedes it.

Hinkel (1987) refers to *though* and *although* as concessives that introduce background information (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Sartvik, 1985; Biber, 1988, in Hinkel, 1987) and provide balanced argument which accounts for opinions or views. Similarly, they are used to contrast ideas and the information included in the sub-structure, usually less crucial than the independent clause (Jacobs, 1995, in Hinkel, 1987). Further, Hinkel (1987) claims that they are used to create balanced thesis statement and in presenting writer's opinion objectively.

Since the genre analyzed was Opinion/Views/Commentary/Analysis, and the source was newspaper, it can be said that *although* and *though* are not only used to show contrast but also to maintain balance in views and opinions.

Whether
Whether also occurs initially in the sentence to convey cohesive relation exemplified in the writings of the Outer Circle Englishes.

SE: (1) ...*The succession plan that will take effect at the end of next year would provide for a more orderly transfer of power to Datuk Seri Abdullah, currently the Deputy President of Umno and Deputy Prime Minister. Whether the succession plan would be able to put rest controversies surrounding the succession issue remains unclear for the moment.*

SE: (2) *If there were a conventional war involving missiles and aircraft, it would be difficult to tell, on the face of it, whether a plane or a missile was delivering a conventional nuclear bomb.*

PE: (1) *Now, President GMA and the United States have apparently decided to hold exercises continuously. And the Supreme Court finds no destruction between permanent and transient forces in its October 10, 2000 ruling on VFA. Whether or not US has studied the ruling closely, it allows the US forces to visit permanently.*

In the SE context *whether* in its simple form is used both within the paragraph and between paragraphs. In PE *whether* is followed by the expression *or not*. However, in both the simple and compound forms, *whether* occurs initially in between paragraphs. It occurs after the first two clauses in the SE sentence (SE 1).

Halliday and Hasan (1976) classify *whether* as a more "generalized adversative" that shows "dismissive expression." It presupposes that some circumstances have been referred to which are then dismissed as irrelevant either because it does not matter whether they obtain or not, or because it does not matter which of the given set of circumstances obtains (Halliday and Hasan, 1976).

However

SE: (1) *The Singapore diaspora is a nascent one. Singaporeans who work abroad on who have given up their citizenship from his country as a negligible presence worldwide. However, this diaspora's contribution can be invaluable as the country reviews its strategies for success.*

The succeeding paragraph in the text is headed by *however* which indicates explicitly the adversative relations between the two paragraphs. Halliday and Hasan (1976) cited that *however* can occur non-initially in the sentence unlike *yet* and *but*.

Whether or not it is in initial position, *however* suggests contrasts between the ideas connected. It means "against or to be set against" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976).

Yet

Another simple conjunction found in the text is *yet*, which, like *but*, occurred in the initial position to suggest external adversative relation, as illustrated in the following PE and USE samples:

PE: (1) *Under the doctrine pronounced by the Supreme Court in its ruling on VFA that requires a treaty duly concurred in by the Senate under Article XVIII, Section 25 of the constitution. Yet the two governments chose to bypass that route by downgrading the MLSA into a more technical agreement under the suggestion of the AFP chief of staff and the commander-in-chief*

of the US Pacific command.

USE: (1)...*In Indian case, this could lead to nuclear war with Pakistan or*
if the Muslim majority in Kashmir were to join Pakistan, or become
independent, the wholesale slaughter and ethnic cleansing of India's
150 Muslims. Yet the world also appreciates the importance of possessing
the territorial integrity of nations like Russia, China, India and Indonesia.

In both texts *yet* functions to maintain cohesive relation by occurring initially in the sentence introducing the succeeding paragraph. *Yet* in the above examples means "contrast."

Causal Relations

The third category in Halliday and Hasan's (1976) conjunction refers to those that express causal relations. They classify causal conjunctions based on the relations they express: result, reason, purpose. In the articles examined, *hence, for this reason, so*, and *otherwise* were found appearing initially in the initial sentence of the succeeding paragraph to signal the causal relations in the text.

Hence
SE: (1) *Their dual comparative perspective provides them a unique opportunity to*
contribute to the revitalization of this global city in a globalized
marketplace.
Hence, the republic launched the Singapore Overseas Network in
San Francisco, Boston and Hong Kong.

Otherwise
USE: (1) ...*He must now respond to their evident exhaustion with new and*
determined leadership.
Otherwise, Bush risks letting events make strategy for him through
incremental adjustments that do not add up to a coherent commitment to
success.

The causal conjunctions *hence, for this reason*, and *otherwise* used in the SE, PE and USE contexts, respectively, occurred initially in the sentence following the paragraph to which they were tied. Hence, they established internal cohesive relations in the discourse.
Hence implies result as the cohesive relation, *for this reason* shows reason for what has been said or done, and *otherwise* suggests 'polarity reversed' (Halliday and Hasan, 1976).
No temporal cohesive devices were identified in the text. It does not mean, however, that the temporal relations are not applicable in the genre examined.

4. DISCUSSION

Some major findings which are deemed relevant in the context of culture are identified in the study. First, the rhetorical pattern of the three speech communities in terms of cohesion is built on the adversative (i.e. non-additive, to use Mohamed and Omer's (2000) term) cohesive relation rather than additive. This seems to contradict Mohamed and Omer's (2000) claim that the English rhetorical pattern is additive due to its having literate culture. In Halliday and Hasan (1976) adversative relations may mean contrast. Hence, the prevalence of adversative relations in the genre examined suggests that the rhetorical pattern

of the three speech communities in terms of giving views, comments, analysis or opinions, aims to present the two contrasting sides.

In Halliday and Hasan's (1976) framework, adversative cohesive relation basically means "contrary to expectations," whereas additive relations suggest that the meaning of one element (the presupposed) is dependent on the other (the presupposing). The preference of the three speech communities for the adversative relations implies that their rhetorical pattern is more on "subordination" which suggests "analytic" relationships rather than "accumulative or additive" (Thatcher, 2000). In Thatcher (2000), US English was characterized as analytic, while South American writing was characterized as "additive" because of its being elaborate, a cultural characteristic of Spain that has somehow influenced the rhetorical pattern of South America. Since the adversative relations have outnumbered the additive relations in the US context, the present study confirms Thatcher's (2000) claim that US English is analytic. Moreover, the prevalence of adversative relations in the Singaporean and Philippine Englishes implies that the rhetorical pattern of the two speech communities in some way conforms to the perceived norm of the Inner Circle English perhaps because the two speech communities have been greatly influenced by the English culture, having been colonized by the British and American forces, respectively. Josey (1980) cited that Singapore had been a British trading post until 1965, whereas the Philippines had been under the Americans until 1946 (Agoncillo and Guerrero, 1977). Lim-Keak (1985) claims that English has been the official language of Singapore since 1965, when it decided to go global. Similarly, the American forces implemented the use of English as medium of instruction and prohibited the use of the vernaculars in the Philippines.

Furthermore, the prevalence of adversative relations in the three speech communities may be a function of their cultural characteristic. The U.S. has been found to be the most individualist in the world (Hoftstedes, 1997, cited in Thatcher, 2000; Kramsch, 1998). Thatcher (2000) associates individualism with universalism, in contrast to collectivism which is associated with particularism. Hofstedes (1997) (cited in Thatcher, 2000) explains particularism as that which refers to "whether or not value systems should take particular relationship systems of the actor into account such as family or friendship ties" (p. 93). Since Halliday and Hasan (1976) define additive relationship as dependence on the meaning of one element based on another, it culturally implicates 'collectivism' where one member of the society depends on another, a characteristic feature of high context and high contact cultures like Arabic. In other words, the preference of US English for adversative relations in contrast to additives seems to confirm Hoftstedes' (1997) claim that the US has individualist/ universalist culture.

Singapore's and the Philippines' preference for adversative relation rather than additive may be attributed to their having pluralistic society. Lim-Keak (1985) claims that Singapore has a plural society in terms of ethnic group, culture, language, etc. Even ethnic groups who just live side by side seldom interact with each other; hence, Singaporeans "never created a sense of belonging" (p. 124). In this respect, the sense of collectivism has possibly been blocked, paving the way for Western universalism/ individualism to prevail. In the same manner, the Philippine society may also be regarded as pluralistic in terms of race, language, and culture. It is a mixture of different races (e.g. Malays, Chinese, Indians, etc.), different languages, and different cultures. Its being an archipelago has also contributed to the absence of unity and a sense of nationalism (Agoncillo and Guerrero, 1977).·

At some points, the rhetorical patterns of the three speech communities are also contrasting. Among the three prevailing cohesive relations, the preference of the US for simple conjunctions such as the additive *and* and *or*, adversative *but*, *though*, *yet*, and causal

because and *so*, in contrast to their complex alternatives (i.e. *furthermore, however, for this reason,* etc.), which are used by the Singaporean and Philippine varieties of English, suggests that the Inner Circle English is relatively brief and concise. On the hand, the Outer Circle English prefers a more elaborate rhetorical pattern. In the Philippine context, the use of such elaborate rhetorical pattern can perhaps be attributed to the influence of the Spanish colonizers.

Another interesting finding is the prevalence of the different types of conjunctions in Philippine English. The use of different types of conjunctions in Philippine English suggests that the Philippines has a "change-oriented" (Mohamed and Omer, 2000) rhetorical pattern. That is, rather than repeating the same conjunction/lexical item in the text, an alternative is used. Moreover, having the most number of explicit conjunctions employed in the text, Philippine rhetorical pattern may be regarded as "writer-responsible" (Mohamed and Omer, 2000). In such a case, the writer makes sure that the relation among the elements in the text is effectively conveyed to the reader by using explicit devices.

That Singapore ranked second to the Philippines in terms of using different types of conjunctions suggests that Singaporean English is also change-oriented. Likewise, having ranked second to the Philippines in terms of the number of explicit conjunctions employed, Singaporean English may also be regarded as writer-responsible. However, compared to Philippine English, it appears that Singaporean English is less change-oriented and less writer-responsible.

The US texts employed the least number of explicit conjunctions among the three. It does not suggest, however, that US texts are not cohesive because a text can still be cohesive even without the explicit linguistic devices. The minimal use of explicit devices in US English is probably a function of its observance of the principle of brevity and conciseness. In this respect, the Inner Circle English may be characterized as brief and concise, whereas Outer Circle English is elaborate.

To sum up, the use of more adversative cohesive relations in contrast to additives suggests that the three speech communities are analytic rather than accumulative, individualist/universalist rather than collectivist/particularist. The use of more explicit linguistic devices in the Singaporean and Philippine Englishes suggests that their rhetorical pattern is change-oriented and writer-responsible. On the contrary, US English rhetorical pattern is brief and concise, yet cohesive, despite the absence of explicit cohesive devices.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In the light of the foregoing findings, it can be concluded that the interplay between language and culture may be reflected in the rhetorical pattern of a certain speech community. The types of cohesive devices employed by the writers may reveal the socio-cultural or even political practices.

Though the findings of the study are tentative, in some way it confirms the CR hypothesis: different cultures have different rhetorical patterns. However, owing to the influences of the English and American culture in the two speech communities (Singapore and the Philippines), as history reveals, the rhetorical patterns of the Inner Circle English and the Outer Circle Englishes are at some points parallel. Finally, the study demonstrates how culture and language (i.e. the lexico-grammatical elements) are not only structurally and semantically important, but also meaningful in the context of culture.

However, the study has its limitations. First, it has failed to identify the occurrences of temporal relations in the data because only the first half of each article was analyzed. It is predicted that other cohesive devices are employed in the other half of each article. Hence, the inclusion of the remaining portions of each article is recommended. A further

exploration of the concept of cohesion including the external and internal cohesive relations (Halliday and Hasan, 1976) is recommended. Finally, other genres like news stories, journal articles, grant proposals, etc., from different discourse communities are also worth studying since they may follow a different rhetorical pattern in terms of using cohesion.

REFERENCES

AGONCILLO, T. & GUERRERO, M. (1977). *History of the Filipino people*. Quezon City: R.P. Garcia Publishing Co.

CONNOR, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CONNOR, U. & KAPLAN, R. (Eds.). (1987). *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

HALLIDAY, M.A.K. & HASAN, R . (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman

HINKEL, E. (1999). Objectivity and credibility in L1 and L2 academic writing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 90-108). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

KACHRU, Y. (1995). Contrastive rhetoric in world Englishes. *English Today, 11*(1), 21-31.

KACHRU, Y. (1999). Culture, context, and writing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 75-89). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

KAPLAN, R. (1987). Cultural thought patterns revisited. In U. Connor and R. Kaplan (Eds), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 9-21). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

KRAMSCH, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.

JOSEY, A. (1980). *Singapore: Its past, present and future*. Singapore: Ho Printing Co. Ltd.

LAUTAMATTI, L. (1987). Observations on the development of simplified discourse. In U. Connor and R. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 87-114). Reading, MA: Addison -Wesley Publishing Company.

LIM-KEAK, C. (1985). *Social change and the Chinese in Singapore*. Singapore: National University of Singapore Press.

MOHAMED, A. & OMER, M. (2000). Texture and culture: Cohesion as a marker of rhetorical organization in Arabic and English narrative texts. *RELC Journal, 31*(2), 45-75.

RADFORD, A. (1997). *Syntactic theory and the structure of English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SCOLLON, R. (2000). Generic variability in news stories in Chinese and English: A contrastive discourse study of five days' newspapers. *Journal of Pragmatics, 32*(6), 761-791.

THATCHER, B. (2000). L2 professional writing in a US and South American context. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(1), 41-69.