MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING
UNIVERSITY OF DANANG

TRẦN THỊ QUÝ

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE PROBLEM-

SOLUTION RELATION IN ENGLISH AND

VIETNAMESE TECHNOLOGICAL NEWSPAPER

ARTICLES

Subject Area : The English Language
Code   :   60.22.15

M.A. THESIS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE
(A SUMMARY)

Supervisor: TRẦN QUANG HẢI, Ph. D.

Danang, 2012

The study has been completed at
the College of Foreign Languages, University of Danang

Supervisor: Trần Quang Hải, Ph. D.

Examiner 1:

Examiner 2:

The thesis will be orally defended at the Examining Committee
Time   : 28 th October, 2012
Venue : University of Danang

The origin of the thesis is accessible for the purpose of
reference at:
- *The College of Foreign Languages Library, University of Danang*
- *Information Resources Centre, University of Danang*

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1. RATIONALE

The preference for this study is also prompted by the fact that the problem- solution relation can normally be found in many technological newspaper articles. The emphasis of the present study will, therefore, be on insight into how the discourse features in the problem- solution relation are organized in both languages (English and Vietnamese). Many studies on cohesion and coherence have been carried out; however, a detailed discussion of the similarities and differences between the problem-solution discourse features in both English and Vietnamese technological newspaper articles has not been dealt with so far. Therefore, I would like to deal with the research title: ***"An Investigation into the Problem-Solution relation in English and Vietnamese Technological Newspaper Articles"***.Hopefully, the choice of the topic would, to some extent, make certain contributions to the teaching and learning English as a foreign language.

1.2. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1.2.1. Aims of the Study

This study aims at exploring the linguistic features of the problem- solution relation in English and Vietnamese electronic technological newspaper articles (ETNAs) and helping Vietnamese learners of English understand and grasp the distinctive characteristics of this kind of relation.

1.2.2. Objectives of the Study

The study is expected to find out the lexical choices in English and in Vietnamese problem-solution relation, identify the main similarities and differences of text structures in the problem-solution relation, and find out how the problem- solution relation in English and Vietnamese is organized and cohered by means of cohesive devices such as reference, conjunction, synonym, collocation, lexical repetition, etc and then suggest some implications for teachers and learners of English, especially journalism students.

1.3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What are the characteristics of the Problem-Solution relation in English and Vietnamese ETNAs in terms of lexical choices, text structures and cohesive devices?

2. What are the similarities and differences between English and Vietnamese in terms of lexical choices, text structures and cohesive devices?

3. What are some suggestions for teaching and learning English as well as writing the problem-solution relation in English?

1.4. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

A study on the characteristics of the Problem-Solution relation in English and Vietnamese ETNAs will be a contribution to Vietnamese learners of English for making their written products acceptable and comprehensible to the readers.

1.5. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This study concentrates on the investigation of some features of problem- solution relation in English and Vietnamese ETNAs namely the lexical choices, text structures, and the cohesive devices.

1.6. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS STUDIES

Mc Carthy [28, p.47] gives an insight into how texts are structured beyond the sentence level, how the structuring of sentences has implications for units such as paragraphs and for the progression of whole text; and how discourse rules and their realizations in language differ from culture to culture. According to him, such grammatical contribution to "textuality" as reference, substitution/ ellipsis and conjunction functioning as cohesive markers create links within and between clauses and sentences in written discourse. In addition, Beaugrande and Dressler's [3, p.4] analyses show that the relationships between coherence and cohesion which have been identified as the major standard of "textuality" in a text plays an essential role in English academic writing. Fitzgerald and Spiegel [12, p.23] emphasize this relationship by indicating that the relationship between writing quality depends mainly on overall coherence in content, organization and the quantity of cohesive devices used. According to Bloor [4, p.4], readers or listeners make sense of a text by

following the connections between its parts, i.e. by looking for macro patterns and clause relations. It is one major source of coherence which derives from the relationship of ideas. The use of sequences typical in English written text, such as hypothetical-real (Mc Cathy [28, p.48]) can help the readers infer the nature of a relationship.

In Vietnam, a number of linguists and researchers have made great contributions to the study of discourse analysis. Diep Quang Ban [42] has given an overall view of text and utterance especially above the sentence level. Nguyen Thien Giap [46] mentions a set of different aspects as context and semantics, information structures, especially discourse and discourse analysis. They particularly emphasize the necessity of coherence and cohesion in creating a clear and comprehensible discourse/ text.

2.2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.2.1. Text

2.2.1.1. Concepts of Text

Linguists in the world view the notion of text from different angles. In fact, there are many definitions of what a text is.

Brown and Yule [5, p.6] define "text" as "the verbal record of a communicative act." Then Cook considers "text" as "a stretch of language interpreted formally, outside the context perceived to be meaningful, unified and purposive."[6, p.158]

Perhaps the concept of text provided by Halliday and Hasan is the most comprehensive and convincing. In their point of view, "the word text is used in linguistics to refer to any passage of whatever length, that does form a unified whole." [18, p.1].A text may be best thought of as a language unit in use. It is not the

unit of grammar as the type of a clause or a sentence; and it is not defined by its size.

2.2.1.2. Features of Text

According to Diep Quang Ban [43], text has the following five basic features:

- Text has a functional factor because every text expresses speakers or writers' intention. It is a communicative function- the function of conveying the message.

- Every text must have the content factor.

- Every text must have the cohesive and coherent factor.

- Quantitative factor is the fourth feature. This feature shows that every text is created by linear continuity of sentences or utterances. This is the foundation for coherence and cohesion.

-The last feature is the boundary factor.Text has a left boundary and a right one.

2.2.2. Discourse and Discourse Analysis

2.2.2.1. Concepts of Discourse

Crystal [8, p.25] states that discourse is a continuous stretch of (especially spoken) language larger than a sentence, often constituing a coherent unit such as a sermon, argument, joke, or narrative.

Cook [6, p.156] has a similar notion of discourse. He claims that discourse is stretches of language perceived to be meaningful, unified and purposive.

In David Nunan's view, [29, p.5] discourse can be defined as a stretch of language consisting of several sentences which are perceived as being related to in some ways."

2.2.2.2. Concepts of Discourse Analysis

Mc Carthy [27, p.5] defines that "discourse analysis is concerned with the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used."

Yule [39, p.83] states that discourse analysis is the study of language use with the reference to the social and psychological factors that influence communication.

According to Nguyen Hoa [48, p.11], discourse analysis is a study of how and for what purposes language is used in a certain context and the linguistic means to carry out these purposes.

In this study, the discourse analysis in EPSR and VPSR is limited to some linguistic characteristics, that is, it explores the written problem- solution relation in ETNAs to find out what lexis, text structures and cohesive devices are used to construct this type of relation.

2.2.3. Discourse Context

Yule [39, p.128] considers the context as the physical environment. However, it is not adequate and the full meaning of the term is not covered.

Nunan [29, p.7] states that context refers to the situation giving rise to the discourse, and within which the discourse is embedded.

Hymes [22, p. 38] categorizes the features of context of situation into eleven as follows: *addresser, addressee, audience, topic, setting, channel, code, message-form, event, key, and purpose.*

2.2.4. Kinds of Discourse Processing

The processing of discourse is regarded as the combination of at least two activities. They are: bottom-up processing and top-down processing. Bottom-up processing is the productive or

interpretative choices one make description of phonology, sentential syntax and lexical semantics while top-down processing involves contextual factors such as sociocultural knowledge and experience in life to produce and interpret the discourse.

Based on these points of view, the problem-solution relation in this thesis is analyzed for three aspects: lexical choices, discourse structures and cohesive devices (i.e. **bottom-up processing**).At the same time, information is processed by means of my background knowledge and experience (i.e. **top- down processing**).

2.2.5. Cohesion and coherence

2.2.5.1. Cohesion

Cohesion referring to the explicit linguistic devices is expressed partly through the grammar, partly through the vocabulary. Halliday and Hasan [18, p.52] identify five different types of cohesive devices, namely grammatical cohesion, which are reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion which consists of collocation, reiteration.

In Vietnamese, Tran Ngoc Them [52, p.20] classifies cohesion into two facets: content cohesion and form cohesion. The content cohesion and form cohesion have a close dialectical relation. *Content cohesion* is expressed through a system of form cohesion devices and *form cohesion* is embodied in content cohesion.

2.2.5.2. Coherence

According to Palmer [32, p.54], 'coherence refers to the rhetorical devices, the ways of writing and speaking that bring about order and unity and emphasis".

Mc Carthy remarks"cohesion is only a guide to coherence, and coherence is something created by the reader in the act of reading the text. Coherence is the feeling that a text hangs together, that it makes sense, and is not just a jumble of sentences."

In Vietnamese, Diep Quang Ban [43] mentions coherence in developing topic of sequences of sentences, on the basis of relevance, the cooperative principle and on other contextual features. In addition, in their research works on discourse, Tran Ngoc Them [53] and Diep Quang Ban [43] strongly emphasize the vitally important roles of topical cohesion and logical cohesion in creating coherent pieces of discourse.

2.3. SUMMARY

CHAPTER 3
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

3.1. RESEARCH DESIGN

The study is based on the combination of qualitative and quantitative analysis. And the study is also based on the comparative, descriptive and statistical research.

3.2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research is conducted with a combination of descriptive, qualitative and comparative methods.

3.3. DATA COLLECTION

The data collection was taken from 80 samples of EPSR and 80 Vietnamese ones in ETNAs published in the years of 2010 and 2012 from the well-known websites in the world and in Vietnam.

Then, the distinctive features of EPSR and VPSR were found and analysed.

3.4. DATA ANALYSIS

After being selected the material, the samples of the problem-Solution relation were examined, classified, described, analyzed and compared to enable the comparison to find out the similarities and the differences in terms of lexical choices, text structures and cohesive devices.

3.5. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

The data were collected from active websites in both languages. The quality of the data is quite reliable and this totally authentic source of data is published in the years of 2010 and 2012, not out-of-date. The investigation of the data followed the principles in the theoretical background presented in chapter 2.

CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
4.1. LEXICAL CHOICES IN EPSR AND VPSR

The study of vocabulary in discourse is concerned with patterns in text generated by the vocabulary relations that are found over clause and sentence boundaries, the role of certain words in organizing discourses and signalling their structure, and the relationship between these features of textuality and the register of the end product. [27, p.86]

Some words that often occur in the problem-solution relation in English are: -Problem: difficulty, obstacle, problem, dilemma, drawback, hindrance, threat, etc.

- Solution: solve, resolve, solution, tip, deal with, step, measure, answer, rules, precaution, option, way, model, etc.

Similarly, the words denoting the problem in VPSR are trục trặc, lỗi, tác động tiêu cực, vấn đề, thách thức, nguy cơ, sơ suất, etc. and the words denoting the solution are giải pháp, khắc phục, ngăn chặn mối đe dọa, cách xử lí, kinh nghiệm, nguyên tắc, etc.

It can be seen that in English as well as in Vietnamese, the Problem-Solution relation is explicitly marked by discourse-organising words (D.O.W.) that cluster round the text, which makes it different from the others. They are regarded as signals of the writer's intention which can help the readers identify not only the basic elements of the relation but also which field the text belongs to. The misinterpretation of these ones can cause problems to the learner in comprehending the content of the whole text.

In addition, on examining and analyzing the data, I found that the problem-solution relation can also be recognized through the collection of a wide range of the lexical items in the discourse context without using discourse-organizing words.

The table 4.1 below summarizes what can be observed from the lexical choices above.

Table 4.1.Lexical Choices in EPSR and VPSR

Lexical Choices	English		Vietnamese	
	Occurrence	Rate	Occurrence	Rate
With D.O.W.	52	65%	31	39%
Without D.O.W	28	35%	49	61%
Total	80	100%	80	100%

There is a difference between EPSR and VPSR in lexical choices. The English writers tend to use discourse- organizing words more than the Vietnamese ones. The use of discourse- organizing words in EPSR takes up the highest percentage with 52 instances (occupying 65%), as opposed to 39% in VPSR. On the contrary, the circular and indirect ways of expression without discourse-organizing words in VPSR accounts for 61% versus 39% in EPSR.

4.2. TEXT STRUCTURES IN EPSR AND VPSR

Based on the analyzed result, problem-solution, situation-problem-solution, situation -problem-solution-evaluation are the main text structures in EPSR and VPSR in ETNAs. The table 4.2 shows the percentage of text structures in EPSR and VPSR.

Table 4.2.Text structures in EPSR and VPSR

Text structures	English		Vietnamese	
	Occurrence	Rate	Occurrence	Rate
Pr-So	18	22.5%	30	37.5%
Pr(Q)So(A)	8	10%	0	0
Si-Pr-So	12	15%	11	13.8%

Si-Pr-SoEv	42	52.5%	39	48.7%
Total	80	100%	80	100%

Moreover, the text structures in EPSR and VPSR of technological newspaper articles are embedded with some common relations such as claim-counterclaim, cause-effect, comparison-contrast, and general-specific ones. We can summarize them in the following table:

Table 4.3.Text structures with Embedded Relations in EPSR and VPSR

	Occurrence Of claim-counterclaim relation	Occurrence of cause-effect relation	Occurrence of comparison-contrast relation	Occurrence of general-specific relation	Total samples
EPSR	13 (16.3%)	28 (35%)	4 (5%)	10 (12.5%)	80(100%)
VPSR	16 (20%)	24 (30%)	7 (9%)	10 (12.5%)	80(100%)

4.3. COHESIVE DEVICES IN EPSR AND VPSR

4.3.1. Grammatical Cohesion in EPSR and VPSR

According to Halliday and Hasan [18], two kinds of cohesion are grammatical and lexical cohesion. Grammatical cohesion consists of reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. Lexical cohesion consists of reiteration and collocation.

Table 4.4.Grammatical Cohesion in EPSR and VPSR

Grammatical Cohesion	English		Vietnamese	
	Occur	Rate	Occur	Rate
Reference	1440	66.4%	350	60%
Substitution	0	0	0	0

Ellipsis	210	9.6%	70	12%
Conjunction	520	24%	165	28%
Total	**2170**	**100%**	**585**	**100%**

4.3.1.1. Reference in EPSR and VPSR

According to Halliday and Hassan [18], reference is the specific nature of the information that is signed for retrieval and the cohesion lies in the continuity of reference whereby the same thing enters into discourse a second time.

(i) Personal Reference

Personal reference includes three classes: personal pronouns, possessive determiners and possessive pronouns.

(4.1)Your smartphone or tablet plays host to a wealth of important information, from addresses to photos to passwords. Here's how to protect it all. [61]

*(4.2) Trong khu vực châu Á - Thái Bình Dương, các trang mạng xã hội đã và đang đóng góp rất nhiều vào việc thúc đẩy doanh số bán hàng cũng như nỗ lực tiếp thị. Mặc dù ngày càng nhiều doanh nghiệp sử dụng phương thức truyền thông này, nhưng **họ** không nhận thức đầy đủ những rủi ro tiềm năng và các nguy cơ mà các phương tiện truyền thông xã hội có thể mang lại.* [210]

The italicized words above are examples of personal pronouns.The word **"it"** in 4.1 refers back to **"your smartphone or tablet"** and the word **"*họ*"** in 4.2 refers back to **"*nhiều doanh nghiệp"*.**

Another means to gain cohesion and coherence of a text is to use possessive pronouns. They are only used in EPSR. Let's consider the following examples.

*(4.3) Emails are a great way for a business to communicate with their employees because they are fast and affordable. Customers can communicate directly to customer-service representatives regarding any question or concern that they may have about their products or services. They will be able to get all of their answers in a quick and efficient manner, allowing **them** to return to the small business for repeat services and allowing the business to increase its customer satisfaction ratings.* [68]

The possessive pronoun **"them"** in (4.3) refers to **"customers"** in the previous part of the sentence to maintain the relationship between the sentences.

(ii) Demonstrative reference in EPSR and VPSR

Demonstrative reference involves the use of the determiners" this, that, these, those", the definite article "the" (the neutral determiner) and the adverbs "here, there, now, then" [18, p.267].

*(4.4) Imagine how you'd feel if you lost your wallet. Scary thought, right? Now imagine if you lost your smartphone or tablet. It's not only an expensive piece of hardware gone missing, but also a mountain of personal data: contacts (both business and personal), appointment calendars, photos, memos, and most likely your Facebook and Twitter feeds.Of course, **that** data can be at risk even if you keep your device tucked safely in a pocketorpurse.* [140]

The anaphoric reference "*that*" in example (4.4) refers back to *a mountain of personal data: contacts (both business and personal), appointment calendars, photos, memos, and most likely your Facebook and Twitter feeds.*

Unlike EPSR, demonstrative reference in VPSR does not include the the definite article "the" (the neutral determiner). Here is an example in EPSR:

(4.5) *A clever experiment may make it possible for you to recover a stolen camera, find people using your photos without permission and help police catch child pornographers.**The experiment** is a collaboration between GadgetTrak, a software company that makes data-protection and tracking software for computers and phones, and CPUsage, a company that gets home computers to collaborate on crunching data when they aren't in use (similar to SETI at home).* [86]

"The" in the above example is an anaphoric reference marker followed by *experiment* to refer to "*a clever experiment*" and its function is to give the cohesion between the two sentences.

(iii) The use of comparative in EPSR and VPSR

Comparative reference can be divided into two groups: *general comparison and particular comparison. General comparison* compares the likeness and unlikeness of two things without respect to any particular property. *Particular comparison* compares things in terms of quantity or quality.

(4.6)*Nước là tài nguyên khan hiếm và đối với nhiều nước, nguồn cung cấp nước không đáp ứng đủ cầu. Cùng với áp lực biến đổi khí hậu và tăng dân số, nước sẽ càng trở nên **khan hiếm hơn**, nhất là ở các khu vực đang phát triển.Hơn nữa, trong những khu vực này, nước có sẵn thường không đảm bảo an toàn để uống.* [147]

The general comparison "khan hiếm hơn" from the above example has great effect on creating strong links among sentences in texts.

(4.7)*The company published a response to a blog earlier this week that recounted the problem of "bricked" Tesla Roadster batteries. The blog claimed that **more than** five owners of the Roadster electric sports car allowed their batteries to be completely discharged, rendering them inoperable.* [106]

By using "more than" in (4.7), the writer illustrates the comparison of quantity.

4.3.1.2. Ellipsis in EPSR and VPSR

The term *ellipsis* refers to the absence of a word, a phrase or a clause which is understood thanks to the context. Based on the viewpoints of Diep Quang Ban [43], Halliday and Hassan [18], there are three ellipsis types: nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis and clausal ellipsis.

(i) Nominal ellipsis

*(4.8) Climate change is affecting plants' seasonal activities more strongly than biological experiments suggest. The finding suggests that such studies may have to be reworked to get a better picture of the effects of global warming."**This** Ø is huge," says Benjamin Cook, a climate scientist at NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York, and a member of the team behind the study.* [137]

In the example (4.8), "*this*" is the ellipted form of "*this better picture of the effects of global warming*". "*This*" is elliptically used in an unconscious way in English for avoiding the repetition of the whole nominal group and this phenomenon derives the addressee of their attention to the new information given subsequently.

(4.9)*Đây là trục trặc bị phàn nàn nhiều nhất khi iPhone 4 thường xuyên mất cột sóng, thậm chí **Ø1** không thể kết nối khi thiết bị*

*xoay hướng. Apple buộc phải thông cáo chính thức thừa nhận sơ suất này, đồng thời **Ø2** hứa hẹn sẽ cho ra mắt bản vá lỗi nay mai.* [146]

Nominal ellipsis in (4.9) occurs at the position of subjects, or in the other words, the subjects are elliptical to avoid unnecessary repetition of the subjects *"iPhone 4" and "Apple"* .These sentences can be sufficiently recovered as follows: *thậm chí **iPhone 4** không thể kết nối...and đồng thời **Apple** hứa hẹn sẽ cho ra mắt bản vá lỗi nay mai.*

(ii) Verbal ellipsis

Verbal ellipsis is the second type of ellipsis that Halliday and Hassan state. Verbal ellipsis is "characteristic of all texts, spoken andwritten, and provides an extremely subtle and flexible means of creating varied and intricate discourse" [18, p.194].

(4.10)*This is not to say you should lock your phone inside a closet and **Ø** never touch it again. Although the risks of mobile malware are on the rise, you can enjoy your smartphone's many features safely by using common sense and learning a few security techniques.* [111]

In (4.10), *"never touch it again"* can be recovered *"should never touch it again"*. This is the type of operator ellipsis, or in the other words, one operator is omitted from the verbal group. The writer's intention is to list some advice to the readers.

(iii) Clausal ellipsis

Clausal ellipsis occurs when both a noun or noun phrase and a verb, or at least part of a verb phrase, is omitted. According to Halliday and Hassan, there are two kinds of clausal ellipsis: a clause or its part can be ellipted in a Yes-No or Wh-construction. Consider the following example:

(4.11) **Ø1** D*one checking email and hitting up your favorite websites? Then why not **Ø2** turn off Wi-Fi? That's the best protection you can buy, and you'll get the added bonus of longer battery life. Of course, you'll still be able to use your word processor, watch movies, and so on — activities that don't require Internet access.* [115]

In (4.11), **Ø1** can be recovered as follows: *"Have you done checking email and hitting up your favorite websites?"* **Ø2** is the elliptical form of *why don't you turn off Wi-Fi?* The writer uses these ellipses to reduce the discourse length but he/she can establish discourse coherence and contribute to a positive solution with the reader.

4.3.1.3. Conjunction in EPSR and VPSR

Conjunction is used to link words, phrases, clauses, sentences or even larger segments in discourse like paragraphs together to secure the logical-semantic relationship.

Additive conjunctions in English are *and, in addition, furthermore, besides, similarly, likewise, etc*. In Vietnamese, *và, còn, hơn nữa, ngoài ra, bên cạnh đó, nói một cách khác, v.v...* is used to join sentences. Here are the examples:

(4.12) *Many users make the mistake of storing passwords **and** other sensitive info in memos **and** address books, where prying eyes can find them with just a few taps.* [88]

Adversative conjunctions in English are *but, however, yet, in fact, on the contrary, on the other hand, etc*; in Vietnamese: *nhưng, song, dù, trái lại, tuy nhiên, dù vậy, ngược lại, v.v...*For instance:

(4.13) *Nạn trộm cắp ôtô luôn là vấn đề nhức nhối ở khắp mọi nơi trên thế giới.**Mặc dù** đã được trang bị hệ thống báo động như nhá đèn, còi hụ **nhưng** xe thì vẫn cứ mất.* [193]

English causative conjunctions are *therefore, so, because, as a result, for, etc* while in Vietnamese *vì thế, thế nên, do đó, do vậy, vì vậy, thế nên, như vậy, v.v...*

(4.14)*The efficient design is perfect for the green geek. It grealy reduces smoke and **therefore** creates a minimal carbon footprint. It's also a neat option for those who invest in survival gear.* [125]

The last type of conjunction is temporal.

(4.15) *To avoid these kinds of scams, do a little research before you install any app. Search online for both professional and user reviews, **then** make note of the developer and pricing model.* [116]

4.4.2. Lexical Cohesion in EPSR and VPSR

According to Halliday and Hassan [18, p.278], the two basic categories of lexical cohesion are reiteration and collocation. However, with regard to semantic tie, I only focus on the reiteration of lexical items.

(4.16) *Hơn 2 năm qua, đội ngũ thiết kế ghế trẻ em của Dorel đã nghiên cứu những vụ va chạm từ bên hông cùng với các nhà nghiên cứu tại trường đại học Kettering. Vào cuối giai đoạn này, công nghệ Air Protect đã ra đời.Công nghệ Air Protect sẽ nén và bảo vệ trẻ không bị ảnh hưởng từ áp lực của vụ va chạm.* [144]

Another type of reiteration is synonymy

(4.17) *Ms. Fennell expects Tuesday's roundtable to focus on the best **ways** to educate the public about the hyperthermia risks, which she says is a good start but insufficient."We also believe technology must be part of the **solution**, just as it has been with*

seatbelts and airbags to prevent crash injuries," Ms. Fennell wrote in a press release. [128]

Example (4.17) shows the use of two synonyms that occur in the first sentence and the second sentence. The noun "*way*" in the first sentence is synonymous with the noun "*solution*" in the second sentence.This synonymy has great effect on creating strong connections between the sentences and emphasizing the problem and solution of preventing crash injuries.

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study has found out the similarities and differences in EPSR and VPSR in terms of lexical choice, text structures and cohesive devices. In terms of lexical choice, both EPSR and VPSR are explicitly marked by a number of vocabulary items that cluster round the relation, making it distinguishable from the others. The discourse-organizing words in English are:

-Problem: difficulty, obstacle, drawback, dilemma, hindrance, problem, threat, etc.

-Solution: solve, deal with, measure, solution, answer, tip, way, rule, etc.

The words that often occur in the two main elements of the problem-solution relation in Vietnamese are:

-Problem: nan giải, khó khăn, trở ngại, bế tắc, tắc nghẽn, hiểm họa, vấn đề, sơ suất, v.v…

- Solution: biện pháp, giải pháp, giải quyết, cách, lời khuyên, hướng dẫn, v.v…

As for lexical fields, there are many similarities between EPSR and VPSR in technological newspaper articles. Each specific domain of technology makes its own choice of peculiar words used as field markers that enable the readers not only to understand the content of the text but also identify the field which it belongs to. However, there is a difference between EPSR and VPSR in lexical choices. The English writers tend to use discourse- organizing words more than the Vietnamese ones. The use of discourse- organizing words in EPSR takes up the highest percentage with 52 instances (occupying 65%), as opposed to 39% in VPSR. On the contrary, the circular and indirect ways of expression without discourse-organizing words in VPSR accounts for 61% versus 39% in EPSR.

With regards to the text structures, the elements of the problem-solution relation in English and Vietnamese technological newspaper articles are not necessarily the same length. As in English, the text structure of the problem-solution relation in Vietnamese sometimes has only two main elements: **problem-solution**.The simple structure of this kind is the same as the question-answer relation and can only be found in English technological newspaper articles. Sometimes, the reality principle may tell the writer that an evaluation is not necessary. So, the text structure has only three elements: **situation-problem-solution.** In general, a typical problem-solution text structure has four successive elements: **situation-problem-solution-evaluation**. In some cases, the situation – problem-solution-evaluation sequence does not appear in chronological order in a text. The evaluation can occur after either

the problem or the solution.The problem-solution relation in English as well as in Vietnamese sometimes becomes more complicated and difficult to predict where each element might appear in the relationship, especially in long texts, as in this complex structure: **Situation-Problem-Solution 1- Evaluation 1- Solution 2- Evaluation 2- General Evaluation.** When there are two possible solutions in a text, the second is usually better or more feasible than the first. The first evaluation tends to be negative but the second tends to be very positive. However, their difference is shown in the frequencies of occurrences. There are no cases of using the structure **Problem (Question) - Solution (Answer)** in VPRS, as opposed to that in EPSR (10%). Moreover, the structure Problem-Solution in EPRS accounts for 22.5% versus 37.5% in VPRS. On the contrary, the precentage rates of the structure **Situation-Problem-Solution** in VPRS and EPSR are not much different (13.8% versus 15%) and the structure **Situation-Problem-Solution-Evaluation** takes up the highest proportion among four types of text structures. Another remarkable similarity of text structure is that EPSR and VPSR are embedded with other relations in technological newspaper articles. The highest percentage of **cause-effect** relation in EPSR is 35% and in VPSR is 30%. However, the **claim-counterclaim** one in VPSR is higher than in EPSR (16% versus 13%).The **comparison- contrast** one in EPSR and VPSR takes a low percentage (5% and 9%). Besides, the **general-specific** relation both in EPSR and VPSR takes up the same percentage (12.5%). Thanks to these relations, EPSR and VPSR seem to be more impressed and persuasive.

Finally, cohesion is the use of linguistic devices to link the sentences and paragraphs together. Firstly, in grammatical cohesion,

reference, ellipsis and conjunction are used; whereas, there are no cases of using substitution. Secondly, in lexical cohesion, no cases of superordinates are found in the study.

There are some differences between EPSR and VPSR. Firstly, English writers have a strong tendency to use reference than Vietnamese ones (66.4% versus 60%). Contrary to the English writers, the Vietnamese writers use ellipsis and conjunction higher. As for reference devices, personal reference in EPSR accounts for 29.8% with 220 instances versus 11.3% with 50 instances in VPSR. There is a clear difference of possessive pronouns between EPSR and VPSR. Possessive pronouns are used with a rate of 6.4% in EPSR; meanwhile, no cases are used in VPSR. Possessive determiners in EPSR are higher than those in VPSR (8.1% versus 6.3%). For ellipsis, nominal ellipsis takes up the highest proportion with 81% in EPSR versus 78.6% in VPSR, but clausal ellipsis is very rare only with the percentage of 5.7% in EPSR. Besides, verbal ellipsis in VPSR is higher than that in EPSR (21.4% versus 13.3%). For conjunction, the frequency of temporal conjunction in VPSR is much higher than that in EPSR (30.3% versus 13.5%). Secondly, in terms of lexical cohesion, repetition accounts the highest percentage with 79% in EPSR and 84% in VPSR, followed by synonyms (21% versus 16%).

5.2. IMPLICATIONS

The thesis has dealt with the applications of teaching and learning English as a foreign language. The findings of the study will probably be a useful source for Vietnamese learners of English. Learning to write effectively is a difficult task because it requires good knowledge of discourse in which cohesion and coherence are

two important aspects contributing to successful writing both in English and Vietnamese. When teaching students how to produce acceptable pieces of writing concerning such relation as problem-solution in English, the teacher should give them some discourse-organizing words that cluster round each relation. Doing so, we will help the students avoid going off the topic being discussed, which is a very important point during the process of writing. Vietnamese learners of English should master four types of text structures and text structures with embedded relations in EPSR and VPSR. More importantly, cohesive devices enable writers to establish the relationships between ideas to make the text logical, smooth and unified. Besides, learners are often influenced by their mother tongue, so when teaching students to write this kind of discourse, the teacher should remind them to pay attention to the similarities and differences between EPSR and VPSR, especially the differences. When the students realize the differences between two languages, they will be able to write texts that can be acceptable.

5.3. LIMITATIONS OF THE THESIS AND FURTHER STUDY

5.3.1. Limitations of the Thesis

The study is limited to some discourse features namely the lexical features, text structures and cohesive devices of the Problem-Solution relation in technological newspaper articles.

5.3.2. Suggesting for Further Researches

-An investigation into the Claim-Counterclaim in English and Vietnamese political newspaper articles.

-An investigation into the Comparison- Contrast in English and Vietnamese critical views.