CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Functional Grammar

Halliday (1985:xiii) argues that functional grammar is essentially a natural grammar, in the sense that everything in it can be explained, ultimately by the reference to how language is used. In this explanation, a grammar becomes a tool to figure out a meaning or a message obtained in a language.

Gerot & Wignell (1994:6) add that functional grammar views language as a resource for making meaning. These grammars attempt to describe a language in an actual use and so focus on texts and their contexts. They are concerned not only with the structures but also with how those structures construct a meaning. So, the meaning of a text is construed grammatically and functionally by following the context.

The study of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) is a part of a social semiotic approach to language called Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). In Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG), language is analyzed in three ways: semantics, phonology, and lexicogrammar, moreover, involving three generalized functions called metafunctions. The metafunctions view that all languages have resources for construing experience (the ideational function), enacting humans’ diverse and complex social relations (the interpersonal function), and enabling these two types of meanings to come together in a coherent text (the textual function). Those three semantic systems make meanings of related kind and are mapped onto the structure of clauses.
Ideational function, unlike two other functions, is the meanings by which people make sense of reality. They are meanings of phenomena about things, about goings on and the circumstances surrounding these happenings and doings. These meanings are realized in wordings through participants, processes, and circumstances. Meanings of this kind are most centrally influenced by field of discourse (Gerot and Wignell, 1994:120).

This function is concerned with building and maintaining the theory of experience. It includes experiential function and logical function. Grammatically, the experiential function shows the process of making meaning from experience that language evolves through clauses, whereas the logical function is the systems of construing logical meaning between clauses. This logical function is realized through logical semantic relation and systems of interdependence combining clauses into a clause complex. The framework drawn is as follows:

Figure 3. Metafunctions (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004)
2.2. Clause and Clause Complex

In Systemic Functional Grammar, a clause is functioned as a unit in which a transitivity, mood, and theme-rheme are considered to be mapped into its system. This clause is considered as the largest unit that its function and meaning are cohesively structured.

Gerot & Wignell (1994:89) state that a clause complex is comprised of two or more clauses logically connected, or put another way, a clause complex is a sequence of processes which are logically connected. From this viewpoint, it is clear that logical semantic relation is that logical connection used to construct a clause complex by having two or more processes engaging one another. This clause complex is also known as the more complex structure of clauses. The connection between clauses also has an equality or interdependency. For examples:

A1. You may come to my house

A2. You may come to my house whenever you want

Example A1 shows a simple sentence and is identified as a clause because this sentence only has one single clause which contains one subject (bold typed) and one predicate (underlined). Whereas, example A2 is a clause complex which the secondary clause whenever you want (bold typed and underlined) is a dependent clause and attached to expand the primary clause. The clause complex has two clauses and each clause has its own predicate.

2.2.1. Minor Vs Major Clauses

Even though a clause is the largest unit in a functional system, it does not mean a clause is constructed with complete grammatical structure. Based on this, there are two types of clauses: minor clauses and major clauses. Minor clauses can be
found in both written and spoken language. Some elements in minor clauses may be implied in some contexts.

Structurally, a minor clause does not have a predicator, on the other hand, a major clause does. For examples:

Address (vocatives)  B1. *Rhonda, sweety cakes*

Greeting  B2. *Hi! Good afternoon!*

Exclamations  B3. *Oh water!*

The three examples above show minor clauses which have no predicator. Example B1 is a vocative (underlined) which is used to appoint something or someone. This clause does not have a complete form of a simple sentence and neither does example B2 (greeting) nor B3 (exclamation).

B4. Diana *asked* Annie to stay in her house

B5. But she *refused*

B6. Which *made* Diana rather disappointed

B7 As she had *thought*

B8. She *was* her best friend

Each of clauses above has a predicator and said as a major clause. Those five clauses contain both subjects and predicates. Each of the sentences is connected as a clause complex. Examples B5, B6, B7 and B8 show that secondary clauses in a clause complex are in a major-clause form.

### 2.2.2. Major Clauses: Independent Vs Dependent

Major clauses have two types based on their independency. There are independent and dependent clauses.

C1. *Although Angelina studied hard, she failed*
C2. Angelina studied hard.

C3. However, she failed.

An independent clause is seen as a clause which can stand alone whereas a dependent clause cannot. At the example C1, *although Angelina studied hard* (bold typed) is a dependent clause because the clause cannot stand alone and is a member of a clause complex. If the clause is separated (example C2 and C3), both clauses are independent. In a clause complex, this independent clause is also called a primary clause whereas the dependent clause is called secondary clause.

There is a possibility of a clause to not being counted in a clause complex as a dependent clause if the clause does not function as a dependent clause but more likely a word which qualify or modify something. This occurrence is called as an embedded clause. For further explanation, look at the example:

Non-embedded clause  C4. *The prisoner, who was a serial killer,* escaped.

Embedded            C5. *The prisoner who was a serial killer* escaped.

The clause *who was a serial killer* (underlined) in the example C4 preceded by a comma is identified as a dependent clause. This is also a non-restricted relative clause. Otherwise, in the example C5 (bold typed) are just words qualifying the meaning of *the prisoner.*

### 2.2.3. Taxis

Taxis is usually called member of complex. It is an interdependence system for joining clauses. It refers to the dependency status of clauses in a clause complex. There are two relations: parataxis and hypotaxis which generally means about the structure of the clauses. The term *hypotaxis* is used to a relationship in which one clause is dependent on another. It is called as subordination because the secondary
clause is dependent to the primary clause. The term *parataxis* is used when one clause follows another. It is called as coordination because both primary and secondary clauses are independent. Either the dependent or independent status determines whether clauses in a clause complex can stand individually when being separated.

### 2.2.3.1. Parataxis

Parataxis refers to clauses as being initiating or continuing. The relation between clauses in a paratactic clause complex is equal. It means when clauses in a clause complex are separated, those clauses can stand alone. Paratactic clauses are marked by number: 1, 2, 3 and so on. For example:

Paratactic 1  
Diana *asked* Annie to stay in her house

2  
*but she refused*

The relation of clauses is paratactic, each clause is equal and can stand individually. The secondary clause *but she refused* is attached by a coordinate conjunction *but*.

### 2.2.3.2 Hypotaxis

Hypotaxis refers to clauses as being either dominant or dependent. Halliday (1985:198) states that hypotaxis is the binding elements of unequal status. The dominant element is free, but the dependent element is not. Status is marked through Greek letters. Alpha marks the dominant clause. Clauses are marked alpha (α), beta (β), gamma (γ), and so on. It is important to note that the alpha, or dominant clause, does not necessarily come first in a clause complex. For example:

Hypotactic  
α  
*I tidied up my messy desk,*

β  
*which took the better part of the morning*
The relation of the above projection is hypotactic. The primary clause is an independent clause and the secondary clause is dependent on it.

2.2.4. Logical Semantic Relation

This logical semantic relation has been known as the relation between clauses in a clause complex, the relation between primary and secondary clauses. Halliday (1985:196) argues that logico-semantic relation is a wide range of different logico-semantic relations any of which may hold between primary and secondary member of a clause complex. But it is possible to group these into a small number of general types, expansion and projection. The followings are logical semantic relations and their interdependency brought by Gerot & Wignell (1994:89-97) and Halliday (1985, 1994, & 2004) which become the main theoretical background of this research.

2.2.4.1. Expansion

In logical semantic relation, expansion links processes by providing additional information. The additional information is distributed through secondary clauses. It involves three types of relationship: Elaboration, Extention, and Enhancement. This relationship can be cross-classified with taxis or the system of interdependence.
The markers which join the clauses of logical semantic relation of expansion and their interdependence are as follows:

Table.1. Markers Which Join Clauses in Expansion (Gerot & Wignel, 1994:94)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Taxis Relation</th>
<th>Markers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elaborating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paratactic</td>
<td>that is to say, or (rather), in other words, for example, for instance, in fact, like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hypotactic</td>
<td>Which</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.4.1.1. Elaboration

This type of logical semantic relation elaborates the clauses by specifying or describing it. This involves four relationships: specifying in greater detail, restatement, exemplification, and comment. Elaboration is shown through the sign =. The types of logical relationships covered under this category are the ‘i.e.’, ‘e.g.’ and ‘namely’ type or also called as exposition or restatement, exemplification and clarification or comment.

a) Exposition or Restatement

This elaboration type is by restating the primary clause and making it in a greater detail. For example: *This stew is awful = it's too salty*. It is restated and given a greater detail.

b) Exemplification

This elaboration type is making the secondary clause as the example of the primary clause to develop it. For example: *You are too young for this conversation*
(primary clause) = *for instance you do not understand us* (secondary clause). The secondary clause is obviously an example provided for the primary clause.

c) Clarification or Comment

This elaboration type clarifies the primary clause by adding an explanatory comment. For example: *I've played in several orchestras* (primary clause) = *I've played in the Darwin symphony and the Brisbane Sinfonia* (secondary clause). The secondary clause is a clarification or information of the primary clause.

a) Paratactic Elaboration

When a clause complex contains clauses which the secondary clause is elaborating the primary clause and equal to the primary clause is called as Paratactic Elaboration. While elaboration is marked as = and parataxis is marked as number 1, 2, .., so, paratactic elaboration is marked as:

```
1 = 2
```

For example:

```
1 I tidied up my messy desk
= 2 it needed it
```

The relation between the clauses above is paratactic elaboration because the secondary clause specifies the primary clause and both clauses are independent.

b) Hypotactic Elaboration

This hypotactic elaboration happens when a clause complex contains clauses in which the secondary clause is elaborating the primary clause and dependent to the primary clause. While elaboration is marked as = and hypotaxis is marked as Greek letters $\alpha, \beta, \ldots$, so, hypotactic elaboration is marked as:

```
\alpha = \beta
```
For example:

\[ a \quad I \text{ tidied up my messy desk}, \]
\[ = \beta \quad \text{which took the better part of the morning} \]

The relation between the clauses above is hypotactic elaboration because the secondary clause specifies the primary clause and the secondary clause is dependent to the primary clause.

Hypotactic elaboration also comes through finite and non-finite clauses. The finite hypotactic elaboration is seen by the use of relatives who, whom, which, whose, when, where, why, and how. The dependent clause must be preceded by a comma to show it is not an embedded clause. It also happens to non-finite category which the dependent clause is in the form of present participle, past participle or gerund. For examples:

Finite \quad D1. \text{This is Nadya, whom you are looking for}

Non-finite \quad D2. \text{He always does his daily activity, watering the garden}

2.2.4.1.2. Extension

This relation extends the meaning of one clause by adding something new. It is divided into three types: addition, replacement, and alternation. The role of conjunctions is determining the relationship between the primary and the secondary clauses. They are such as additive (and, nor), adversative (but), replacive (instead), subtractive (except), and alternative (or) conjunctions. It involves ‘and’, ‘but’, and ‘or’ type relationships and marked or symbolized by a + sign. For example:

\[ I \text{ play a guitar} \]
\[ + \text{ and my brother plays a piano} \]
\[ I \text{ love playing guitar} \]
but I’m less rapt with biola

I could follow a course

or I could practice myself

In this case, the second clause adds a new, but related meaning to the first. It could be considered that extension is as the ‘moreover’ or ‘furthermore’ relationship.

a) Paratactic Extension

In paratactic extension, it is divided into two types: addition and variation. In addition type, it is by adjoining the clauses using additive and adversative conjunctions. Variation type is a replacement of other clause and using alternative and subtractive conjunctions. This paratactic extension is marked as:

\[
\begin{align*}
1 + 2
\end{align*}
\]

For example:

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & \quad I \text{ tidied up my messy desk} \\
+ 2 & \quad \text{and I finished revising a paper}
\end{align*}
\]

The relation between the clauses above is paratactic extension because the secondary clause is an addition or something new different from the primary clause, using a paratactic additive conjunction and both clauses are independent.

b) Hypotactic Extension

Additive conjunction used for this type is beside. Some other conjunctions used are comparative (on the other hand, instead, whereas, while) conjunctions. This hypotactic extension is symbolized as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha + \beta
\end{align*}
\]

For example:

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha & \quad I \text{ tidied up my messy desk} \\
+ \beta & \quad \text{whereas Des prepared lecture notes}
\end{align*}
\]
The relation between clauses above is hypotactic extension because the secondary clause is a variation or something new different from the primary clause, using a comparative conjunction *whereas* and the secondary clause is dependent to the primary clause.

The finite category comes when the secondary clause uses a contrastive dependency while non-finite category applies for non-finite-formed dependency such as present participle, past participle or gerund. For example:

Finite E1. Sandra is a good student in her school, while Nadya is a troublemaker

Non-finite E2. The Indian was shot by the hunter, injured by an air gun

2.2.4.1.3. Enhancement

This involves circumstantial relationship where the circumstantial information is coded as a new clause rather than within a clause. This can be temporal, conditional, causal, concessive, spatial or manner. It is marked through an “x” sign. For example:

*I went to rehearsal*

\(x\) after I lectured all day (temporal)

*You don’t have time to practice*

\(x\) if you teach both day and night (conditional)

*We didn’t have a rehearsal on Monday*

\(x\) because it was a public holiday (causal)

*We had a rehearsal on Monday*

\(x\) although it was a public holiday (concessive)

*We rehearsed at Kedron Park High School*
I’m developing a more pleasing sound

x by changing my embouchure (manner)

a) Paratactic Enhancement

Like extension, enhancement also does need the role of conjunctions. Some conjunctions used for paratactic enhancement are: temporal (meanwhile, when,), spatial (and there), manner (in that way, thus), causal (therefore), conditional (otherwise), and concessive (yet, still). The types of marker used are summarized below:

Table 2. Markers of Paratactic Enhancement (Saragih, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Markers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>A meanwhile B&lt;br&gt;A subsequently B&lt;br&gt;A previously B</td>
<td>(and) meanwhile, (when) (and) then, and + afterwards and/but + before that/first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td>A there B</td>
<td>and there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>A is via/by means of B&lt;br&gt;A is like B</td>
<td>(and) in that way, (and) thus (and) similarly, (and) so, thus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Causal-Conditional</td>
<td>because A so result B&lt;br&gt;because intention A so action B&lt;br&gt;if A then B&lt;br&gt;if not A then B&lt;br&gt;if A then contrary to expectation B&lt;br&gt;contrary to expectation A then B</td>
<td>(and) so, (and) therefore for, because (and) then, (and) therefore or else, (or) otherwise but, (and) yet, still, but + nevertheless (though)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This type of enhancement is marked as:

\[
1 \times 2
\]

For example:

\begin{align*}
1 & \quad I \text{ tidied up my messy desk} \\
\times 2 & \quad \text{so I have somewhere to write again}
\end{align*}

The secondary clause of enhancing relationship above is independent so both clauses can stand alone. This paratactic enhancement is attaching a causal conjunction so.

b) Hypotactic Enhancement

Hypotactic enhancement is sometimes seen as an adverbial clause because the secondary clause qualifies the process in the primary clause. In deciding whether a clause complex is paratactic or hypotactic, it can be done by changing the order of the clauses. If the conjunction moves with the clause, it is most likely hypotactic. Hypotactic enhancement is symbolized as:

\[
a \times \beta
\]

For example:

\begin{align*}
a & \quad I \text{ tidied up my messy desk} \\
\times \beta & \quad \text{because I couldn’t find the meeting agenda} \\
\text{or} \quad \times \beta & \quad \text{because I couldn’t find the meeting agenda} \\
a & \quad I \text{ tidied up my messy desk}
\end{align*}

In this case, the secondary clause because I couldn’t find the meeting agenda is an adverbial clause which qualifies the process tidied up in the primary clause. The relation is hypotactic due to its dependent status.

As summarized below, the finite hypotactic is constructed by using subordinating conjunctions while non-finite is constructed by using particular conjunctions and prepositions.
Table 3. Markers of Hypotactic Enhancement (Saragih, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Finite</th>
<th>Non-Finite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conjunctions</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>as, while</td>
<td>while</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>when, as soon as,</td>
<td>when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the moment whenever,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>every time after, since</td>
<td>since until</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>until/till</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as, while</td>
<td>while</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>when</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td>as far as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td>where</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whichever, everywhere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>as, as if, like, the way</td>
<td>like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Causal-Conditional</td>
<td>because, as, in case,</td>
<td>with, through, by, at, as a result, because of, in case of (in order/so as) to, for (the sake of), with the aim of, for fear of in the event of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>seeing that, considering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in order that, so that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>if provided that,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as long as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>even if, although</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.4.2 Projection

A clause *He said “I’ll come to your house”* and the clause *I’ll come to your house* have the same meaning but the first clause is a projection or representation of the second clause in another viewpoint. This condition is said as a projection when it
links clauses by having one process projected through another either by quoting or reporting. Both meanings (ideas) and wordings (locutions) can be projected. A projected wording is marked with (“”) and a projected idea is marked with (‘). Either propositions (information) or proposals (goods and services) can be projected. Projection occurs through Mental (idea projection) and Verbal Processes (locutions projection). For example:

Verbal:

*The conductor said*

“*The next concert is in July*

Mental:

*I thought*

‘*the next concert is in July*

In the cases above, *said* is a verbal process and *thought* is a mental process, so the first clause is locution and the second clause is idea.

### 2.2.4.2.1. Idea

Halliday (1985:197) assumes idea is one clause is projected through another, which presents it as an idea, a construction of meaning. Idea is a projection type in which a mental process is as the basic because this projection relates to meanings and feelings. Not all mental processes can project. It is important to know whether a clause can project or not based on the mental processes. Mental processes of perception (see, hear, etc) do not project. Mental processes of cognition (think, remember, consider) can project propositions by both quoting and reporting. Mental processes of reaction (want, desire) can project proposals.
a) Paratactic Idea

Paratactic idea is commonly seen as a quoting projection because each clause can stand individually or independent. In addition, it mostly uses mental process of cognition. This type of projection is also reversible. Paratactic idea is marked as:

1 ‘ 2

For example:

1 I thought
‘ 2 ‘I can’t have dinner with you

Mental process thought is used. I can’t have dinner with you is an independent clause which follows the primary clause.

b) Hypotactic Idea

This type of projection is said as a hypotactic idea if a dependent status is attached in the secondary clause. It is marked with:

α ‘ β

For example:

Idea: proposition

α I thought
‘ β that I couldn’t meet you again

α I decided
‘ β to meet you again

Idea: proposal

α I don’t want
‘ β to meet you again

In these cases, the addition of the word that and to is to make the status of the clause dependent and it is irreversible. This hypotactic idea does not only project mental
process of cognition but also mental process of reaction (want, desire). That is why both proposition (information) and proposals (goods and service) can be projected.

The finite category happens when both clauses are finite or in the indicative mood, while the non-finite category occurs if the secondary clause is non-finite or in the form of gerund or to infinitive. For example:

Finite  F1. They considered that the animals would be preserved
Non-finite  F2. He thought to finish it all

2.2.4.2.2. Locution

Locution is simply a classification of projection where verbal processes are required to be involved. Halliday (1994:252) explains that types of verbal processes are: (a) General process (say), (b) Specific verbs of statements (tell, observe, repot, announce) and Questions (ask, demand, inquire), (c) Verb say combined with circumstantial element such as explanation (explain), response (reply), reservation (protest) (d) Verbs with a connotation to various actions and feelings such as shout (say loudly), insist (say emphatically), complain (say irritably).

Based on the use, verbal processes are divided into reporting and quoting. Some verbs like insinuate, deny, imply, maintain are used only for reporting and others such as say, tell, remark, shout, demand, protest, announce are used for both reporting and quoting.

a) Paratactic Locution

If wordings in a clause are projected by another clause in a clause complex, then it is called locution. Furthermore, if those clauses are quoted and independent, then it must be a paratactic locution. Paratactic locution is also identified as reversible clause. This paratactic locution is marked as:
For example:

```
1   I said
2   “I can’t meet you again
```

In this case, a clause *I said* is a projecting clause and *I can’t do this assignment* is a projected clause. Since both projecting and projected clause are reversible, the clause complex above is identified as paratactic locution.

b) Hypotactic Locution

It is not enough to differ between paratactic and hypotactic projection only by seeing at the dependent status of each. In fact, there is a type of a clause complex of hypotactic projection which both clauses are independent. An absolute identification is done by determining whether the clause is reversible or not. Then the role of quotation mark is also needed to make sure if the projection is quoting or reporting. This kind of condition is applicable towards both idea and locution type.

If the hypotactic locution has been identified accurately, then it is marked as:

```
α “ β
```

For example:

```
α   I said
β   that I couldn’t meet you again
α   He said
β   He wouldn’t meet you again
```

*He said* and *He wouldn’t meet you again* have an independent status, but it cannot be reversed as *He didn’t do that assignment He said*. So, type of this locution is hypotactic. Both the examples are in the finite category.
2.3. Previous Work

In supporting this research, it is needed to look at the previous similar researches to work upon. The similar researches taken are presented to know what the study is all about, the method used, the findings, what they contribute to, and the difference between those works and this research.

Marchelina (2014) writes a thesis entitled, “Taxis and Logico-semantic Relation Consisting in Clause Complexes in Business Articles on The New York Times Newspaper: A Study of Functional Grammar “. Her work is about the taxis relation and the relationship of logico-semantic relation in a selected newspaper text. This research uses a qualitative descriptive method and focuses on both taxis and logico-semantic relation. The results are 9 data of expansion relationship and 4 data of projection relationship. This research gives a good understanding for the writer on how to formulate the problems. Her research only puts one newspaper as the data source and separates logical semantic relation from taxis relation, whereas this current research takes two newspapers and combines logical semantic relation and its interdependence.

Maryam (2007) writes a thesis entitled, “Clause Complex Analysis in “No Greater Love””. This thesis analyzes the relationships of logical semantic relation in each clause of the novel, particularly expansion. This research uses qualitative descriptive method in which the data is qualified based on the classification of taxis relation and then explained more on the logical semantic relation. The results indicate that 6 data of hypotaxis show elaboration and enhancing relationships, 2 data in the form of parataxis show extending relationships. In addition, 3 data of parataxis and hypotaxis show extending-enhancing relationship and 2 data in the form of hypotaxis and parataxis bring enhancing and extending relationships. Therefore,
parataxis always brings extending relationships and hypotaxis always brings up the elaboration and enhancing relationships. This thesis gives a direction to put both types of logical semantic relations and to choose another form of data. The scope of the study in her research is only limited to expansion relationship since she believes that this relationship would give a significant result, meanwhile in this research, both expansion and projection are involved and the data are taken from newspaper texts.

Rukmini (2010) writes a thesis entitled “The Logico-Semantic Relation of Clause Complexes in the Abstracts of the Final Project Reports Produced by the English Department Students”. Her analysis is on the logical semantic relation of clause complexes occurs in the selected text and the realization of the author of the text. By using a qualitative descriptive method, she analyzed 5 abstracts written by the students of literature programs and other 5 abstracts of education programs. The results are clause complexes of both parataxis and hypotaxis. Whereas the logical semantic relations are elaboration, extension, enhancement and idea projection; the locution projection is not used at all. The realization is relatively good but some errors such as voice, grammar, tenses are still made by the students. Her research is contributive in defining the research design and the method. In her research, the logical semantic relation and taxis relation are separated. The data used is the students’ abstract, and the realization of the text is also discussed. This study analyses the data taken from newspaper. The logical semantic relation is combined with systems of interdependence.