

SFL analysis: An investigation of students' use of cohesive devices in exposition text

Rojab Siti Rodliyah, and Alfath Eka Liani*

English Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Language and Literature Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Jl. Dr. Setiabudhi No. 229 Bandung 40154 West Java, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The 2013 Indonesian Curriculum stipulates that one of the students' basic competencies in the English subject is to produce an analytical exposition text. The students are required to write the text persuasively and cohesively. These requirements make them consider composing such a text as a challenging task. This study investigated students' utilization of cohesive devices in writing analytical exposition texts and examined their inaccurate uses. It attempted to demonstrate the underlying issues that caused the inaccurate uses of cohesive devices and to seek the solutions. The study employed Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA) of six analytical exposition texts written by 11th grade students in Cimahi. They were collected using purposive sampling and were analyzed using Halliday and Hasan's cohesion framework. This study revealed that lexical cohesion served as the most frequently used cohesive devices in the students' texts followed by reference and conjunction. Inaccurate uses of cohesive devices were also found. Most of the reference and conjunction devices were misused, whilst repetition devices were redundantly utilized. These findings showed that although the students were skilful in presenting relevant supporting arguments and making their text personal, they still experienced confusion when utilizing cohesive devices. Therefore, teachers need to equip the students with adequate knowledge concerning text cohesiveness as well as to provide more practice and feedback to improve their skills in writing an analytical exposition text.

Keywords: Analytical exposition text; cohesion; cohesive devices; text cohesiveness

First Received:

29 October 2021

Revised:

14 May 2022

Accepted:

22 May 2022

Final Proof Received:

27 May 2022

Published:

31 May 2022

How to cite (in APA style):

Rodliyah, R. S., & Liani, A. E. (2022). SFL analysis: An investigation of students' use of cohesive devices in exposition text. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 235-246. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i1.46596>

INTRODUCTION

Mastering good writing skills is crucial as it enables students to hone the other three language skills. They constitute reading, listening, and speaking, and these skills are essential in strengthening the students' foundation in academic writing (Al Badi, 2015; Bazerman, 2010; Huy, 2015). Mastering writing skills also helps them to focus more on their texts' listenability and to refine their texts by simply reading it aloud or requesting their friends to do so (Huy, 2015). This, in addition, will lead to the students' language learning development in the future.

In Indonesia, the 2013 curriculum stipulates the English language as one of the mandatory subjects taught at senior high school level. The curriculum covers several competencies, one of which mandates students to be able to produce an analytical exposition text. However, many of the students still consider writing the text as one of the most challenging tasks (Arianto et al., 2017; Sari et al., 2018). According to Emilia et al. (2018), the complexity of the text involves not only the sentence structure (tenses, verb phrases, etc) but also the persuasive arguments, as the analytical exposition text is classified as one of the argument genres.

* Corresponding Author
Email: alfathekalianii@gmail.com

There are two types of exposition text. The first is analytical exposition text which is the focus of the study. This text deals with persuading the reader into having the same perspective as the writer does towards a particular issue. The second is a hortatory exposition text which not only functions to persuade the readers but also to provide suggestion or recommendation at the end of the text (Bashir, 2017; Derewianka & Jones, 2016). To achieve its social purpose, both analytical and hortatory exposition text must follow the generic structure: thesis statement, arguments, and restatement of thesis or conclusion (Anderson & Anderson, 1997; Martin & Rose, 2008). "Thesis statement" is where the issues are generally introduced, "arguments" is where reasonings and supporting data are presented, and "conclusion" serves to reemphasize the writer's perspective towards the issue discussed (Emilia et al., 2018; Gustine, 2019).

In composing a cohesive analytical exposition text, Indonesian high school students still struggle to employ cohesive devices. One of the factors causing this is the lack of exposure to the nature of argumentative writing, both in their native language and the English language (Emilia et al., 2018). According to Hawes and Thomas (2012), this is related to students' cultural differences and language structure. Chanyoo (2018) and Emilia et al. (2018) further added that students' cultural background and first language would influence the organization of cohesive devices in their analytical exposition texts. Other studies concerning the utilization of cohesive devices also revealed similar findings. For instance, whilst Iranian students would rely more on the utilization of grammatical devices in their argumentative writing, Indonesian students tended to employ lexical devices (Dastjerdi & Samian, 2011; Sari et al., 2018). Heni et al. (2018) argued that most Indonesian students used reiteration devices which often led to overusing repetition items. Hence, it caused redundancy of lexical devices. Furthermore, a text that contains more grammatical devices indicates that it is more identifiable and personal, also richer in information and supporting evidence (Alarcon & Morales, 2011; Almutairi, 2017).

Several previous studies from around the world have also attempted to reveal other factors that might cause problems to students in the utilization of cohesive devices (Hamed, 2014; Mohamed, 2016; Nasser, 2007; Ong, 2011). Nasser (2017) and Ong (2011), for instance, reported that the most problematic device used by students in China and Yemen was reference. Meanwhile, Hamed (2014) and Mohamed (2016) stated that a majority of students in Libya and Malaysia were consistently challenged when employing causative and adversative conjunctions. In Indonesian context, this inaccurate use was rarely observed. Many studies often only focused on grammatical items and left

lexical items unexplored. For instance, studies by Khairunisa and Savitri (2018) and Nindya and Widiati (2020) only investigated the inaccurate use of cohesive devices in terms of their grammatical cohesion. They showed that students were struggling to employ reference devices due to their lack of exposure to the English language.

For these reasons, the present study aimed to fill the gap by not only investigating how cohesive devices were utilized in Indonesian high school students' analytical exposition texts but also examining the inaccurate use of lexical cohesive devices. In addition, it attempted to bring together results from relevant previous studies to investigate the underlying issues related to inaccurate uses of cohesive devices and to seek the solutions. To achieve these, this study employed Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA) using Halliday and Hasan's cohesion taxonomy (Halliday & Hasan, 1976) and its identification of error as the framework of analysis.

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), cohesive devices both grammatical and lexical play major roles in the construction of a text. They are the features that bind the text together and create meaning. Thus, if cohesive devices were employed inaccurately in students' text, the reader would misunderstand the information attempted to be conveyed (Dastjerdi & Samian, 2011; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). Eggins (2004) as well as Gerot and Wignell (1994) further added that cohesive devices aim to create textures in a text. They showcase the composition of semantic relations which would result in a high level of text readability. Furthermore, cohesive devices are classified into two major categories: grammatical and lexical cohesion. The former includes reference, substitution, conjunction, and ellipsis, whilst the latter includes reiteration and collocation (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Halliday and Hasan (1976) identified four types of cohesive devices errors, which are omission, misuse, redundant repetition, and unnecessary addition.

Reference means referring to something mentioned somewhere in the text (Derewianka & Jones, 2016). It comes in two divisions that are divided by their types and functions (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). One that is based on types are personal, demonstrative, and comparative references. Personal reference includes personal pronouns, possessive pronouns, and possessive determiners. Demonstrative reference is concerned with verbal pointing, and comparative reference works to signal quantity and quality of comparison using adverbs or adjectives (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). Meanwhile, there are three types of reference based on its functions. The first is homophoric reference that indicates an identity taken from outside the text, but the readers are assumed to have already known what the identity is

(e.g., the sun) (Eggins, 2004). The second is endophoric which contains anaphoric and cataphoric reference. Anaphoric reference functions to refer back to things mentioned beforehand, whilst cataphoric refers to things that follow immediately after the reference (Emilia, 2014; Halliday & Hasan, 1976). The third is exophoric reference that is used more in spoken rather than in written discourse. Although exophoric reference is considered as non-reference items by many linguists, Halliday and Hasan (1976) perceived the contrary since it still contributes to creating meaningful text.

As for conjunction, Halliday and Hasan (1976) categorized it into four major categories with three core functions. Those are additive, adversative, causative, and temporal. Adversatives such as “yet” and “but” are classified as extending conjunctions because they function to add new information in a text. Meanwhile, additives such as “and” as well as “in other words” are classified as elaborating and extending conjunctions at the same time because they not only function to add new information, but also to elaborate existing information in a text. Other conjunctions, such as “because”, “due to”, “firstly”, and “next” belong to causatives and temporals. They function as enhancing conjunctions, meaning they create cohesion relating to matter (e.g. here, there, elsewhere), manner (e.g. likewise, similarly), spatio-temporals (e.g. now, next, soon), and causal temporals (e.g. then, as a result, hence) (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

Unlike reference and conjunction, substitution and ellipsis are rarely found in written text. They are more commonly used in spoken discourse to make effective communication (Eggins, 1994; Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Substitution functions to substitute a particular word, or phrase, or clause using “so”, “one”, or “do”, while ellipsis omits a particular word, or phrase, or clause without changing the meaning (Droga & Humphrey, 2003; Emilia, 2014).

Lexical cohesive devices come in two categories. They are reiteration and collocation. Reiteration includes repetition, synonymy, and antonymy, whilst collocation involves hyponymy and meronymy (Eggins, 2004; Gerot & Wignell, 1994; Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Repetition devices are words that are repeated multiple times. As for synonymy and antonymy, the former refers to words that have similar meaning to one another whilst the latter is defined as words that have contrastive meaning to one another. In contrast to reiteration, the two collocation devices – hyponymy (kind of) and meronymy (part of) – share similar purposes which are oftentimes difficult to distinguish. For instance, “bed”, “sofa”, and “wardrobe” are kinds of (hyponymy) furniture, whilst at the same time being parts of (meronymy) house furniture (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). Hence, as suggested by Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), this study

analyzed hyponymy and meronymy under one category that is collocation to avoid double identification.

METHODOLOGY

In this study, Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) cohesion framework acted as the coding operation whilst students’ analytical exposition texts were the data under investigation. This study used Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA) as the method as it has successfully helped linguists to deeply explore organizational processes in text and interpret the data (Bryman, 2004; Cassell & Symon, 1994; Mayring, 2003). Babbie (2001) and Ryan and Bernard (2000) also asserted that QCA is a proper and useful method for text analysis, for it is considered as an operation of coding. It functions to alter raw data from texts or images into a set of standardized forms. Coding in this context refers to the process of seeking the underlying patterns and categories (Titscher et al., 2000). Other studies in Indonesia concerning the utilization of cohesive devices in exposition text (Awwalia & Suhardi, 2020; Nugraheni, 2016) were also conducted using this method.

This present study investigated six out of thirty-six analytical exposition texts written by 11th grade students of state high schools in Cimahi, Indonesia chosen using purposive sampling. The six texts were written by students from three different levels of proficiency: low, middle, and high achieving. At first, the teacher assigned thirty-six students to write analytical exposition text. They had the option to choose one out of five topics: (1) the good impact of social media, (2) the importance of English, (3) why should we obey the COVID-19 health protocols, (4) the positive sides of online learning, and (5) the weakness of virtual class. The teacher informed them that the minimum words was 200 and the maximum was 550. The students had seven days to finish and submit their work.

Students’ writings were collectively scored and rated using Rose and Martin’s (2012) Writing Assessment Criteria as the purposive sampling tool (see Table 1). The criteria, which include genre, register, discourse, grammar and graphic features, were chosen due to its coverage of a wide range of fourteen aspects to be measured derived from the Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). Hence, it enabled the researcher to equally measure each aspect in students’ analytical exposition texts without privileging one aspect over the other.

Those who scored between 14 to 42 from the total score of 140 were classified as low achiever, 43 to 105 as middle achiever and 106 to 140 as high achiever. The researcher chose two texts of each category to represent students’ level of proficiency in writing analytical exposition text.

Table 1
Rose and Martin's (2012) Writing Assessment Criteria

GENRE	
Purpose	The appropriateness and development of writing purpose
Staging	How well-constructed and developed each stage is
Phases	How well-organized the sequence of each stage is
REGISTER	
Field	How the writer's understanding of field in texts or issues are presented and elaborated in arguments
Tenor	How the writer persuades the readers
Mode	How the language is highly written by the writer (too spoken or not)
DISCOURSE	
Lexis	How the writer constructs lexical resources in text
Appraisal	How the writer uses system of appraisal in persuading the readers
Conjunction	How the writer maintains logical reasoning in text
Reference	How clear who or what is being referred in text
GRAMMAR	How appropriate and accurate the sentences and word groups are constructed
GRAPHIC FEATURES	
Spelling	How the writer accurately spells core words and non-core words
Punctuation	How accurate the punctuation is used in text
Presentation	How the layouts or paragraphs are visibly distinguished

The data analysis began by segmenting each of six texts into sentences and marking them with numbers. This was done in order to make the identification process easier. Once all types of cohesive devices were identified, the identification of cohesive devices errors immediately followed. Following all the items being tabulated and calculated, the data were interpreted and discussed using Halliday and Hasan's (1976) cohesion framework. During the data interpretation, several previous research studies were also discussed.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this study are presented in three sections. The first section discusses the overall realization of cohesive devices. The second section presents the identification of inaccurate uses of cohesive devices. The last section discusses the pedagogical implication of this study.

The Realization of Cohesive Devices in Students' Analytical Exposition Texts

This study revealed that, as seen in Table 2, among five major categorizations of cohesive devices proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976), lexical devices were dominating the use of cohesive devices. This includes major utilization of reiteration and collocation in six students' texts with 514 items found (62.8% of 819 items). This consistent appearance indicates that despite having different levels of proficiency, students already acknowledged the foundation of composing analytical text cohesively. That is to stick to the topic being discussed by employing lexical items that are related to one another.

On the other hand, Table 2 also displays that the least used cohesive devices were substitution and ellipsis. Having only nine (1.1%) and four items (0.5%) respectively, both substitution and ellipsis were only found in middle and high achieving students' texts. There was no existence of both in low achieving students' texts. This result was expected since both are more commonly used in spoken than written discourse.

Table 2
The Realization of Cohesive Devices in Six Students' Texts

Cohesive Devices	Low Achiever (Mean: 214 words)		Mid Achiever (Mean: 238 words)		High Achiever (Mean: 535 words)		Total f	Total %
	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Reference	30	19.6%	54	27.7%	114	24.2%	198	24.2%
Conjunction	20	13.1%	25	12.8%	49	10.4%	94	11.5%
Lexical cohesion	103	67.3%	111	57%	300	63.7%	514	62.8%
Substitution	0	0%	3	1.5%	6	1.3%	9	1.1%
Ellipsis	0	0%	2	1.1%	2	0.4%	4	0.5%
Total	153	100%	195	100%	471	100%	819	100%

Moreover, both devices are also challenging to be employed in texts. Hence, they are usually found in middle and high achievers' texts since they could make sense of their communication to be more effective.

Furthermore, as indicated in Table 2, it seemed that the higher the students' level of proficiency, the more words they were able to write and so were the cohesive devices they employ. Nevertheless, the relationship among the three is still shallow to be confidently concluded. Thus, further discussion regarding this matter will be presented in the following subsections alongside the discussion of the utilization of cohesive devices.

Table 3
The Realization of Reference

Types of Reference	Low Achiever (Mean: 214 words)		Mid Achiever (Mean: 238 words)		High Achiever (Mean: 535 words)		Total f	Total %
	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Personal	14	46.7%	33	61%	45	39.5%	92	46.5%
Demonstrative	15	50%	18	33.3%	53	46.5%	86	43.4%
Comparative	1	3.3%	3	5.6%	16	14.1%	20	10.1%
Total	30	100%	54	100%	114	100%	198	100%

The example of personal and demonstrative reference in students' text are seen as follows.

- (1) "We must study and use English so that if one day we need it, we will easily understand...." (Text 1, sentence 10)
- (2) "With sanctions, ignorant citizens or any violators will obey the health protocols. This could also urge and convince more people...." (Text 5, Sentence 17 and 18)

Sample 1 and 2 demonstrate that rather than repeating the words "English" and "sanctions", the students cleverly replaced them with "it" and "this". They were anaphorically displaying the realization of personal pronoun and demonstrative references respectively. Other personal and demonstrative references in the form of possessive determiner (e.g., our, your), possessive pronoun (e.g., them), and definite article "the" also appeared frequently throughout six students' texts. This major utilization of personal and demonstrative references was also found in studies conducted by Almutairi (2017), and Khairunisa and Savitri (2018). They also reported very few occurrences of comparative references. It signals that the students were well aware of the fact that in order to make their texts stick to one personal view and their reasonings identifiable, their arguments must be personal and demonstrating logical reasonings (Emilia et al., 2018; Knapp & Watkins, 2005).

Furthermore, similar to Albana et al. (2020), Malombassang (2018), and Sari et al. (2018), this study also reported that reference was the most widely used cohesive devices when it came to grammatical cohesion items (24.2%) followed by

Reference

As seen in Table 2, reference in six students' analytical exposition texts was the second most frequently used cohesive devices (24.2%) across the three levels of students' proficiency. It was also the most frequent cohesive devices found in terms of grammatical cohesion with 198 items found. The details regarding the employment of each item are shown in Table 3.

Students across the three levels of proficiency tended to use more personal (46.5%) and demonstrative (43.4%) reference rather than comparative (10.1%) reference.

conjunctions in the second place (11.5%). This finding strengthens other studies showing that reference has a huge role in minimizing redundant repetition of words in students' analytical exposition text (Arianto et al., 2017; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). Doing so, the arguments and evidence provided by the students could be easily understood by the readers. Therefore, the text could effectively persuade and convince the readers into having the same perspective as the writer does (Bashir, 2017; Gustine, 2019).

Conjunction

This study revealed conjunction as the second most widely used cohesive devices in the category of grammatical cohesion and the third in the overall category of cohesive devices. It took 11.5% of the overall cohesive devices with 94 items found across six students' analytical exposition texts. The tabulation is presented in Table 4.

Students across the three levels of proficiency had the tendency to employ additive (40.4%) and causative (29.8%) conjunction. Only a small percentage of adversative conjunction was used (6.4%). Studies observed by Khairunisa and Savitri (2018), Mohamed (2016), and Nugraheni (2016) also uncovered similar findings.

However, this study also revealed that the utilization of additive is vital in exposition text as it has a major role in adding more evidence and information to strengthen their arguments toward a particular issue discussed in their analytical exposition text.

Table 4
The Realization of Conjunctions

Types of Conjunction	Low Achiever (Mean: 214 words)		Mid Achiever (Mean: 238 words)		High Achiever (Mean: 535 words)		Total f	Total %
	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Additive	10	50%	6	24%	22	44.9%	38	40.4%
Adversative	1	5%	3	12%	2	4.1%	6	6.4%
Causative	5	25%	7	28%	16	32.7%	28	29.8%
Temporal	4	20%	9	36%	9	18.4%	22	23.4%
Total	20	100%	25	100%	49	100%	94	100%

An example of additive found in high achiever’s text is seen in sample 3.

(3) “Moreover, with 74% of people suffering from speech anxiety, online education tends to foster better class participation considering online class is less intimidating.” (Text 6, Sentence 8)

(4) “Therefore, we must obey government regulations so that the virtual class ends soon.” (Text 3, Sentence 15)

Furthermore, from sample 4, a student in middle achieving level was seen to demonstrate a causative “therefore” and “so that” to re-emphasise his points regarding the arguments he presented previously in his text. This according to Emilia et al. (2018) and Gustine (2019) is crucial as it is found at the closing stage of the text. This further indicates that the student was aware how to conclude and repeat the core point of the thesis statement at the beginning of the text.

However, the small number of adversatives which only occurred as many as six times in total (6.4%) indicates that all the students aggressively

provided information and data regarding their stance on a particular issue to persuade the readers. Nonetheless, they showed little expertise to rebut or offer counter arguments to the other side’s perspective (Hamed, 2014). As for the establishment of temporal which had a quite high percentage (23.4%), it shows that students were also aware that using words such as “firstly”, “next” and “after that” for instance, could help them organize their main arguments as to not be mixed with the other arguments (Dastjerdi & Samian, 2011; Ong, 2011).

Substitution and Ellipsis

The realization of substitution and ellipsis in six students’ analytical exposition texts were rarely spotted. As Halliday and Hasan (1976) suggested, they are commonly employed in spoken rather than in written discourse. Nevertheless, that does not mean both could not be utilized in written discourse. Table 5 displays the realization of substitution and ellipsis found throughout six students’ texts.

Table 5
The Realization of Substitution and Ellipsis

	Low Achiever (Mean: 214 words)		Mid Achiever (Mean: 238 words)		High Achiever (Mean: 535 words)		Total f	Total %
	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Substitution	0	0%	3	60%	6	75%	9	69.2%
Ellipsis	0	0%	2	40%	2	25%	4	30.8%
Total	0	0%	5	100%	8	100%	13	100%

As shortly discussed at the beginning, it is visible in Table 5 that neither substitution nor ellipsis employment were found in texts written by students in low achieving level. However, both were seen employed in middle achievers’ texts as many as three and two items respectively whilst also identified in high achievers’ texts for as many as nine and four items. This finding corresponds to the phenomena observed by Adiantika (2015), Arianto et al. (2017), and Malombassang (2018). The fact that both could be established in middle and high but not in low achiever texts is due to its complexity and challenging factor as they are commonly used to make spoken communication effective (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). Thus, this study revealed that the higher the students’ ability in speaking English, the higher the chance they could make their

communication effective by employing both devices. In return, as Huy (2015) asserted, the less challenged they will be to utilize those devices in written form. Moreover, Alarcon and Morales (2011) also affirmed that the lack of substitution and ellipsis used in analytical exposition text is due to indefiniteness that does not play a part in supporting and strengthening the arguments conveyed. An example of substitution and ellipsis (marked with “Ø”) found in students’ texts is presented as follows.

(5) “Most people Ø infected with the COVID-19 virus will experience mild to moderate respiratory illness and Ø recover without requiring special treatment. Although some aren’t so lucky especially old people.” (Text 6, Sentences 2 and 3)

Sample 5 written by a student from high achieving level demonstrates both the utilization of

ellipsis and substitution. The student chose “some” in “some aren’t so lucky” to substitute the idea of “some people” or “some of them” which still refers to the previous sentence discussing the same context of people who are infected with the Covid-19. The presence of ellipsis was also spotted in sample 5 when the student omitted “who are” in “Most people (who are) infected with the Covid-19” and removed “will” as a form of parallelism in “... and (will) recover without requiring special treatment.” It is visible that a student with a high level of proficiency knew exactly what words to substitute or omit in regards to making his or her text more effective without changing the meaning of the ideas conveyed (Adiantika, 2015; Eggins, 1994).

Table 6
Realization of Lexical Cohesion

Types of Lexical Cohesion	Low Achiever (Mean: 214 words)		Mid Achiever (Mean: 238 words)		High Achiever (Mean: 535 words)		Total f	Total %
	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Repetition	52	50.5%	59	53.1%	148	49.3%	259	50.4%
Synonymy	10	9.7%	11	10%	40	13.3%	61	11.8%
Antonymy	0	0%	2	1.8%	13	4.3%	15	2.9%
Collocation	41	39.8%	39	35.1%	99	33%	179	34.8%
Total	103	100%	111	100%	300	100%	514	100%

Unsurprisingly, studies by Emilia et al. (2018), Iseni et al., (2013), and Sari et al. (2018) also showed identical findings. Repetition, as demonstrated in sample 6 for instance, could be massively found in analytical exposition text due to its function as an alternative to keep track of the participants in the texts when the students have no idea how to realize it using reference devices. It also presents when they have no knowledge to reemploy the words using synonymy or antonymy (Heni et al., 2018). Hence, the lack of them (11.8% and 2.9%). However, Heni et al. (2018) further stated that the abundance of repetition could also possibly be a sign of the students attempting to make their analytical exposition texts easier to be comprehended.

(6) “Students who are smart don’t get fair treatment. This is because students who are not very smart can easily copy other students’ assignments while students who are smart have to try on their own.” (Text 3, Sentence 7 and 8)

(7) “Online learning via Zoom Meeting gives the students advantage to review the material instantly, either by rewinding the video that has been streamed on YouTube or by reading the transcript, slides, or any other form of material that came along with the video conference.” (Text 6, Sentence 5)

Sample 6 displays the repetition of the word “students”, whilst sample 7 showcases the realization of collocation found in the student's text. In sample 7, “online learning”, “Zoom Meeting”, “YouTube” and “video conference” demonstrate the “part of” relationship or meronymy. This is because Zoom Meeting and YouTube are parts of online

Lexical Cohesion

Reporting similar results as Albana et al. (2020), Alshalan (2019), Chanyoo (2018), and Emilia et al. (2018), this study showed lexical devices as the most used cohesive devices. It also dominated the use of grammatical cohesion for about 62.8% as shown in Table 2. The realization of lexical cohesion is presented in Table 6.

Taking as much as 50.4% subsequently followed by the occurrence of collocation (34.8%), repetition became the most used cohesive devices both in lexical cohesion and also in the overall cohesive devices.

learning. Meanwhile, “video”, “slides” and “material” demonstrate the “kind of” relationship or hyponymy. This is because they are kinds of material (for learning). These utilizations of collocation seen in sample 7 signals that students had acknowledged ways to provide more information and to gradually expand and shift the textual meaning. This is done to make their text convincing by presenting relevant things to the topic or issues being discussed (Aларcon & Morales, 2011; Emilia et al., 2018). Furthermore, Eggins (2004) also asserted that such occurrences of devices are critical in analytical exposition text as they serve to strengthen the sense of internal connectedness.

The Inaccurate Use of Cohesive Devices in Students’ Analytical Exposition Texts

Students ranging from low, middle to high achieving levels seemed to employ numerous grammatical and lexical cohesive devices. However, that does not directly justify that they have mastered the way to compose analytical exposition texts appropriately. This is due to the constant upsurge in the word counts in each level that was also identified. Thus, further observations concerning the inaccurate use of cohesive devices are critical since it could help students to acknowledge their underlying issue and ways to overcome it. Table 7 presents the inaccurate use of cohesive devices found in six analytical exposition texts.

From the overall cohesive devices found in six students’ analytical exposition texts, about 7.8% (64 items) of them were found to be inaccurately

utilized. The majority of errors was misuse which took 4.6% from the overall errors followed by redundant repetition for as many as 2.8%. As expected, this finding corresponds to studies done

by Awwalia and Suhardi (2020) and Rahman (2013) who reported misuse and redundant repetition as a major challenge for students to overcome.

Table 7
The Error Identification of Cohesive Devices in Six Students' Texts

Types of Error	Low Achiever (Mean: 214 words)		Mid Achiever (Mean: 238 words)		High Achiever (Mean: 535 words)		Total f	Total %
	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Misuse	12	7.8%	11	5.6%	11	2.3%	34	4.6%
Unnecessary Addition	5	3.3%	0	0%	1	0.2%	6	0.7%
Omission	0	0%	1	0.5%	0	0%	1	0.1%
Redundant Repetition	1	0.6%	11	5.6%	11	2.3%	23	2.8%
Total Error	18	11.8%	23	11.8%	23	4.9%	64	7.8%
Total Cohesive Devices	153	100%	195	100%	471	100%	819	100%

In terms of omission and unnecessary addition, both displayed a small number of presences, contributing only 0.1% and 0.7% to the overall errors identified. Nevertheless, this could not be a signal that students have mastered to seldom do mistake in both categories because it could also indicate that they might use less cohesive devices or compose texts with small number of words which in

returns reducing the plausibility for errors to occur (Cox et al., 1990; Dastjerdi & Samian, 2011).

Reference

In utilizing reference in analytical exposition texts, the number of errors demonstrated in six students' texts was about 13 out of 198 reference devices found. This means 6.6% of the references were inaccurately employed (see Table 8).

Table 8
The Error Identification of Reference

Error Found in Reference	Low Achiever (Mean: 214 words)		Mid Achiever (Mean: 238 words)		High Achiever (Mean: 535 words)		Total f	Total %
	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Misuse	4	13%	2	3.7%	6	5.3%	12	6.1%
Unnecessary Addition	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Omission	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	1	0.5%
Redundant Repetition	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total Error	4	13%	3	5.6%	6	5.3%	13	6.6%
Total Reference	30	100%	54	100%	114	100%	198	100%

Despite having different level of proficiency, students from low, middle to high achieving levels were seen to consistently face the same problems in a form of misuse (6.1%) when they utilized reference devices, and on the other hands, showed only small number of errors in omission (0.5%) with no error found in unnecessary addition and redundant repetition. Most of the misuse occurred when students employed demonstrative and personal reference as seen in sample 8.

(8) "when learning via video conference, many students do not activate the camera, it makes students seems like their (do) not pay attention to the teacher." (Text 3, Sentence 5)

In sample 8, student misused demonstrative reference in a form of definite article "the" twice in "the camera" and "the teacher" as the readers have no idea what camera or what teacher the writer intended to refer to since both were supposed to be in a form of personal reference "their camera" and "their teacher". This means that both words refer

back to the context of "students". Misuse in personal reference particularly in a form of possessive determiner "their" was also found in "their not pay attention to the teacher" since it does not show any relevance to things being possessed; hence, the proper reference should be "they" as it points back to the word "students" mentioned earlier.

It seemed that the student still lack exposure to the use of reference devices, leading to their confusion. Regarding this, similar results were also found by Khairunisa and Savitri (2018), and Nindya and Widiati (2020), signalling that as Brown (2007) suggested, the source of problem is in the students' interlingual ability where they still stick to their first language whilst translating into English. In this case, students still had difficulties and or confusion in translating "mereka" to proper English reference, since "they", "their" and "theirs" are translated into "mereka" in Indonesian. Moreover, it also indicates an intralingual issue since they were seen to over-generalize the use of definite article "the" before

writing an object or thing (Al-Khresheh, 2016; Brown, 2007).

Conjunction

From a total of 94 conjunctions found across six students' analytical exposition texts, as many as 11.7% of them were realized inaccurately. Similar to when students employed reference, misuse (9.6%) was also the most common error found in the utilization of conjunctions as displayed in Table 9.

Table 9
The Error Identification of Conjunction

Error found in Conjunction	Low Achiever (Mean: 214 words)		Mid Achiever (Mean: 238 words)		High Achiever (Mean: 535 words)		Total f	Total %
	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Misuse	5	25%	4	16%	0	0%	9	9.6%
Unnecessary Addition	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1.1%
Omission	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Redundant Repetition	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	1	1.1%
Total Error	6	30%	4	16%	1	2%	11	11.7%
Total Conjunction	20	100%	25	100%	49	100%	94	100

Examples of the inaccurate use is displayed in sample 9.

(9) "Social media can also support the learning process during pandemic. Such as using YouTube to share virtual class..." (Text 4, Sentence 7 and 8)

The words "such as" which belong to additive conjunction functions to elaborate things mentioned previously, specifically to provide examples or illustrations in the same sentence (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). However, in sample 9 the student seemed to use "such as" separately in a new sentence; thus, inaccurately employed. Additionally, even when the two sentences in sample 9 were combined together, it would still sound unnatural as the proper additive would be "for instance" or "for example". For instance, "social media can also support the learning process during (the) pandemic, for example using YouTube to share virtual class...".

Most of the misuses found were spotted when students employed additive and causative conjunctions. This was also the result found by Nindya and Widiati (2020) as well as Ong (2011), reporting that both interlingual and intralingual transfer are still problematic for students. Such errors such as putting "because" at the beginning of a sentence or putting it without any cause-and-result relation is a sign that students are not only still incompetence in understanding the grammatical rule in the English language (the target language), but also that they lack of knowledge to employ conjunctions in their own mother tongue (Brown, 2007).

Substitution and Ellipsis

Since substitution and ellipsis are mostly found in spoken rather than written discourse, it is unsurprising that only nine and four items of them

As many as 9.6% misuses of conjunction were spotted in analytical exposition texts written by low and middle achieving students, no misuse identified in texts written by high achieving students. When compared to the total conjunction found across six students' texts, both redundant repetition and unnecessary addition shared the same percentage for about 1.1%.

were identified among six students' exposition texts. There was zero occurrence of error in substitution and ellipsis. As Adiantika (2015), Alarcon and Morales (2011), and Arianto et al., (2017) suggested, both cohesive devices are rarely found in the argumentative writing genre. Moreover, the utilization of both substitution and ellipsis as seen in Table 5, were only spotted in texts written by students from middle and high achieving level. Thus, the smaller the number of cohesive devices employed by the students, the smaller the chance of them being inaccurately utilized.

Nonetheless, this rare occurrence of both devices could also indicate students' inability and incompetence to compose effective texts as proved that students with middle to high level of proficiency could at least employ those devices in a very small number, whereas students from low achieving level showed zero utilization of them (Alarcon & Morales, 2011; Nindya & Widiati, 2020). Therefore, it could be seen that in terms of substitution and ellipsis, the underlying problem is coming from students' inability to communicate effectively in spoken discourse which later reflected in their way of conveying ideas in written discourse as speaking and writing skills relates to one another (Huy, 2015).

Lexical Cohesion

Unlike the realization of grammatical cohesion in which misuses frequently dominated the types of error occurred in analytical exposition texts, most error in lexical cohesion came in a form of redundant repetition as seen in Table 10. Out of 514 lexical cohesive devices found, 40 of them (7.8%) were found inaccurately employed with the majority of them (4.3%) being redundantly repeated in six analytical exposition texts. This redundant repetition

is aligned with the fact that as presented in Table 6, repetition devices were the most predominantly used lexical devices (50.4%) whilst also being the most employed cohesive devices compared to all categories of cohesive devices (31.7%) proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976).

Sample 10 demonstrates redundant repetition identified in student's text.

(10) "Social media can expand our knowledge. Nowadays, a lot of people share their experimental videos, their article, or even their school notes through social media. Social media can also support the learning process during pandemic" (Text 4, Sentence 4, 5 and 6)

Table 10.
The Error Identification of Lexical Cohesion

Error Found in Lexical Cohesion	Low Achiever (Mean: 214 words)		Mid Achiever (Mean: 238 words)		High Achiever (Mean: 535 words)		Total f	Total %
	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Misuse	3	3%	5	4.5%	5	1.7%	13	2.5%
Unnecessary Addition	4	3.9%	0	0%	1	0.3%	5	1%
Omission	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Redundant Repetition	1	1%	11	10%	10	3.3%	22	4.3%
Total Error	8	7.8%	16	14.4%	16	5.3%	40	7.8%
Total Lexical Cohesion	103	100%	111	100%	300	100%	514	100%

As briefly discussed earlier, students tended to utilize repetition when they did not acknowledge which synonymy, antonymy, or reference devices they should utilize. This might be the result of attempting to relate a particular word to something mentioned previously (Ong, 2011; Rahman, 2013). This is certainly the case demonstrated in sample 10. Instead of using personal pronoun "it" in sentence 5 and 6, the student chose to repeat the word "social media". Thus, it caused redundant repetition. This issue indicates lack of exposure and practice in writing in the target language (English) as students seemed to not acknowledge ways to avoid redundant repetition (Nindya & Widiati, 2020). This also signals that the students suffered from lack of vocabulary mastery (Rahman, 2013). So, they used the same words over and over again to showcase their ideas. Borrowing Brown's (2007) explanation, the source of this problem is students' interlingual and intralingual transfer. It is interlingual since in students' perspective, choices to use the word "it" was translated as "itu" which does not make sense in Indonesian context. It is also intralingual because students also over-generalized using repetition; hence, the redundancy in repetition (Al-Khresheh, 2016).

Pedagogical Implication

It is acknowledged that students' underlying issues that caused their inaccurate use of cohesive devices were lack of language transfer skills, lack of exposure to the English language, and their confusion in employing those devices. To overcome these, this study suggests several pedagogical implications.

Firstly, teachers must be able to help students to think directly in English by exposing students to numerous authentic English written materials. This is beneficial in exposing them to new vocabularies

and ways to employ various cohesive devices that eliminate redundant repetition. Secondly, it is recommended that the study of cohesive devices have a place in the curriculum. Thus, instead of being directly taught text types as a whole, students could be taught more about constructing cohesive text beforehand. Lastly, constant support and constructive feedback alongside proper training and practices of cohesive devices must also be provided to hone students' skill in composing text cohesively.

CONCLUSION

Students across the three levels of proficiency namely low, middle, and high achieving have demonstrated massive utilization of both grammatical and lexical cohesion in their analytical exposition texts. Having lexical devices as the most frequently employed cohesive devices, the utilization of reference and conjunction followed in the second and third place. They were dwarfing substitution and ellipsis as the least used cohesive devices. The abundance of lexical devices followed by reference and conjunction was expected since in writing exposition text, students are required to elaborate their arguments by presenting relevant information and evidence using lexical devices while also utilizing reference and conjunction to make their texts effective, identifiable, and cohesive with proper sequencing of arguments.

Nonetheless, the high number of cohesive devices employed across six students' texts does not ultimately indicate that the texts are cohesive. This is because among those cohesive devices found there are plenty of them that were used inaccurately. Concerning this, the biggest contributors of the inaccurate uses are misuses which frequently occurred when students utilized references and

conjunctions, and also redundant repetition which dominantly appeared in lexical cohesion.

The inaccurate uses of cohesive devices both grammatical and lexical cohesion which include misuse, redundant repetition, omission and unnecessary addition signal that students still had issue in their interlingual and intralingual ability to compose written text. This reflects students' lack of exposure to the English language, lack of language transfer skill, and confusion in employing cohesive devices. Therefore, it is highly critical for English educators in Indonesia to better equip students with adequate text cohesiveness knowledge, proper teaching strategy, and sufficient constructive feedback.

REFERENCES

- Adiantika, H. N. (2015). Cohesive devices in EFL students' expository writing. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 4(1), 94–102. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v4i1.316>
- Al Badi, A. H. (Ed.). (2015). *Academic writing difficulties of ESL students*. The 2015 WEI International Academic Conference Proceedings.
- Alarcon, J., & Morales, K. N. (2011). Grammatical cohesion in students' argumentative essay. *International Journal of English and Literature*, 2(5), 114–127. <https://doi.org/10.5897/IJEL.9000016>
- Albana, H. H., Marzuki, A. G., Alek, & Hidayat, D. N. (2020). Cohesive devices in student's writing (A discourse analysis on argumentative text). *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 8(1), 6–11.
- Al-Khresheh, M. H. (2016). A review study of error analysis theory. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research*, 4(2), 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.6000/2371-1655.2016.02.05>
- Almutairi, N. D. (2017). Discourse analysis of cohesive devices in Saudi student's writing. *World Journal of Educational Research*, 4(4), 516–523. <https://doi.org/10.22158/wjer.v4n4p516>
- Alshalan, K. F. (2019). A systemic functional linguistic analysis of cohesion and the writing quality of Saudi female EFL undergraduate students. *Arab World English Journal*, 1–62. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/th.241>
- Anderson, M., & Anderson, K. (1997). *Text types in English* (Vol. 2). Macmillan Education Australia.
- Arianto, M. A., Refnaldi., & Rosa, R. N. (2017). The systemic functional linguistics: The appropriate and inappropriate use of cohesive devices in students' academic text. *Lingua Didaktika: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*, 10(2), 127–136. <https://doi.org/10.24036/ld.v10i2.7197>
- Awwalia, L., & Suhardi. (2020). Cohesive devices analysis: Mind your writing texture! *Eralingua: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing Dan Sastra*, 4(2), 174–183. <https://ojs.unm.ac.id/eralingua>
- Babbie, E. (2001). *The practice of social research* (9th ed.). Wadsworth.
- Bashir, M. (2017). *Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA/MA/SMK/MAK*. Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia.
- Bazerman, C. (2010). *The informed writer* (5th ed.). WAC Clearinghouse.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Longman.
- Bryman, A. (2004). *Social research methods* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Cassell, C., & Symon, G. (1994). *Qualitative methods in organizational research, a practical guide*. SAGE Publications.
- Chanyoo, N. (2018). Cohesive devices and academic writing quality of Thai undergraduate students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 9(5), 994–1001. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0905.13>
- Cox, B. E., Shanahan, T., & Sulzby, E. (1990). Good and poor elementary readers' use of cohesion in writing. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 25(1), 47–65. <https://doi.org/10.2307/747987>
- Dastjerdi, H. V., & Samian, S. H. (2011). Quality of Iranian EFL learners' argumentative essays: Cohesive devices in focus. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(2), 65–76. <https://www.mcseser.org>
- Derewianka, B., & Jones, P. (2016). *Teaching language in context* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Droga, L., & Humphrey, M. (2003). *Grammar and meaning: An introduction for primary teachers*. Southwood Press.
- Eggs, S. (1994). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. Macmillan Publishers.
- Eggs, S. (2004). *Introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd ed.). Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Emilia, E. (2014). *Introducing functional grammar*. Pustaka Jaya.
- Emilia, E., Habibi, N., & Bangsa, L. A. (2018). An analysis of cohesion of exposition texts: An Indonesian Context. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(3), 515–523. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i3.9791>
- Gerot, L., & Wignell, P. (1994). *Making sense of functional grammar*. Gerd Stabler.
- Gustine, G. G. (2019). *Writing for academic purposes*. UPI Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English* (1st ed.). Longman.

- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Hamed, M. (2014). Conjunctions in argumentative writing of Libyan tertiary students. *English Language Teaching*, 7(3), 108–120. <http://journale-academiauitmt.edu.my/>
- Hawes, T., & Thomas, S. (2012). Theme choice in EAP and media language. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(3), 175–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2012.04.005>
- Heni, A. N., Syarif, H., & Marlina, L. (2018). Lexical cohesive devices in narrative and exposition texts. *E-Journal of English Language and Literature*, 7(4), 412–421. <https://doi.org/10.24036/ell.v7i4.101839>
- Huy, N. T. (2015). Problems affecting learning writing skill of grade 11th at Thong Linh high school. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 3(2), 53–69. <https://www.academia.edu/download/40668008/PROBLEMS-AFFECTING-LEARNING-WRITING-SKILL-OF-GRADE-11.pdf>
- Izeni, A., Almasaeid, A. A., & Yonnes, M. A. B. (2013). The role of discourse markers and cohesive devices in writing: EFL students a case study. *ANGLISTICUM. Journal of the Association-Institute for English Language and American Studies*, 2(4), 35–48. [https://doi.org/10.0001/\(aj\).v2i4.1266.g1767](https://doi.org/10.0001/(aj).v2i4.1266.g1767)
- Khairunisa, N. C., & Savitri, W. E. (2018). Analysis on cohesive devices errors in EFL university students' argumentative composition. *RETAIN: Research on English Language Teaching in Indonesia*, 6(1), 70–77.
- Knapp, P., & Watkins, M. (2005). *Genre, text, grammar: Technologies for teaching and assessing writing*. UNSW Press.
- Malombassang, R. (2018). An error analysis of the cohesive devices made by the students in writing paragraph. *Tamaddun: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Dan Budaya*, 17(2), 71–78. <https://doi.org/10.33096/tamaddun.v17i2.15>
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2008). Genre relations: Mapping culture. Enquinox.
- Mayring, P. (2003). *Qualitative inhaltsanalyse, grundlagen und techniken* (8th ed.). UTB.
- Mohamed, N. (2016). Use of conjunctions in argumentative essay by ESL undergraduates. *E-Academia Journal UiTMT*, 16(22), 1–13.
- Nasser, A. N. A. (2017). A study of errors in the use of grammatical cohesive devices in argumentative texts written by Yemeni EFL learners. *International Journal of Applied Research*, 3(10), 172–176.
- Nindya, M. A., & Widiati, U. (2020). Cohesive devices in argumentative essays by Indonesian EFL learners. *Journal on English as A Foreign Language*, 10(2), 337–358. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v10i2.1949>
- Nugraheni, R. (2016). Cohesive devices in learners' writing. *Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 18(1), 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.2015.180106>
- Ong, J. (2011). Investigating the use of cohesive devices by Chinese EFL learners. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 13(3), 42–61. <https://shorturl.at/gwGO6>
- Rahman, Z. A. A. A. (2013). The use of cohesive devices in descriptive writing by Omani Student-Teachers. *SAG*, 3(4), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244013506715>
- Rose, D., & Martin, J. R. (2012). *Learning to write, reading to learn: Genre, knowledge and pedagogy in the Sydney school* [E-book]. Equinox.
- Ryan, G. W., & Bernard, H. R. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. In *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 769–802). SAGE Publications.
- Sari, N., Winarsih, D., & Sarwanti, S. (2018). An analysis of cohesive devices in analytical exposition text written by the eleventh graders of SMAN 1 Magelang in the school year 2016/2017. *Journal of Research on Applied Linguistics, Language, and Language Teaching*, 1(1), 47–57. <https://doi.org/10.31002/jr1t.v1i1.194>
- Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R., & Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857024480>