

Lexical Cohesion Devices in Students' Narrative Text and Its Pedagogical Implication in Language Teaching: A Discourse-Semantics Point of View

Hieronimus Canggung Darong*, Yosefina Helenora Jem, Stanislaus Guna

Department of English, Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus, Indonesia

*Corresponding email: heironimusdarong@gmail.com

Received: 01 March 2022

Accepted: 06 April 2022

Published: 11 April 2022

Abstract: *Lexical Cohesion Devices in Students' Narrative Text and Its Pedagogical Implication in Language Teaching: A Discourse-Semantics Point of View.* **Objective:** This study aims at examining the lexical devices used in college students' narrative writing. **Method:** Each students was requested to compose a free-topic narrative text which were subsequently analyzed following the principles of discourse-semantic analysis framework. **Findings:** Although the use of conjunction and reference contributed to the cohesiveness, the results still confirmed that the lexical relations distributed within the texts did not suit with the linguistic environment of the texts. **Conclusion:** Referring to the findings, the texts constructed by the students were not really being cohesive. As an implication, in language teaching, teachers and learners should pay attention on the use of cohesive devices to create more and better logical writing.

Keywords: text, lexical device, cohesive, teaching

Abstrak: *Lexical Cohesion Devices in Students Narrative Text and Its Pedagogical Implication in Language Teaching: A Discourse-Semantics Point of View.* **Tujuan:** Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menyingkap penggunaan perangkat kohesi pada tulisan narasi siswa. **Metode:** Setiap siswa diminta untuk menulis sebuah teks narasi dengan topik bebas yang selanjutnya dianalisis dengan menggunakan konsep diskursus semantik. **Temuan:** Walaupun penggunaan konjungsi dan referensi berkontribusi pada kepaduan teks, hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa relasi leksikalnya tidak selaras dengan konteks penggunaan dalam teks. **Kesimpulan:** Merujuk pada temuan, peneliti menyimpulkan bahwa tulisan-tulisan siswa belum terpadu/kohesif. Sebagai implikasi, dalam pengajaran bahasa guru dan siswa harus memperhatikan penggunaan perangkat kohesi untuk menyusun tulisan yang lebih bagus dan logis

Kata kunci: teks, perangkat leksikal, kohesif, pengajaran

To cite this article:

Darong, H, C., Jem, Y, H., & Guna, S. (2022). Lexical Cohesion Devices in Students' Narrative and Its Pedagogical Implication in Language Teaching: A Discourse-Semantics Point of View. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif*, 12(1), 362-374. doi: 10.23960/jpp.v12.i1.202228.

■ INTRODUCTION

There have been many studies regarding the text. The studies highlight that text analysis should be based on many aspects such as linguistics aspects (Baklouti, 2011; Chang, 2018; Choura, 2019; da Cunha, 2019; Lin, 2015; Lorés-sanz, 2011; Nagao, 2019; Nguyen et al., 2020; Samar, Talebzadeh, Kiany, & Akbari, 2014) and approach or methodological aspect (Simpson, 2005; Skoufaki, 2019; Tomoyuki, 2021; Upton & Cohen, 2009; Welbers, Atteveldt, & Benoit, 2017).

Focusing on linguistic aspect, the grammatical structure alone is insufficient for the production of an adequate text. The standard grammatical structure should consider the actual communicative context. As such, it has something to do with situational coherence to the creation of a text. Yet, the use of a correct standard grammatical pattern and the consideration of situational context are not the only resources for creating a text. There is still another essential resource that needs to be considered in order to produce a text. This resource is concerned with the way the clauses used in a text that so-called text unity. As Eggins (1994), Choura, (2019), Ilinska, Ivanova, & Senko (2016) highlight that the resource deals with the components determining the unity of text namely contextual properties of a text referred to as coherence and cohesion which concerns with the internal properties of the text.

Furthermore, the concept of unity of text is related to semantic ties or "relations of meanings that exist within the text. It refers to the "non-structural text-forming relations (Halliday, 1985). Text would seem to lack any type of relationship if there is semantic ties linking to each components within the text itself. This is supported by Suwandi (2016) saying that that texts should have certain structure depending on factor that is quite different from those required

in the structure of a single sentence. Some of those factors are described in terms of cohesion devices that help to connect information of the text such as the use of conjunction, reference and the existence of lexical relation within the text.

In practice, the study of cohesion is an increasingly important area in applied linguistics. As such, cohesion processes in a text is crucial and is regarded as a required component of a text. One aspect of the cohesion in question is lexical cohesion by which connections between parts of the text occur. Lexical cohesion refers to relationship between and among words in a text. In this regard, it primarily deals with the cohesive relationships with other sentences and the creation of certain linguistic environment and the meaning of each sentence (Halliday, 1985; Moradi, 2011; Hasan, 2014; Scott-baumann, 2011)

Furthermore, Briones (2016), Eggins (1994) and Leong (2019) argue that the connection between text and cohesion is an understanding how cohesion functions within the text to create semantic relations that could be of benefit for so-called unity. Similarly, Yin (2017) says that the term cohesion refers to the way the parts of discourse are related together. Cohesion denotes certain features of a text like the semantic tie in a text, the consistency of participants, and the connection in terms of lexical selections such as reference, lexical relation, conjunction ellipsis, conversational structure, and a variety of lexical ties. Saying it differently, in order to achieve the sense of connectedness, cohesive device has a significant role in text writing.

Owing to the importance role of lexical cohesion in writing, there have been many studies carried out in the field. For example, The examination the texts conducted by Bu, Connorlinton, & Wang (2020), Chu & Huang (2020), Gusthini, Sobarna, & Amalia (2018), Kai (2008), Qian & Pan (2019), and Risberg & Lymer (2020)

who found that the words choice and semiotic layers determine the cohesiveness and proposition of the texts. Meanwhile, others dealt with linguistics resources and cohesion devices that, in fact, significantly benefit for a comprehensive analysis of any text types (da Cunha, 2019; Xuan, 2017; Jitpranne, 2018; Schubert, 2019; Silke, Quinn, & Rieder, 2019; Zhan & Huang, 2018).

In a more specific focus of cohesion devices analysis (Alarcon & Morales, 2011) analyzed the lexical cohesion used in the genre in question. Analyzing quantitatively and qualitatively the cohesive devices used by undergraduate students in their argumentative essay, they found that repetition had the highest frequent cohesive devices used and respectively followed by synonym, and collocation. To add, this study found out that certain cohesive types assisted the students in the argumentation process. Differently, focusing on students' thesis writing, personal reference, demonstrative reference and comparative reference were dominantly appear (Liyana, 2014). The three features in question contribute significantly to the text cohesivness. Meanwhile, taking students' writing discussion text, Gailea & Hafipah (2018) found that references namely demonstrative pronoun and comparative pronoun are found as the most frequent of cohesive devices used within texts. Still on refernce analysis, a study on essays written by Jismulatif (2020) found that the most frequent reference cohesive devices used was personal reference and followed by demonstrative reference and comparative reference.

Moving to the cohesion types ahead, there are two main types of cohesive devices, namely grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. The former deals with the linguistic structure. Meanwhile, lexical cohesion consisting of Reiteration (repetition, synonym, subordinate, general word) and collocation is the cohesion that arises from semantic relationships between

words. Reiteration uses the words that have similar or near the meaning to produce the semantic relation within sentences. Then collocations are those combinations of words which occur naturally with greater than random frequency. They are two or more words group that exist between idioms and free- word- collections, allowing for some replacement of their lexical elements. They should be constructed in such a way that they should be of benefits for recognizable relation between the words and sentence toward the unity of text (Briones, 2016; Eggins, 1994; Leong, 2019; Ong, 2019; Othman, 2020; Potter, 2016; Suparto, 2018).

Regardless the fruitful findings of numerous studies on text cohesiveness, studies on narrative text viewed from discourse-semantics persepective is still lacking. The key notion lies behind the term so-called cohesion is that there is a semantic tie between a unit at one point in a text and a unit at another point on its intpretation. Therefore, this study extends the previous studies regarding the employment of cohesion devices used in the text type in question. Aside from knowing the cohesiveness of students' this study might assist teachers in teaching writing.

■ METHODS

Participants

This study was conducted at English Study Program of Universitas Katolik Santu Paulus Ruteng. Out of forty two students in the two chosen classes, twenty students were selected as the participants of the study. As such, the twenty students in question were selected purposively following the needs of the study.

Research Design and Procedure

This study belongs to descriptive qualitative design employing discourse-semantic conception in analyzing students' narrative text. Since text can be regarded as data (Gentzkow, Kelly, &

Taddy, 2019), some steps were done by the researchers. First, the students were asked to compose a free- paragraph composition following the given guidelines. The free-theme narrative composition was the researchers' expectation on the most knowledgeable texts and best effort in making appropriate choices of diction both in expressing as well as in communicating their messages and ideas effectively and meaningfully. In this way, the researchers would be able to gain valid and reliable data showing their capability in constructing effective uses of lexical cohesion devices within the texts. Second, the researchers read, justified and categorized the lexical cohesion devices found from the students' texts.

Instrument

Aside from the researchers themselves, writing guideline were used as an instrument to gain the data. As such, the researchers prepared and constructed guideline for a free-topic composition. The guideline was concerned with the time, length of writing. In addition, the guideline also dealt with aspects of writing and the generic structure of narrative text.

Data Analysis

The steps of analysing the texts in question were brought to some ways. *First*, to make the

researchers easier in analyzing the use of lexical cohesion devices, the texts were modified into sentences and clauses. *Second*, the sentences and clauses, from which the texts were built, were examined in terms of the lexical devices types used. *Third*, the types of lexical devices were analyzed in the context of their use within the text following the principles of discourse-semantic analysis proposed by (Eggs, 1994). As such, the analysis was conducted in such a way that the use of lexical device types and the relatedness of linguistics resources could be revealed effectively and significantly contribute the unity of texts. In this study, to reveal the unity of text, the researchers were concerned only on the employment of conjunction, lexical relation and reference analysis.

RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

Standing on Eggs (1994) conception of discourse semantics on the unity of the text, there should be an understanding of the description of types of cohesion through which the texture of a text is realised. The types of cohesion devices for this purpose include conjunction, lexical relations and reference. The interpretation of those types as such would be of benefit whether or not a text is being united. The following tables represent the results of analysis of the three types in question.

Table 1. Distribution of Conjunction

S	Conjunction Types												Tot
	A	C	P	S	M	Su	Con	Ca	Com	Cons	Loc	Al	
1	1	-	2	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	7
2	-	1	1	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	7
3	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	6
4	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3
5	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	5
6	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	5
7	1	-	2	-	1	-	-	3	-	1	-	-	8
8	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	5
9	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4

10	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	6
11	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
12	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
13	2	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	6
14	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	4
15	2	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	7
16	3	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	7
17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	4
18	3	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
19	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	6
20	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4
	2	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	7

S: students; a: additive; c: contrast; P: purpose; S: simultaneous; M: means; Su: Successive; Con: condition; Ca: cause; Com: comparative; Cons: Consequence; Loc: Location; Al: Alternation; Tot: Total

Based on the data in the Table 1, the most conjunctions employed by students was additive and followed by contrast, purpose and cause conjunctions. In this regard, the logical relations appearing in the texts were concerned with the link of preceding and following clause. The link is regarded as a relationship of addition; one sentence adds to the meanings made in another (extension), of a relationship of restatement or clarification (Elaboration) or even of an enhancement. Meanwhile, other conjunctions were used less than those types in question. Yet, there were some types which were not used at all. As such, the number of logico - relation types of each students' text was not significantly contribute to the texture of texts.

Along the line of the findings above, there is an important point to highlight. As such, the type of conjunction relation used in the texts contributes significantly to the construction of the texts. It means that the texture of a text can also be seen from the use of conjunctive relations. Conjunction relation, as has been mentioned previously, deals with the way logical relationships between the parts of a text is created and expressed. In this context, judging from the

conjunctive reticula and its analysis, all the texts under study hang together. The presence of conjunctive relations of addition which is largely used serves to support the cohesiveness of the text. Besides, there are a number of conjunctive relations used which support the cohesiveness of the text, namely contrast, purpose and cause conjunctions. In this regard, the conjunction used was linguistics resources employed suit their environment and meaning in context. Then, this findings corroborates the studies of da Cunha (2019), Xuan (2017), Jitpranne (2018), Schubert (2019), Silke, Quinn, & Rieder (2019) and Zhan & Huang (2018) confroming that linguistics resources and cohesion devices that, in fact, significantly benefit for a comprehensive analysis of any text types.

Data in table 2 confirms that out of 20 of students' writing, the major type of lexical relations that appeared in their writing was reiteration. The use of this type showed a significant difference with collocation types. It can be seen from the table that the pecentage of reiteration was 93,7% and collocation was 6,3%. Furthermore, based on the classification of reiteration types, repetition was the most common or most frequently type

Table 2. The distribution of lexical relations

Students	Topic and Types of Lexical Relations														
	Theme: Legend					Theme: Romance					Theme: Fable				
	Reiteration		Col			Reiteration		Col			Reiteration		Col		
	Rep	Sny	S u p	G W		Re p	Sn y	Sup	G W		R e p	Sn y	Sup	G W	
1.	15	4	2	0	2										
2.	25	2	3	0	2										
3.	38	5	3	1	1										
4.	12	3	3	1	2										
5.	21	5	3	0	2										
6.						13	3	3	0	0					
7.						15	3	3	6	1					
8.						18	3	2	4	1					
9.						14	1	6	0	0					
10.						18	6	1	0	5					
11.						8	7	1	0	2					
12.											10	1	0	0	3
13.											9	2	1	2	2
14.											10	5	0	0	1
15.											13	2	3	1	1
16.											20	4	3	2	2
17.											11	4	3	0	0
18.											8	2	1	2	2
19.											29	2	1	2	2
20.											9	2	1	2	2
Total	111	19	14	2	9	86	23	16	10	9	119	24	14	11	15
Repetition: 65.5%			Synonym: 14.31%		Superordinate: 9.12%			General word: 4.77%			6.3%				
											93.7%		6.3%		100%

used among other lexical cohesion devices. In percentage, repetition has the highest percentage (65,5%) of the three others types namely synonym (14,31%), superordinate (9,12 %), and general word which appeared as the lowest

percentage that is 4,77%. Thus, the lexical relation (Table 1) is constructed mostly in the form of reiteration by means of repetition, synonym and or co-hyponymy and general word. The words are displayed to link the preceding and the

following clause. The link of those would be beneficial of what is being talked about within the text.

The cohesiveness of the texts under study is shown by the lexical relation. The concern here is basically directed to relating a text to its main focus. In other words the analysis of lexical relations can be defined as a systematic way of describing the relation between words to each other in a text which can be viewed through lexical string analysis. In this context, It was found that the most lexical relations used in the texts under study is *repetition*, then, followed by *synonym* and ultimately, the *co-hyponymy*. For some students, these lexical relations between lexical items appearing across clauses can be considered as indicating cohesive ties between the words, in addition to provide knowledge about the taxonomic relations of the words. Yet, data in Table 2 still indicates that most of students still inconsistent with the employment of such taxonomic relations. In this regard, lexical items or vocabulary items which constitute bulk of English are very broad and complex to learn and acquire. Moreover, in fact the learning and the acquisition of vocabulary items have never been completed. Lexical cohesion as part of lexical items consists of reiteration and collocation. Reiteration requires the ability to make effective and appropriate uses of repetition, synonym, super ordinate and general word whereas collocation requires the subjects' ability in making use of lexical items which are not dependent on each other. This principle of lexical cohesion clearly suggests that in writing short narrative texts which have good cohesive effect or lexical cohesion, there is a need for writers to have rich mastery of lexical cohesion otherwise they are not of course able to write shorts discourses showing high degree of cohesive effect (Kai, 2008; Murthy & Kumar, 2007; Poulimenou et al., 2016).

In addition, the establishment of the above findings appears to be in congruent with the theoretical frameworks reviewed to underpin the undertaking of the present study. In general theories of discourse analysis have been widely recognized and admitted as very difficult and complex to learn and acquire. Therefore, the establishment of the low or poor ability of the students in making effective and appropriate uses of lexical cohesion in writing narrative text was not very surprising; in the sense they are in line with the broadness and complexity of lexical items. (Kelly, 2020; Lule, 2007; Moragas-fernández, Calvo, & Capdevila, 2018; Nartey, 2018; Bartely, 2018; Tolochko & Boomgaarden, 2017).

Table 3 shows the number of reference is different in students texts. The identification of these constructions was conducted by keeping track the participants has been given at an earlier point in the texts. It is from elsewhere within the texts themselves. What is more to be taken in consideration is the construction of each. Despite the differences, it was found that all students mostly share a common feature that is, anaphorically constructed and respectively followed by exophoric reference, comparative refernce, and homophoric refernce. Meanwhile, there were only two students employed cataphorically constructed reference. Thus, utilizing reference chain in terms of text untiy was dominantly contributed by endophoric type by means of Anaphoric reference.

Eventually, the term reference which here refers to the way of introducing and keeping track of the participants in a text might contribute to the texture of text. The participants in this respect have to do with the people, places, and things being dealt with in a text. From the chart reference of the texts, all are highly cohesive. This judgment is supported by the fact that most of references found in the texts under study are categorized as anaphoric. It is in line with the

Table 3. Reference analysis

Students	Reference Types					
	Homophoric	Exophoric	Endophoric			
			Anaphoric	Cataphoric	Esphoric	Comparative
1	2	4	8	-	-	-
2	-	3	7	-	-	-
3	-	4	4	-	-	-
4	-	6	5	-	-	-
5	-	3	4	-	-	3
6	-	3	6	-	-	-
7	1	3	8	-	-	-
8	-	3	5	1	-	-
9	-	2	5	-	-	2
10	-	4	5	-	-	-
11	-	4	4	-	-	-
12	1	3	6	-	-	-
13	-	3	6	-	-	-
14	1	4	7	-	-	1
15	-	4	4	-	-	2
16	-	3	6	-	-	-
17	-	3	8	-	-	-
18	-	3	7	-	-	1
19	1	2	6	1	-	-
20	-	5	7	-	-	1
Total	6	69	118	2	-	10

theory purposed by Eggins (1994) that if most items are retrieved from endophoric, it belongs to highly cohesive. This reference creates cohesion since endophoric ties create internal texture of the text.

As its conception, discourse is a communicative event in which language plays a prominent role. It minimally requires a sender (writer), a receiver (reader), and a message that is being communicated. This message is not just a concatenation or a series of clauses; it makes a unified, coherent whole. Both the sender and receiver normally have the implicit agreement that the message being communicated is coherent. To achieve this, a text should have a texture, that is, the property that distinguishes text from non text. It is about the basis for unity and semantic

independence within text. Simply words, It is what holds the clauses of text together to give them unity. (Eggins, 1994).

It is very important to note that there are two components determining the unity of clauses in a text. They are the contextual properties of a text referred as coherence and cohesion, which stands for the internal properties of the text. The term coherence can be described as the way a group of clauses relate to the context. As has been previously mentioned, the concept of context is categorized into two levels, the context of culture (genre) and the context of situation (register). From these two levels of context, there are two types of coherence, namely generic coherence and situational or registerial coherence (Eggins, 1994; Trabasso, Secco, & Van den Broek, 1984;

Yin, 2017). Situational coherence, which according to Systemic Functional Linguistics includes field, tenor and mood, is realised through lexicogrammatical categories. On the other hand, the term cohesion refers to the way the parts of discourse are related together. Cohesion denotes certain features of a text like the semantic tie in a text, the consistency of participants and the connection in terms of lexical selections. Yet, it should be kept in mind that the discourse stratum of the Systemic Functional Linguistic model includes all the systems of various text-forming resources (Wodak, 2011). This means that the discourse is concerned with the description of the cohesion devices types through which the texture of a text is realized. The types of include conjunction, lexical relation and reference.

Yet, the findings of this current study have indicated that students were not yet able totally to make effective and appropriate use of lexical cohesion in writing short discourses. This is supported by the data confirming that the texture of the texts did not meet the requirement of the unity of text. Although, the use of conjunction and reference informed good texture of the texts, the lexical relation of the texts still deviated from the course.

Pedagogical Implication

The concept of teaching is still arguable. Many experts have long been interested in doing research to what and how teaching should be. Nowadays, teaching strategy seems to be a rising topic that is currently up for debate. Many approaches, methods, strategies or techniques as well are proposed by scholars by which teachers can do in learning process. By now, we might be asking these kinds of questions: Why are there so many approaches, methods or strategies? Is one approach better than the other? Does certain method really work?

In the context of pedagogy, one challenging aspect of language learning especially writing skill

is about how to keep texture of text in terms of cohesion and coherence reflecting the textual meaning of certain text. As such, textual meanings weave experiential meaning and interpersonal meaning together in coherent and comprehensible language. Analyzing textual grammar can improve teaching language from many views. This implicitly means that in a particular text analysis, realizing the importance of theme in a clause is essential. Theme is what the message is concerned with (Halliday, 1985). For the English speakers use the first position in the clause to signal what the message is about. Yet, there might be problems faced by ESL or EFL learners in writing if they are not aware of it. Theme is not only regard as starting point of a clause, rather, it is also a signpost to indicate where the message or meanings come from and where they go in context.

Therefore, teachers should lead the learners by introducing the concern of clauses and by forming a link back into the context where they belong to. If so, the learners can construct their texts more logical and more coherent by using appropriate textual themes and topical Themes in question (Martin & Zappavigna, 2019). To signify, in language teaching, teachers should cope with essential grammatical aspects as the topic sentence, sequencing conjunctions, pronouns, reference, lexical relations and so forth. For example, conjunction analysis- anaphoric reference, which is most of the time appear in many oral and written texts, warrants notices due to barriers that it may lead to learners at various levels degree. It is especially needed at an early point of learning a foreign language when learners crash up to go after all-inclusive meaning turnout much notice to interpreting message in a given text both by clause or sentence. Moreover, the most important role in composing sophisticated text, and therefore one that needs much focus on the sides of teachers and learners is that of words and phrases which signal internal link of parts of

text, namely conjunctions (Yin, 2017).

To date, it should be kept in mind that words and clause are important for good understanding of certain text, aside from lexical meaning, are also prominent aspect for making natural discourse in many contexts support the trust that they should be considered by teachers and learners. In this respect, it is good to give context for learners that might epitomize how they make use of lexical devices such as conjunction; anaphoric references, lexical relations and other grammar related components of language which, if not essential, are at least useful for proficient communication. Despite the fact that many language teachers have been experiencing this, some probably have no idea about the explicit and systemic knowledge of it that will be undoubtedly of benefit to teaching learning language.

■ CONCLUSIONS

In terms of conjunction and reference analysis, this study empirically found that the texture of the texts under study is acceptable and subsequently lead to the so-called unity of text. However, in terms of lexical relation, the texts do not meet the requirement of good texture. Thus, the texts are not insufficient to be regarded as good textures or well-arranged- features of texts unity. However, what is more is the pedagogical implication in language teaching. Teachers and learners should deal with essential grammatical aspects as the topic sentence, sequencing conjunctions, pronouns, reference, lexical relations for the sake of constructing better texts, more logical, and more coherent.

Yet, this study suffered from some limitations. First, the study dealt only with lexical cohesion devices of texts. Meanwhile, another aspect namely grammatical cohesion is of benefit to reveal the unity of text. Therefore, further studies might be more challenging to reveal the

cohesion type in question. Since this study was concerned only discourse- semantic analysis which, in fact, may include aspects of metafunction of language, further studies might also examine the functions of language which are realized by register category of field, tenor and mode within the text.

■ REFERENCES

- Alarcon, J. B., & Morales, K. N. S. (2011). Grammatical Cohesion in Students' Argumentative Essay. *Journal of English and Literature* 2(5), 114–127.
- Baklouti, A. S. (2011). The Impact of Genre and Disciplinary Differences on Structural Choice: Taxis in Research Article Abstracts. *Text&Talk*, 31(5), 503–523.
- Briones, R. R. Y. (2016). Textual Analysis through Systemic Functional Linguistics. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics (JELTL) Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 1(2), 109–144.
- Bu, H., Connor-linton, J., & Wang, L. (2020). Linguistic Variation in the Discourse of Corporate Annual Reports/ : A multi-dimensional Analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 22(6), 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445620928231>
- Chang, P. (2018). Maintaining Coherence in Research Argument: Identifying Qualitative Differences between Experts' and Students' Texts. *Text&Talk*, 0(0), 1–28.
- Choura, S. (2019). Grammatical Choices of Ditransitive Patterns in Academic Articles. *Text&Talk*, 39(3), 315–340.
- Chu, R., & Huang, C.-T. (2020). The day after the Apology: A Critical Discourse Analysis of President Tsai's National Apology to Taiwan's Indigenous Peoples. *Discourse Studies*, 23(1), 1–18.
- Da Cunha, I. (2019). A corpus-based analysis

- of textual genres in the administration domain. *Discourse Studies*, 22(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445619887538>
- Eggins, S. (1994). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Pinter.
- Gailea, N., & Hafipah, A. (2018). The Analysis of Cohesive Devices in Students' Writing Discussion Text. *The Journal of English Literacy Education*, 5(2), 88–98.
- Gentzkow, M., Kelly, B., & Taddy, M. (2019). Text as Data. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 57(3), 535–574.
- Gusthini, M., Sobarna, C., & Amalia, R. M. (2018). A Pragmatic Study of Speech as an Instrument of Power: Analysis of the 2016 USA Presidential Debate. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 5(1), 97–113.
- Halliday, M. A. . (1985). *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hasan Moradi, N. (2011). *Content Analysis of Textbooks*. Tehran(Persian): Tehran: Abizhe.
- Hasan, R. (2014). Towards a Paradigmatic Description of Context: Systems, Metafunctions, and Semantics. *Functional Linguistics*, 1(9), 1–54. /
- Ilinska, L., Ivanova, O., & Senko, Z. (2016). Teaching Textual Analysis of Contemporary Popular Scientific Texts. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 236(December), 248–253.
- Jismulatif, N. (2020). A Study on Reference as Cohesive Device in Essays Written by the Fourth Semester Students of the English Study Program Universitas Riau. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4(1), 212–219.
- Kai, J. (2008). Lexical Cohesion Patterns in NS and NNS Dissertation Abstracts in Applied Linguistics: A Comparative Study. *The Linguistics Journal*, 3(3), 132–144.
- Kelly, C. R. (2020). Donald J. Trump and the rhetoric of resentment. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 106(1), 2–24.
- Leong, P.A. (2019). Visualizing Texts: A tool for Generating Thematic-Progression Diagrams. *Functional Linguistics*, 6(4), 1–13.
- Lin, C. (2015). An Exploratory Comparison of the Use of Modifiers by Native Speakers of English and Mandarin Chinese in Academic Lectures. *Text&Talk*, 35(1), 77–
- Liyana, C. I. (2014). Cohesion and Coherence in English Education Students' Thesis. *Englisia*, 1(2), 281–295.
- Lorés-sanz, R. (2011). The Construction of the Author's Voice in Academic Writing: the Interplay of Cultural and Disciplinary Factors. *Text&Talk*, 31(2), 173–193.
- Lule, J. (2007). War and its metaphors/ : news language and the prelude to war in Iraq, 2003. *Journalism Studies*, 5(2), 179–190.
- Martin, J. R., & Zappavigna, M. (2019). Embodied meaning: a Systemic Functional Perspective on Paralanguage. *Functional Linguistics*, 6(1), 1–33.
- Moragas-fernández, C. M., Calvo, M. M., & Capdevila, A. (2018). The process en route: the metaphor of the journey as the dominant narrative for the political discourse in Catalonia. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 15(5), 1–23.
- Murthy, K. N., & Kumar, G. B. (2007). Language identification from small text samples *. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 13(1), 57–80.
- Nagao, A. (2019). The SFL genre-based approach to writing in EFL contexts.
- Nartey, M. (2018). 'I shall prosecute a ruthless war on these monsters': a critical metaphor

- analysis of discourse of resistance in the rhetoric of Kwame Nkrumah. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 16(2), 1–18.
- Nguyen, D., Liakata, M., Dedeo, S., Eisenstein, J., Mimno, D., Tromble, R., & Winters, J. (2020). How We Do Things With Words: Analyzing Text as Social and Cultural Data. *Review*, 3(August), 1–14.
- Ong, J. (2019). A Case Study of Classroom Discourse Analysis of Teacher's Fronted Reading Comprehension Lessons for Vocabulary Learning Opportunities. *RELC Journal*, 50(1), 1118–1135.
- Othman, W. (2020). Causal Relations on a Cline of Explicitness: An SFL Perspective. *Functional Linguistics*, 7(2), 1–14.
- Potter, L. (2016). Ideological Representations and Theme-Rheme Analysis in English and Arabic news Reports: A systemic Functional Approach. *Functional Linguistics*, 3(5), 1–20.
- Poulimenou, S., Stamou, S., Papavlasopoulos, S., & Poulos, M. (2016). Short Text Coherence Hypothesis. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 23(2), 191–210.
- Qian, D. D., & Pan, M. (2019). Politeness in Business Communication: Investigating English Modal Sequences in Chinese Learners' Letter Writing. *RELC Journal*, 50(1), 20–36.
- Risberg, J., & Lymer, G. (2020). Requests and Know-how Questions/ : Initiating instruction in Workplace Interaction. *Discourse Studies*, 22(6), 753–776.
- Samar, R. G., Talebzadeh, H., Kiany, G. R., & Akbari, R. (2014). Moves and Steps to Sell a Paper: a Cross-cultural Genre Analysis of Applied Linguistics Conference Abstracts. *Text&Talk*, 34(6), 759–785.
- Schubert, C. (2019). 'OK, well, first of all, let me say ...': Discursive uses of response initiators in US presidential primary debates. *Discourse Studies*, 21(4), 438–457.
- Scott-baumann, A. (2011). Text as Action, Action as Text? Ricoeur, 'oó and the Affirmative Search for Meaning in the 'Universe of Discourse.' *Discourse Studies*, 13(5), 593–600.
- Silke, H., Quinn, F., & Rieder, M. (2019). Telling the truth about power/ ? Journalism discourses and the facilitation of inequality. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 16(3), 1–7.
- Simpson, J. (2005). Conversational Floors in Synchronous Text-based CMC Discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(3), 337–361.
- Skoufaki, S. (2019). Rhetorical Structure Theory and Coherence Break Identification. *Text&Talk 2019;*, 0(0), 1–26.
- Suparto, A. D. (2018). Analisis Ketransitifan dalam Framing Artikel Berita Online. *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, 7(1), 16–32. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26499/rnh.v7i1.586> ©2018,
- Suwandi. (2016). Coherence and Cohesion: An Analysis of the Final Project Abstracts of the Undergraduate Students of PGRI Semarang. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(2), 253–261.
- Tolochko, P., & Boomgaarden, H. G. (2017). Analysis of Linguistic Complexity in Professional and Citizen Media. *Journalism Studies*, 19(12), 1786–1803.
- Tomoyuki, K. (2021). How Do Applied Linguistics Researchers Structure Coherence Relations in the Process of Establishing a Niche for Their Research/ ? *Text&Talk*, 0(0), 1–19.
- Trabasso, T., Secco, T., & Van den Broek, P. (1984). *Causal Cohesion and Story Coherence*. In H. Mandl, N. L. Stein, & T. Trabasso (Eds). *Learning and*

- Comperhension of Text* (pp. 83-111). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Inc.
- Upton, T. A., & Cohen, M. A. (2009). An approach to Corpus-based Discourse Analysis: The move Analysis as Example. *Discourse Studies*, 11(5), 585–604.
- Welbers, K., Atteveldt, W. Van, & Benoit, K. (2017). Text Analysis in R. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 11(4), 245–265.
- Wodak, R. (2011). Complex Texts: Analysing, Understanding, Explaining and Interpreting Meanings. *Discourse Studies*, 13(5), 623–633.
- Yin, Z. (2017). Principles of Teaching Cohesion in the English Language Classroom. *RELC Journal*, 49(3), 1–18.
- Zhan, H., & Huang, S. (2018). Critical genre analysis/ : investigating interdiscursive performance in professional practice. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 15(5), 1–4.