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ABSTRACTS

Dwi Nurcahyo. 2006. *A Study of Cohesiveness on Students’ Writings in the English Department of the State University of Semarang*. Thesis. English Education Study Program. Postgraduate Program, the State University of Semarang. Advisors: I. A. Maryanto, Ph. D, II. Prof. Retmono, Ph. D
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Communicative competence has been the main target of Language Teaching and Learning process. Teaching English is a matter of training students so that they are able to communicate in English either orally or in written. Cohesion, besides coherence, has then become important case to discuss due to the fact that it is part of writing competence. Analyzing the use of cohesion in a writing is looking closely the utilization of cohesive devices, such as *reference, substitution, ellipsis, and lexical cohesion* in it.

This study is aimed at investigating how students in the English Department of the State University make use of the cohesive devices in their narrative essays. This is a qualitative case study. The data is collected by giving an assignment to the students to make a narrative essay. Their essays are then analyzed by technique of marking. The marking technique is done by using *bold typing, italicizing, underlining*, and *giving quotation mark*. The analysis also presents some charts to know the occurrence of cohesive devices in the students’ essays.

The results of the analysis showed that the students tend to use *reference* in high intensity compared with the other cohesive devices. Most of their writings have also applied the *endophoric reference* in a quite good proportion so that their writings can be considered as the cohesive ones. Finally, it is recommended that teachers or lecturers should expose their students to intensive course for cohesion and coherence because these two items are the main properties by which their writings are considered to be the good ones.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Teaching a language means training students to be able to communicate in the language being taught. Communication itself can be spoken or written. As suggested by Wiannastiti (2004: 1), teaching English as a second language has to meet its final objective i.e. students’ competency in communication by using English either spoken or written. When people communicate, they negotiate meaning (Helena, 2004: 1). Just like a transaction, they will make a deal if they understand each other. However, a negotiation sometimes does not occur due to misunderstanding. Therefore, communication, either written or spoken, must be managed well in order to avoid misunderstanding. Writing is one of the important language skills. Through writing one can share his/her idea and when it is read by others, communication will occur. If someone can manage his/her writing well, s/he will be able to invite someone else to have smooth communication. In this case, so far English teachers or lecturers have frequently found student’s writing in the form of either essays or articles, which are not written well due to the fact that their writings are difficult to understand. On the one side, this is caused by the fact that their writings may contain some ambiguities or maybe the sentences of their articles do not hang together so that they do not constitute a clear theme. Due to this fact, teachers/lecturers have done some efforts to guide students to create good writing.
In order to produce good writing in English, one should not only be able to arrange words into *grammatical sentences* (in the perspective of the existence of *subject, verb, object* and *adverb* in every sentence) but s/he must also be able to create cohesiveness between sentences and to bind the sentences with the appropriate genre so that the sentences, as Wiannastiti (2004: 1) wrote, will create a special purpose in context. The communicative purpose of a text according to Bathia (1993:13) in Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000:6) is considered to be the most important feature related to genre. Linguists interpret the concept of context itself in wide variety of range. Halliday (1989:5) tends to use the word context to mention context of situation. However, in other parts of his book, he also uses the term *context* to refer to context of culture, inter-textual context, and intra-textual context (1989: 49). Of those contexts suggested by Halliday, I have a deep concern on the last context, i.e. intra-textual context. Intra-textual context is coherence within text, including the linguistic cohesion that embodies the internal semantic relationships (Halliday and Hasan, 1989: 49). This concept relates to the aim of my thesis; that is to analyze the *connectedness* aspect of English students’ writing in a university. Related to the concept of *connectedness*, Lyons (1995: 263-264) states that there are two kinds of connectedness, namely cohesion and coherence. He also points out that cohesion has to do with the form of a text while coherence deals with the content of a text. In this case, I do not put coherence in the center of discussion in my thesis. I would just like to explore the use of the cohesiveness aspect in creating good writing.
Thus, in an effort to help students produce good writing, it is important for English teachers or lecturers to socialize intensively the importance of paying good attention to the cohesiveness aspect in writing articles, short stories, novels or essays. It is in order to make the sentences of the students’ writing hang together so that an understandable writing can be created. Utomo (2000:5) states that a text is not considered to be a good one if it is not cohesive. He also underlines the analysis of Halliday and Hasan’s analysis (1989:2) saying that a text is considered to be a good text if it fulfills two properties, they are cohesion and coherence. According to them cohesion is internal property, while coherence is contextual properties of paragraph. Utomo (2000:5) continues that cohesive text is a text to which a paragraph in the text tie together and coherence means that a group of sentences relates to the context.

1.2. Statement of the Problems

This study is done to answer the following question:
How do the students in the English Department of the State University of Semarang make use of cohesive devices to produce good writing?

1.3. Purpose of the Study

This study aims to know the level of cohesiveness of the students’ writings in the English Department of the State University of Semarang.
1.4. Scope of the Study

This study gives a descriptive analysis about cohesiveness in college students’ writing. It focuses on describing how the students utilize cohesive devices in writing narrative essays. The writings analyzed are the narrative essays of the students of ‘Remedial Class of Writing 2’ in the English Department of the State University of Semarang.

1.5. Significance of the Study

1.5.1. For Teachers/Lecturers

The result of this study can hopefully be used as reference for teachers or lecturers in evaluating their students’ writings. Cohesiveness is a means of determining the quality level of students’ writings. Besides, the result of this study is also expected to be a practical description of how college students make use of cohesive devices. Therefore, I hope that the results of this study can be utilized as guidance for lecturers or teachers to help solve students’ writing problems.

1.5.2. For Students

The research findings are expected not only to be the clues for students to make better writings in the future but also to enable them to give good evaluation of any writings they find. Besides, it is expected to be helpful to students in grasping the idea of articles or essays they read.
### 1.5.3. Definition of Terms

Some of the terms used in this thesis are cohesion, cohesive devices, reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. Based on Halliday and Hasan (1976, 1989) and Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000), the definition of above terms are as follows:

a. **Cohesion**
   
   Cohesion is relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as a text.

b. **Cohesive Devices**
   
   Cohesive devices are some language elements by which cohesion is linguistically realized.

c. **Reference**
   
   Reference is the specific nature of the information that is signaled for retrieval. It is a relation on semantic level.

d. **Substitution**
   
   Substitution is a relation between linguistic items, such as words or phrases. It is a relation on grammatical level.

e. **Ellipsis**
   
   Ellipsis is simply ‘substitution by zero’. In other words, it is ‘something left unsaid’.

f. **Conjunction**
   
   Conjunction is a cohesive relation which expresses certain meanings that presupposes the presence of other components in the discourse.
g. Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion is the cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary.

1.5.4. the Organization of the Thesis

I organize this thesis into five chapters. The first chapter explains some points, i.e. background of the study, statement of the problems, purpose of the study, scope of the study, significance of the study, definition of terms, and the organization of the thesis. Chapter two reviews some literature related to the theme of the study. Meanwhile, chapter three elaborates the research design that I use in this study. Chapter four is the core of this thesis. It describes the research findings. Finally, this thesis is closed by chapter five. It shows the conclusions of the study as well as some suggestions.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, I shall quote some theories related to my study, i.e. those that correlate with the phenomenon of cohesiveness. The concepts to be presented are communicative competence, the concept of cohesion, cohesion and linguistic structure, cohesion and linguistic context, coherence, cohesive devices (types of cohesion), as well as concepts of writing strategy.

2.1. Communicative Competence

Communicative competence has become a serious discussion among linguists. This term is used to refer to the major goal of taking a language course, i.e. to enable students to develop communication (Celce-Murcia and Olshtain, 2000: 16). Based on this concept, the parameter of success in teaching a language is the ability of students to communicate in a target language. Wiannastiti (2004: 1) suggests that teaching English as a second language has to meet its final objective i.e. students’ competency in communication by using either spoken English or written one. Formerly, Chomsky (1957, 1965) in Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000: 16) states that grammatical competence is what is regarded as communicative competence but it was then argued by Hymes (1967, 1972) and his colleagues. He pointed out that communicative competence does not only consist of grammatical competence but also of sociolinguistic or pragmatic competence. Meanwhile, Canale and Swain (1980), Canale (1983) in Celce
Murcia and Olshtain (2000: 16) proposed that communicative competence could be described as consisting of at least four components: linguistic or grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence. Regarding this point of view, they added that all the competencies could be realized through discourse. In other words, communicative competence can be reached by someone if he/she is competent in discourse. Discourse itself in one dimension is divided into written and spoken discourse. From this basis, then emerges what is called written and spoken text. In this case, writing essays is then regarded as a part of communicative competence.

2.2. the Concept of Cohesion

The concept of cohesion has something to do with what is called text and texture. Coulthard (1994: 9) defines a text as a string of words. Meanwhile, referring to the suggestion of Halliday and Hasan (1976:1-2), text is used in linguistics to refer to any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that does form a unified whole. Additionally, a text is a unit of language in use. It is not a grammatical unit, like a clause or a sentence, and it is not defined by its size. A text is not a unit of form but of meaning. Therefore, according to them, it is regarded as a semantic unit. A text does not consist of sentences, but it is realized by or encoded in sentences. In another book, Halliday (1989: 10) adds that text is language that is functional, that is doing some job in some context of situation. Based on discourse approach, a text can be spoken or written (Celce-Murcia and Olshtain, 2000: 5). Text is not only derived from essays, novels or articles. In a
wider point of view, as suggested by Martin and Rose (2003: 1), text is produced interactively between speakers, between writers and (potential) readers. Hence, text can be used to interpret aspects of culture.

Text has a close relationship with texture. A text has texture, and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text. In other word, texture is the property of ‘being a text’ (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 2). According to Hasan (1989: 71) texture is a matter of meaning relations. She continues that the texture of a text is manifested by certain kinds of semantic relations between its individual messages. The following example shows the existence of texture:

Take and wash five oranges. Put them in a fireproof dish.

The word *them* in the second sentence refers back to the *five oranges*. It can be said that the word *them* is anaphoric to the word *five oranges*. The texture is provided by the cohesive *relation* that exists between the word *them* and *five oranges*. Concerning texture, there is also a concept relating to it, namely *tie*. In the example above, it can be seen that between the two sentences there is a tie called *reference*. The other types of tie that will be discussed in other sections of this chapter are ellipsis, substitution and conjunction as well as lexical ties. The terms (text, texture, and tie) discussed above are parts of the concept of cohesion.

Then, what is cohesion itself? Cohesion is “relations of meaning” that exist within the text, and that defines it as a text (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 4). Based on this definition, the concept of cohesion correlates with the semantic level. The occurrence of cohesion can be seen in a discourse in which the interpretation of some elements in the discourse is dependent on that of another. In short, cohesion
is one element, besides coherence, which will result in texture. While texture is the property that distinguishes text from non-text. Eggins (1994: 85) maintains that texture is what holds the clauses of a text together to give them unity.

2.3. Cohesion and Linguistic Structure (tdk pakai titik)

To understand the relationship of cohesion and linguistic structure, I need to explore some questions about the correlation between texture and structure, cohesion and sentence as well as cohesion and discourse. Since a text is not a structural unit, it can also be said that cohesion is not a structural unit. It is due to the fact that texture is a property of being a text (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 2). Meanwhile, texture is manifested by certain kinds of semantic relation. So, it is appropriate to say that cohesion as a phenomenon of semantic relations is beyond the range of structural relations. Yet, it does not mean that structural relations are not important and have nothing to do with cohesion. Structure is a means of expressing texture. All grammatical units—sentences, clauses, groups, words—are internally ‘cohesive’ simply because they are structured (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 7). Cohesion is not needed in making parts of a sentence hang together because they already in coherence with each other by virtue of structure. The close relationship between cohesion and sentence is that a sentence is a significant unit for cohesion because it is the highest unit of grammatical structure which tends to determine the way in which cohesion is expressed (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 6, 8). Based on Celce Murcia and Olshtain (2000: 16), writing is part of discourse competence and as a consequence cohesion must take a part in
discourse structure. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 10) state that cohesion is not just another name for discourse structure. Then, where is the position of cohesion in discourse structure? They continue that concept of cohesion is set up to account for relations in discourse, but rather in different way, without the implication that there is some structural unit that is above the sentence. Additionally, Cohesion refers to the range of possibilities that exist for linking something with what has gone before (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 10).

2.4. Cohesion and Linguistic Context

In this section, there are some theories to discuss, i.e. the domain of cohesive relations, text and situation, components of context of situation and register, the place of cohesion in the linguistic system as well as the meaning of cohesion. Regarding the domain of cohesive relations, the first thing to remember is that cohesion is not a structural relation, so it is not restricted by sentence boundaries. Therefore, cohesive relations are non-structural relations which work to help a text hang together (Gerot and Wignel, 1995: 170). Cohesion occurs when there is a presupposition between elements in a discourse. One element may immediately presuppose another element in the preceding sentence or in the following one. In some cases, the presupposed element may not be in the immediately preceding sentence but in some sentence that is more distant (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 330). So, once again, cohesion is not restricted by sentence boundaries.
Regarding the relationship between text and situation, it is important to remember the Halliday’s statement (1989: 10) that text is language that is functional, that is doing some job in some context of situation. Meanwhile, the term *situation* refers to all those extra-linguistic factors, which have some bearing on the text itself. The term *situation* itself is usually used to address ‘context of situation’. Hymes (1967) in Halliday and Hasan (1989: 9) proposed a concept for describing the context of situation, namely:

- the form and the content of the message;
- the setting;
- the participants;
- the intent and effect of the communication;
- the key;
- the medium;
- the genre;
- the norms of interaction.

Halliday (1989: 11) mentions that text is a social exchange of meanings. He also states that there are three features of the context of situation, i.e. *field*, *tenor* and *mode*. Field refers to what is happening, tenor refers to who are taking a part and mode refers to what part the language is playing. In short, Halliday tries to explain that text is an instance of the process and product of social meaning in a particular context of situation. Those concepts describe the components of context of situation. With regard to register, it is important to refer to sociolinguistics. According to Hudson (1996: 45) register is widely used in sociolinguistics to refer
to ‘varieties according to use’. “Varieties” here means varieties of language. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 26) define register as the set of semantic configurations that is typically associated with a particular class of contexts of situation. They add that register also defines the substance of the text: *what it means*, in the broadest sense, including all the components of its meaning, social, expressive, communicative and so on as well as representational. The concept of register is included in this study because it is closely related to the concept of cohesion. The concept of cohesion and register effectively defines a text. Text can then be redefined as a passage of discourse, which is coherent in these two regards: it is coherent with respect to the context of situation, and therefore consistent in register; and it is coherent with respect to itself, and therefore cohesive (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 23).

Regarding the place of cohesion in the linguistic system, it is necessary to remember that there are three major functional-semantic components, the *ideational*, the *interpersonal* and the *textual*. This concept of functional-semantic components can be referred to the concept suggested by Halliday and Hasan (1976, 26-28). They explain that the *ideational* component is that part of the linguistic system, which is concerned, with the expression of ‘content’, with the function that language has of being about something. The *interpersonal* component is concerned with the social, expressive and conative function of language, by expressing the speaker’s ‘angle’: his attitudes and judgements, his encoding of the role relationship in the situation, and his motive in saying anything at all. Whereas, the *textual* component is the text-forming component in
the linguistic system. This last component is that which is concerned with cohesion. Cohesion is part of the text-forming component in the linguistic system. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 28-30) also point out that within a text the meaning of each sentence depends on its environment, including its cohesive relations with other sentence. Considering cohesion is investigating the linguistic means whereby a text is enabled to function as a single meaningful unit.

2.5. Coherence

Besides cohesion, there is another phenomenon of connectedness, namely coherence. Lyons (1995:263-264) proposes that the distinction between cohesion and coherence has to do with the difference between form and content. As maintained by Eggins (1994: 87), there are two properties by which clauses could hang together in one unity, namely cohesion and coherence. She adds that cohesion is the internal property of a paragraph, while coherence is contextual properties of it. Coherence is a matter of content rather than of form. Coherence, as stated by Celce Murcia and Olshtain (2000: 8) contributes to the unity of a piece of discourse such that the individual sentences or utterances hang together and relate to each other. Soedjipto and Hasan (1994) defines coherence as: *kepaduan atau kekompakan hubungan antara kalimat yang satu dengan yang lain dalam sebuah paragraph*. They point out that coherence is the unity or cohesiveness of connection between one sentence and another in a paragraph. Differentiating cohesion and coherence, Djajasudarma (1994: 46) underlines that coherence is the relation of meaning whereas cohesion is the relation of form. The
question to be answered is then how to create coherence in a writing. Celce Murcia and Olshtain (2000: 8) suggested that coherence depends on:

- the presence of linguistic devices that strengthen global unity;
- the patterns and strategies of text development that are very culturally specific;
- the presence of a conventional scheme or organization that is recognizable as generic or specific to a particular communicative purpose and discourse community.

He also adds that overall coherence also depends on the degree of coherence within each paragraph or section of the text. Soedjito and Hasan (1994) state that the unity of a paragraph can be maintained by using connective marks either explicitly or implicitly. Explicit connective marks are showed by the use of words or phrase like pronoun, transitional phrases or words, and so on. Implicit connective marks are showed by the context of situation, environment, etc. Eggins (1994: 87) suggests that there are two types of coherence, namely situational coherence and generic coherence. Situational coherence deals with context of situation (register) and generic coherence deals with context of culture (genre). In some cases, a group of clauses may provide cohesiveness but they do not have coherence. However in other cases, a group of clauses may on the contrary provide coherence but they do not contain cohesion. The following clauses are the example of those which are considered to be not cohesive but it is coherent. It is because there are no cohesive devices.

*Indonesia is facing economic crisis. Economic crisis is a hard condition for poor people. Unemployment is one of the effects of economic crisis.*
The above text seems to be cohesive due to the existence of repetition of the words *economic crisis*. In fact, it is not cohesive, but it is coherent. The coherence can be seen from the relation of meaning of the words *economic crisis*.

2.6. Cohesive Devices

According to Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000: 126), cohesion is realized linguistically by devices and ties that are elements or units of language used to form a larger text (spoken or written). Through cohesive devices, the types of cohesion can be identified. Halliday and Hasan (1989: 82) classify cohesive devices into three, i.e. grammatical cohesive devices (reference, substitution and ellipsis), lexical cohesive devices (repetition, synonymy, antonymy, meronymy) and conjunction. In short, as explained by Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000: 53) following Halliday and Hasan’s concept, there are four ways (cohesive devices) by which cohesion is created: by reference, ellipsis and substitution, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. The following table is suggested by Halliday and Hasan (1976: 324) to give a description of cohesion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of cohesive relation</th>
<th>Representation in linguistic system</th>
<th>Semantic</th>
<th>Lexicogrammatical (Typically)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additive, adversative, causal and temporal, external and internal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adverbial groups, Prepositional groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Identification:</td>
<td>Personals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By speech role</td>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By proximity</td>
<td>Definite article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By specificity (only)</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Lexical cohesion:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collocation (similarity of lexical environment)</td>
<td>Same or associated lexical item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reiteration (identity of lexical reference)</td>
<td>Same lexical item; synonym; superordinate; general word</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substitution</th>
<th>Identity of potential Reference (class meaning) in context of non identity of actual (instantial) reference</th>
<th>Verbal, nominal or clausal substitute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal, nominal or clausal ellipsis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.6.1. Reference

Reference is the specific nature of the information that is signaled for retrieval. Retrieval from the shared context of culture is called *homophoric reference* and retrieval from immediate context of situation is called *exophoric reference*. Whereas retrieval from within text is called *endophoric reference*. Thus, reference is classified into three: homophoric, exophoric and endophoric reference. The following sentences describe the application of the three types of reference.

a) *Last night the moon* was shining brightly

b) *That chicken in the cage* will be sold

c) *Some students are being punished by the teacher. They came late.*

In sentence (a), we retrieve the identity of ‘the moon’ through context of culture (cultural knowledge); no one would ask ‘which moon’. Retrieval from outside the
text occurs in sentence (b). We can find the identity of referent item of *that chicken* in the context of situation. Sentence (c) shows the phenomenon of reference which occurs within text.

Eggins (1994: 97) points out that it is endophoric reference which creates cohesion, since endophoric ties create the internal texture of the text, while homophoric and exophoric reference contribute the text’s coherence. Therefore, when discussing cohesion, we only focus on the discussion of endophoric reference. There are three kinds of endophoric reference, namely: *anaphoric reference, cataphoric reference* and *esphoric reference*. Anaphoric reference occurs when the referent has appeared at an earlier point in the text. This type of reference can be found in the sentence below.

*d*). *Anton is my brother. He likes coffee very much.*
The pronoun *he* refers back to the participant *Anton*. It means that the identity of the referent item is retrieved from the preceding text. On the contrary, cataphoric reference occurs when the referent item is retrieved from the following text. This type of reference is illustrated in the following sentence.

e). *The teacher tried to focus on this problem: how students get along with English*
The demonstrative *this* refers to the following sentence. Esphoric reference occurs when the referent in the phrase immediately following the presuming referent item. For example:

e). *It is the hotel where I stayed last year*
The definite article *the* tells us that we know which *clinic*. We are immediately told which *clinic* in the following part of the nominal group *where I stayed last*
The above types of reference are so called in the perspective of retrieval system. Regarding the types of reference in the perspective of cohesive ties, there are three types of reference, namely: personals (pronominals), demonstratives, and comparatives (*the following tables of reference are suggested by Halliday and Hasan (1976:38-39).*

### Table 2: Personal reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic category</th>
<th>Grammatical function</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Modifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>Possessive</td>
<td>Noun (pronoun)</td>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I, me</td>
<td>Mine, My</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You, you</td>
<td>Yours, Your</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We, us</td>
<td>Ours, Our</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He, him</td>
<td>His, His</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She, her</td>
<td>Hers, Her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>They, them</td>
<td>Theirs, Their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It, it</td>
<td>[its], Its</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One</td>
<td>One’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Demonstrative Reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic category</th>
<th>Grammatical function</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Selective</th>
<th>Non selective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modifier/Head</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Modifier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>Determiner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This, these</td>
<td>Here (now)</td>
<td>The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That, those</td>
<td>There then</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*year.*
2.6.2. Substitution

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 88) state that the distinction between substitution and reference is that substitution is a relation in the wording rather than in the meaning. There are three types of substitution; nominal, verbal, and clausal. The following table shows the types of substitution.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Non prominent (given)</th>
<th>Prominent (new)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thing (count noun)</td>
<td>one(s)</td>
<td>The same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process (nominalized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>do be the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>Process (+.....)</th>
<th>do</th>
<th>do so</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) *We have no coal fires; only wood ones*
The word *ones* is the substitute of the word *fires*. This phenomenon of substitution belongs to nominal substitution. This form of cohesion is different from personal or demonstrative reference. In reference there is a total referential identity between the reference item and the presupposing item; nothing to be added to the definition. In substitution there is always some redefinition. Substitution is used precisely where the reference is not identical, or there is at least some new specification to be added like that in sentence no. (1). In the sentence above the word *ones* presupposes the word *fires*. The word *wood* figures as the redefining element of *fires*; *what* *fires*? The process of redefining has the effect of repudiating whatever is not carried over in the presupposition relation.

2) *They all started shouting. So I did the same.*

The word *the same* substitutes the word *shouting*. What is being substituted here is the process.

The next is verbal substitution. The verbal substitute in English is *do*. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 112) says that the verbal substitute *do* operates as Head of a verbal group, in the place that is occupied by the lexical verb; and its position is always final in the group *(see the following example)*.

3) “*I don’t know the meaning of half those long words, and, what’s more, I don’t believe you do either!*”

The word *do* substitutes for *know the meaning of half those long words*. The presupposed items are in the same sentence, and so the substitution is not by itself cohesive. But verbal substitution regularly extends across sentence boundaries.
Another type of substitution is clausal substitution. In this substitution, what is presupposed is not an element within the clause but an entire clause. The words used as substitutes are *so* and *not*.

4) *Is there going to be an earthquake? – It says so*

In this example, the *so* presupposes the whole of the clause *there’s going to be an earthquake*, and the contrastive environment is provided by the word *says* which is outside it (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 130)

2.6.3. Ellipsis

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 142) point out that substitution and ellipsis are very similar to each other. Ellipsis is simply ’substitution by zero’. The underlying point of view in discussing ellipsis is that it is ‘something left unsaid’ but it can be understood. Like the types of substitution, ellipsis is also classified into three types, i.e. nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis, and clausal ellipsis. Nominal ellipsis means ellipsis within the nominal group. Nominal ellipsis involves the upgrading of a word functioning as Deictic, Numerative, Epithet, or Classifier from the status of Modifier to the status of Head (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 148).

Some illustrations are given in the following example.

1) *The men got back at midnight. Both were tired out*

The word *both* presupposes the word *men*. This is an account of deictic element.
2) Smith was the first person to leave. I was the second

The word the second presupposes the word the first. The sentences show how ellipsis occurs in a nominal group ‘Numeratives’. The next discussion is about verbal ellipsis. Verbal ellipsis means ellipsis within the verbal group. For example in

3) Have you been swimming? – Yes, I have.
4) What have you been doing? – Swimming.

The two verbal groups in the answers, have (in yes I have) in (7) and swimming in (8), are both instances of verbal ellipsis. Concerning this case, it is important to consider the principle systems such as lexical ellipsis, operator ellipsis, finiteness, polarity, voice, and tense. These selections especially finiteness, polarity, voice, and tense, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976: 167), are obligatory for all verbal groups. The following sentences are some examples of the applications of these systemic selections.

5) a. What are you doing? (positive)
   b. Thinking (positive: ‘I’m …’)
   c. Not day dreaming? (negative: ‘aren’t you …?’)
   d. No, thinking (positive: ‘I’m…’)

The sentences above show that the omitted items carry polarity. The answers (9 b. and 9 d) denote that they contain operator ellipsis since they involve the omission of operator. Regarding lexical ellipsis, it can be seen in (7) in which the lexical verb is omitted to show a phenomenon of ellipsis. The following
sentences are the examples of the application of verbal ellipsis which shows finiteness and modality.

6) *The picture wasn’t finished. If it had been, I would have brought it.*

7) *He’s always being teased about it. I don’t think he likes being.*

The sequences of the presupposition are: (10) finite presupposed by finite and (11) finite presupposed by non-finite.

8) *I could help them. – Why don’t you?*

9) *Are you going to tell her? – I ought to*

The sequence of presupposition in the examples above are: (12) modal presupposed by non-modal and (13) non-modal presupposed by modal. The following discussion is about voice and tense. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 182) underline that voice is expressed towards the end of the verbal group, by the presence (passive) or absence (active) or some form of be or get just before a lexical verb, with the lexical verb in the passive participle form (see the following example).

10) *They haven’t finished the picture. If it had been, I would have brought it.*

The sequence of the presupposition is *active* followed by *passive*: ‘if it had been finished’. This is an application of voice (active and passive).

11) *She intends to come. – She won’t*

In this example, there are two verbal groups involved in the presupposition, the first, the presupposed one, is non-finite and the other, the elliptical one is finite. The non-finite one is tense-less, and the finite one is future.
The following discussion is clausal ellipsis. The discussion of this case is closely related to what is called by modal element and prepositional element. This is due to the fact that clause in English consists of these two elements (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 197).

12) *The Duke was going to plant a row of poplars in the park*  

     (Modal element)     (Propositional element)

From the example above, it can be seen that the modal element, which embodies the speech function of the clause consists of the Subject plus the Finite element in the verbal group. Meanwhile, the prepositional element consists of the residue: the remainder of the verbal group, and any Complements or Adjuncts that may be present. For clearer description about Finite, Complement and Adjunct, it can be referred to Gerot and Wignel (1995).

13) *What was the Duke going to do?*- *Plant a row of poplars in the park*  

   In the answer, the Modal element is omitted: the Subject and, within the verbal group, the finite operator *was*. Hence there is operator ellipsis in the verbal group.

14) *Who was going to plant a row of poplars in the park?*- *The Duke was*  

   In this sentence, there is an omission of the Complement and the Adjunct. It is an instance of ellipsis of the Propositional element.

15) *What did I hit?* – *A root.* (Complement; Goal)

   This is an example of ellipsis in direct response of WH-question. Besides, there is also ellipsis occurring in one kind of response called indirect response, as in the following example:
16) *Is it Tuesday today? – I don’t know*

Ellipsis can also be found in ‘reported speech’ sequence as in the following example:

17) *John didn’t tell me why he was coming.*

Besides response, there is also a term called *rejoinder*. A rejoinder is any utterance by a second speaker which presupposes that of the first speaker whether it was a question or not. The following sentence is an instance of the application of *question rejoinder*.

18) *Peter’s here. – Is he?*

Sometimes, ellipsis also occurs in *indirect yes/no question* (see the following sentence)

19) *She might be better living away from home. - I’m not sure*

20) Ellipsis also occurs in *indirect statement* as in the following example.

21) *England won the cup. – Who told you?*

In this sequence of sentences, the whole of the presupposed clause is carried over.

Based on Halliday and Hasan (1976: 221), there is no ellipsis of single elements in the structure of the clause. So the following sequence of sentence is not appropriate:

22) *The opportunity has now been lost. – I sincerely regret.*

The appropriate one should be:

23) *The opportunity has now been lost. – I sincerely regret it/the fact*
2.6.4. Conjunction

Halliday and Hasan states:

Conjunction is rather different in nature from the other cohesive relations, from both reference, on the one hand and substitution and ellipsis on the other. Conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings. (1976: 226)

Gerot and Wignel (1995: 180) suggest that conjunction is the semantic system whereby speakers relate clauses in terms of temporal sequence, consequence, comparison and addition. Eggins (1994: 105), following Halliday’s statement (1985), states that there are three main types of conjunctive relations, namely: elaboration, extension and enhancement. Elaboration is a relationship of restatement or clarification, whereby one sentence is (presented as) a re-saying or representation of a previous sentence. Extension is a relationship of either addition or variation. Enhancement refers to ways by which one sentence can extend on the meanings of another, in terms of dimensions such as time, comparison, cause, condition, or concession. Besides being divided into the above types of relation, conjunctions are also divided into those, which are expressed explicitly, and those, which are expressed implicitly. Additionally, Gerot and Wignel (1995: 180) suggests that conjunction may connect clauses externally as ideational or phenomenological meanings, or internally as textual meanings. The following sentences are the instances of the applications of conjunctive relation.

1) *And in all this time he met no one* (additive)

2) *Yet he was hardly aware of being tired* (adversative)
3) *So by night time the valley was far below him* (causal)

4) *Then, as dusk fell, he sat down to rest* (temporal)

2.6.5. Lexical Cohesion

The cohesive resource of lexical relations refers to how the writer/speaker uses lexical items and event sequences to relate the text consistently to its area of focus (Egginis, 1994: 101). Referring to Halliday and Hasan (1976: 288, 1989: 82), the types of lexical cohesion are *reiteration* and *collocation*. *Reiteration* is a form of lexical cohesion, which involves the repetition of a lexical item, the use of a *synonym, near-synonym, superordinate*, and *general word*. In other words, *reiteration* is the identity of lexical reference. *Collocation* is the similarity of lexical environment, which includes some semantic relationship, such as *complementary, antonymy, and hyponymy*. Halliday and Hasan (1997: 288) have suggested a framework for the description of lexical cohesion as follows:

1. **Reiteration**
   a. *Repetition*; when lexical item is repeated; 
      
      *e.g. book: book*
   b. *Synonymy (near-synonymy)*; when two words essentially restate each other: 
      
      *e.g. clinic: hospital*
   c. *Superordinate*; when two lexical items are related as a whole to part (vice versa).
e.g. car: jaguar
d. **General word**;
   e.g. bicycle: thing
e. **Completenessity**; when two (or more) lexical item are related in a complementary relationship
   e.g. boys: girls
f. **Antonymity**; when two (or more) lexical items encode a contrast relationship;
   e.g. wet: dry
g. **Hyponymy**; when two (or more) lexical items used in a text are related through sub-classification
   e.g. flower: rose rose: daffodil = co-hyponyms

2. **Collocation**;
   This type of relation can be seen in such relation as doctor: operate, play-piano, bees: honey, transfusion: clinic, king: crown, hair: comb, etc.

Hasan (1984) in Gerot and Wignel (1994: 177-178) mentions that there are eight categories of lexical cohesion, namely:

1. General; *repetition, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, and meronymy*
2. Instantial; *equivalence, naming, and semblance*

The following sentences are some examples of *meronymy, equivalence, naming, and semblance*:
1) **meronymy**: flower – petal  
   flower – petal = co-meronym

2) **equivalence**: the sailor was their daddy

3) **naming**: they called their puppy Flutty

4) **semblance**: Her hair is like wave.

### 2.7. Concept of Writing Strategy

Oshima and Hogue (1998: 3-15) proposes that there are three stages of writing process, those are **prewriting, planning (outlining), and writing and revising the drafts**. Prewriting comprises two steps, i.e. choosing and narrowing a topic. Planning (outlining) consists of making sublists, writing the topic sentence and outlining. Meanwhile, writing and revising drafts include writing the first rough draft, revising content and organization, proofreading the second draft, and writing the final copy. They also add that to make a good paragraph, one should consider some elements that qualify a paragraph to be categorized as the good one. Two of those elements are unity and coherence. In fact, when people talk about coherence, they must connect their discussion with a phenomenon of language called cohesion. So, cohesiveness is part of the requirements for a good writing. It is because a good writing has texture and texture is the result of coherence and cohesion.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHOD

The research design used in this study is descriptive qualitative. The data of the research were taken from students’ narrative essays of the ‘Remedial Class of Writing 2’ in the English Department of the State University of Semarang. The data are analyzed based on the concept of cohesion proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976). Regarding the systematization of data collection and data analysis, I partly refer to the Eggins’ suggestions (1994) as well as those given by Utomo (2000) and Ardriyati (2003). The data are analyzed to find the phenomenon of cohesiveness in university students’ writings. This phenomenon can be seen from the use of cohesive devices such as reference, ellipsis, substitution, conjunction and lexical cohesive device. Through the analysis of the cohesive devices, I can describe the level of cohesiveness of the students’ writings. Any concepts related to the study especially those proposed by Halliday and Hasan are used to be the parameter whether the data (students’ writings) are in accordance with the concepts or not. The following points are the more details of the methods of research that I use.

3.1. Methods of Data Collection

a. Data and Subject of the Research

The data to be analyzed are written data and the subjects of the research are the narrative essays written by the students of the English Department of
2005-2006 Academic Year of the State University of Semarang who joined Remedial Class of Writing 2.

b. Procedure

After the board of examiners accepted my thesis proposal, I proceeded to ask for permission letter to the postgraduate program officers of the State University of Semarang for doing research in the English Department of S1 Degree of the State University of Semarang. Then, I did my research. It was on Monday 21 June. Before doing the research, I also asked for permission to the lecturer of the Remedial Class of Writing 2. At 9.00 a.m, on Monday 21 June, I attended the first class and gave an assignment to the students. In the assignment I told the students to write a narrative essay about their most unforgettable experience. They were free to choose their own topic but I also gave some alternatives of topic. I gave them one hour to do the assignment. I also did that activity in the second class at 11.00 a.m. The total number of the students joining that remedial class was fifty-seven. So, I got fifty-seven narrative essays, which were ready to be analyzed. The steps of analyzing the data will be explained in the following section.

3.2. Methods of Data Analysis

a. Unit of Analysis

This study analyzes the phenomenon of cohesion occurring in the data (students’ narrative essays). Thereafter, this study focuses on analyzing how the students make use of cohesive devices (reference, substitution, ellipsis,
conjunction and lexical cohesion) in their writings. From this analysis, I will be able to know the level of cohesiveness of the writings and also to identify the typical relations applied in the writing in the perspective of cohesion. The analysis is based on the theory of Halliday and Hasan as well as Eggins. Besides, I also refer to the thesis of Utomo and Ardriyati.

b. Stages of Analyzing the Data

1) The collected data (students’ narrative essays) will not be entirely used. I will only take the narrative essays, which have little number of grammatical errors. It is due to an assumption that maybe, the fewer the grammatical errors, the better the quality of the writings will be. Therefore, I at first examine their narrative essays to select which of their essays have little number of grammatical errors. Besides, I will also select the essays to find out which ones consist minimally of 15 sentences. This limitation of selection is on the purpose of searching the essays in which cohesion has more chance to occur. Next, I retype the selected students’ essays by computer so that it will be easy for me to mark each sentence of them with numbers and it is also to enable me to further analyze the essays.

2) Then, I identify the occurrence of cohesive devices (reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion) by marking the application of them.

3) I mark the use of cohesive devices by giving underline, bold typing, as well as with italics and quotation mark. The bold typed words will
represent reference, whereas the underlined words will represent the substitution and ellipsis. Meanwhile, the Italics represent conjunction and the quotation-marked words represent lexical cohesion. It is to enable me to further analyze the data.

4) The next stage is interpreting the findings based on the theories mentioned above.

5) Finally, I list the use of cohesive devices in tables.

c. Stages of Interpreting the Data

1) I identify the occurrence of cohesive devices (reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction or lexical cohesion).

2) Then, I sub-classify each cohesive device into some categories according to the theory of Halliday and Hasan. The categorization is as follows:

a. Reference is sub-classified into personal references/pronominals, demonstratives, and comparatives.

b. Substitution is sub-classified into nominal substitution, verbal substitution and clausal substitution.

c. Ellipsis is sub-classified into nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis and clausal ellipsis.

d. Conjunction is sub-classified into additive, adversative, causal and temporal. Besides, it is also sub-classified into internal and external conjunction and is classified into elaborating, enhancing, and extending conjunction.
e. Lexical cohesion is sub-classified into *repetition, synonymy, superordinate, general word, antonymy, complementary, hyponymy*, and *collocation*.

3) Through the sub-categorization of cohesive devices, I will be able to identify the typical tie relations applied between sentences in the students’ essays.

4) Based on the occurrence of cohesive devices in the students’ essays, I will be able to describe the level of cohesiveness of their essays.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter shows the data analysis, which covers the presentation of the research findings. It gives a description of how the students of English Department of Semarang State University (UNNES) make use of cohesive devices in their writings. Through the description, I can measure the level of cohesiveness of the students’ writings. As mentioned in the previous chapter, I analyze the data based on the English cohesion theory of Halliday and Hasan. According to them, there are five cohesive devices (types of cohesion), those are reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. Concerning the typical tie relations, I refer to Hasan’s suggestion (1989:74, 79). There are three typical tie relations, i.e. co-reference, co-classification, and co-extension. She states that co-referentiality is typically realized by the devices of reference such as pronominals, demonstratives, and comparatives. Co-classification is normally realized by substitution or by ellipsis. Meanwhile, co-extension is usually realized by lexical cohesion, such as repetition, synonymy, hyponymy, antonymy, and meronymy.

In the analysis, I use techniques of marking, i.e. bold typing, underlining, italic typing, and quoting. The bold typed words represent reference. The underlined words represent substitution and ellipsis. The words in italic represent conjunction. Meanwhile, quotation-marked words represent lexical cohesion. The data were taken and retyped as is and the analysis is focused on the study of
cohesiveness. So, the grammatical errors are not discussed in a wide range of analysis. I only give a specific highlight to the inappropriate words related to the use of cohesive devices. Thus, this analysis does not only focus on describing the cohesive devices used by the students but also explain how students use them in the context of grammatical and lexical cohesion. It is due to the fact that cohesive devices, as explained by Halliday and Hasan (1989: 82), can be classified into grammatical and lexical cohesive device. Reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction belong to grammatical cohesive devices. Whereas, lexical cohesion (repetition, synonymy, collocation) belong to lexical cohesive device.

There are some points which I consider important to put forward in this section for the sake of giving a general outline of my analysis, namely:

1) This is a study of cohesion, so the basic concept I employ in my analysis is that of semantic relations.

2) Those semantic relations, as I mentioned above, are co-referentiality, co-classification, and co-extension.

3) Those three types of cohesive tie, which further create cohesion, are realized by cohesive devices (reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion).

4) The analysis covers not only the description of the use of cohesive devices but also that of how students make use of them in the perspective of grammatical and lexical cohesion.
5) This analysis is not only to codify the text in terms of cohesive categories but also to inspect and look closely the individual case of cohesion.

4.1. The Use of Cohesive Devices in Students’ Writings in the English Department of the State University of Semarang

There are 11 texts to be analyzed. All of them are narrative essays. I will give a description of how the students make use of cohesive devices in each text. However, before going through the analysis, I at first display all of the sentences of each text. The following texts are the original ones. No effort had been made to edit them.

4.1.1. The Use of cohesive devices in Text 1

Text 1

(1) I was 22 years old. (2) My father sent me to Semarang four years ago to continue my “study” in UNNES. (3) I took “English” Literature for my “subject”. (4) I realized that my father did not have enough “money” to “pay” my registration in every semester. (5) I tried to help him by took a side “job” as a “singer” in a wedding party or another meeting which needed an entertainment. (6) I got the side job as a “singer” since I was in the third semester. (7) One of my friends introduced me to her player and then she invited me to join with her music group. (8) After that I knew many organ “players” that using me in their job. (9) I had got a lot of money from this “job”. (10) The important thing is I enjoy and really love it. (11) Every month I could collect money about Rp 700.000 until Rp. 1.000.000. (12) If it was after Lebaran day or near by the independence day in August 17, I got more than 1 millions rupiahs. (13) I thought it was an easy “job” because I just sang and entertained people through my voice for about 2 hours. (14) It was about 5 “songs” that I had “sung”. (15) From my vee every month, I could fulfilled my own necessity and payed my SPP in college myself. (16) I could help my little sister to” continue” her “study” in “college” too. (17) I still do this “job” up to now and I do not know when I will stop because I like it very much.
a. The Use of Reference (Pronominal)

I found five types of pronominal, those are him, her, she, their and it. The general categories of those pronominals are respectively singular-masculine, singular-feminine, singular-feminine, plural, and singular-neuter. The word him in sentence (5) refers to the word my father mentioned in the preceding sentence. The word her and she in sentence (7) presuppose the same person, i.e. the writer’s friend, which is mentioned in sentence (6). But the function of them is different. The word her functions as deictic-possessive, while the word she functions as head-determinative. And pronominal her in sentence (16) refers back to the word my little sister mentioned in sentence (15). The word their, which is a deictic-possessive presupposes the organ players. Because the referent item is found in the same clause, not in separate clause (i.e. in the earlier point), so this pronoun is considered to have provided an esphoric reference. With regard to pronominal it in sentence (10), (12), (13), (14), (17), each one shows different identity of referent. It in sentence (10) and (17) refers to the writer’s job. These two pronominals have the same referent and create a cohesive chain through anaphoric reference. An esphoric reference occurs in sentence (13). It is because the referent of pronominal it is provided within the same clause, i.e. in the following point (the referent is the phrase an easy job). While it in sentence (12) and 14) refer to the immediate context of situation. So, these pronominals provide cohesive chain through exophoric reference. Thus, all the above pronouns have provided cohesive chains except those which have exphoric reference (pronoun it in
sentence 12 and 14). Exophoric reference does not contribute internal properties of text, but it contributes contextual properties of text.

**b. The Use of Reference (demonstrative)**

There are two types of demonstrative, i.e. *the* and *this* and the categories of them are respectively *definite article* and *demonstrative-near*. The word *the* in sentence (6), (10), (12) refers to specific identity. *The* in the first clause of sentence (6) refers to the writer’s profession mentioned in the preceding sentence (sentence 5), so I consider it’s referent item to be retrieved anaphorically. But *the* in the second clause is self-defining, so the reference is homophoric. The word *the* in this case does not contribute the creation of cohesion. *The* in sentence (10) and (12) is also self-defining. Concerning *this* in sentence (9) and (17), it anaphorically interprets the writer's profession mentioned in the preceding sentence.

c. **The Use of Conjunction**

I found four types of conjunctive element, those are *and then*, *after that*, and *because*. Conjunctive *and then* is a *temporal sequential elaborating* conjunctive. It is found in sentence (7). An *additive* conjunction is found in sentence (17). The word *and* in this sentence shows an *extending* relation between two clauses. Meanwhile, sentence (7) is linked to sentence (8) with a *temporal enhancing* conjunctive ‘*after that*’. As for the word *because* in sentence (13), this conjunctive bridges the two clauses in a *reversed causal* relation. And I also found *conjunctive element* in sentence (15) but it is in a form of *phrasal conjunctive*. It is the phrase *from my vee every month*. I consider it as *causal respective direct*
conjunctive. All of the above conjunctives have also created external logical relations due to their reference to the real world.

d. The Use of Lexical Cohesion

I found a strongly felt cohesion in the text. It can be seen from the existence of equivalence, collocation, and repetition of some words. The equivalent lexical items are the word study, English, and subject in sentence (2) and (3). Another phenomenon of equivalence is found in sentence (5), i.e. the word job and singer. Meanwhile, collocation occurs in some sentences, i.e. the word money and pay in sentence (4) as well as the word continue and study in sentence (17). Some repeated words are singer, player, and job.

4.1.5. The Use of Cohesive Devices in Text 2

Text 2

(1) I have a good lesson which make me always remember that. (2) The story start when I was in Senior High School. (3) I was in first class. (4) I liked scientific lesson so much. (5) I always studied hard in order to followed this lesson. (6) In the end of the semester our teacher gave us two “choices”. (7) The “choice” is about the program which we will take in second class. (8) I liked scientific lesson but I also liked “history lesson”. (9) The teacher gave us a time to thinking about it. (10) Then I discussion with my close friend. (11) She also liked “scientific lesson”. (12) After discussing for long time, in the end we chose social program. (13) We chose that program because our rival not too many. (14) We thought that we could the winner in our class. (15) The first day of the school days was coming. (16) We gathered in auditorium. (17) The teacher announced our class. (18) My close friend and I the social program but we different “class”. (19) We were sad because we couldn’t together in the same “class”. (20) In the “class” I was alone. (21) I didn’t have friends. (22) It was make me lazy to study. (23) I couldn’t “solve” my “problem”. (24) Then I told my “problem” to my mother. (25) My mother was surprised. (26) She was disappointed about my choice but she gave me same advised which make calm me down. (27) Then I promised to myself if I have same problems I will discuss with my mother.
a. The Use of Reference (Pronominal)

There are only two kinds of pronominals in the text, i.e. *it* and *she*. *It* in sentence (9) has no clear reference. While *she* in sentence (11) presupposes *my close friend* (a friend of the writer’s). And *she* in sentence (26) refers to the phrase *my mother* mentioned in the previous sentence. All of those pronominals are classified into anaphoric references.

b. The Use of Reference (demonstrative)

The demonstratives found in the text are *that*, *this* and *the*. *That* in the first sentence of the text has an ambiguous reference. It is not clear which item the demonstrative presupposes. Maybe the writer wants to use the word *that* as the presupposing item for the theme of the writing. To prevent ambiguity, the writer should have preceded the first sentence with a sentence containing a word or a phrase representing the theme of the writing so that the presupposed item will be existent. While *this* in sentence (5) refers to the word *scientific lesson* in sentence (4). Concerning the words *the*, some of them are self-defining (homophoric), while some others are anaphoric and cataphoric references. Those which are categorized as self-defining ones are found in sentence (2), (9), (14), (15), and (17). Anaphoric reference can be seen from the use of the word *the* in sentence (20). The word *the* in the first clause of sentence (7) presupposes the word *choices* mentioned in the preceding sentence (anaphoric reference), while *the* in the phrase *the program* shows a cataphoric reference. It is due to the fact that the phrase is presupposed by the clause which comes after it.
c. The Use of Reference (Comparative)

Some references found in the text which are considered to be comparatives are the same in sentence (19), same in sentence (26), and same in sentence (27). All of them are anaphoric references.

d. The Use of Conjunction

The conjunctives found in the text are in the end of the semester, then, after discussing for long time, because, but, and then. They are respectively considered to be temporal conclusive, temporal sequential, temporal sequential, causal simple, adversative-containing ‘and’, and temporal sequential. In another point of view, the above conjunctives are respectively considered to be external enhancing, external enhancing, external enhancing, external causal, external extending, and external enhancing.

e. The Use of Lexical Cohesion

I found some repetitions in the text. The repeated words are ‘class’, ‘lesson’, ‘choice’ and ‘problem’. Besides, there is also an occurrence of collocation in sentence (23). The collocated words in this sentence is solve and problem.

4.1.10. The Use of Cohesive Devices in Text 3

Text 3

(1) When I graduated from Junior high school, I was confused to choose a senior high school. (2) My father asked me to continue my “study” in government “school” because I had high enough scores in my Junior high “school” diploma, but I refused it. (3) I wanted to continue my study in an Islamic boarding house. (4) I chose it because I wanted to add my religious knowledge, besides my common “knowledge”. (5) However, my father forced me, I kept having a strong desire to “continue” my “study” in Islamic boarding house. (6) I tried hard to make my “father” sure by giving some arguments, such as I wanted to have much
friends, experiences, and be independent in my life. (7) Then, my “father” allowed me to do my choice because he really wanted me to better in my “life”. (8) I was so happy when I heard that. (9) He did not force me anymore, but he asked me to promise to be the best as long as I could. (10) Finally, I “continued” my “study” in Islamic boarding house far from my hometown. (11) In the first time, I felt so lonely far from my family. (12) But, day by day I could pass it. (13) I studied seriously and “obeyed” the school “regulations”, so that I could have high scores in class. (14) I respected my teacher, so that I could get their knowledge, and they gave me many books when I graduated. (15) Besides, I also had many friends that we still keep our relationship up to now. (16) Thanks God, you have answered my father, mother, and myself prayer to graduate from Islamic boarding school with a white name, and also make them proud of me to have much useful knowledge.

a. The Use of Reference (Pronominal)

The pronominals found in the text are it, he, their, they, and them. It in sentence (2) refers anaphorically to the first clause of sentence (1). This pronominal presupposes the order of the writer’s father for him to continue his study in government school. The word it in sentence (4) has a cohesive tie with the preceding sentence, so this pronoun provides anaphoric reference. Exophoric reference appears in pronoun it in sentence (12). The identity of referent can be tracked down in the immediate context of situation, which is illustrated in the preceding sentence. He in sentence (7) refers anaphorically to the word my father. The words he in sentence (9) have the same reference as the word he in sentence (7). The words they and them in sentence (14) have ambiguous references. Maybe the writer intended to create a cohesive chain with the word my teacher. However, the word my teacher should have been presupposed by the word he/she or replaced by the word my teachers. The word them in the last sentence has a cohesive chain with the word my father, mother but there is still ambiguity due to the existence of the word my self. To avoid ambiguity, the writer should have
retyped the word *my father and mother* in one more clause as the preceding sentence of the sentence containing the word *them*.

**b. The Use of Reference (Demonstrative)**

There are two demonstratives applied in the text, i.e. *that* in sentence (8) and *the* in sentence (13). The word *that* presupposes the illustration in the preceding sentence, so it is considered to have provided *anaphoric reference*. And *the* provides a homophoric reference because it is self-defining.

**c. The Use of Reference (Comparative)**

Actually, there is one comparative. It is the word *better* in sentence (7). However, this word has no clear reference. There is ambiguity to which word this word refers (what is *better*).

**d. The Use of Ellipsis**

I found one phenomenon of ellipsis. It is in the clause *I could* in sentence (9). In this case there are some words that are left unsaid, i.e. *be the best*. So, the complete sentence without ellipsis would be:

…*but he asked me to promise to be the best as long as I could (be the best)*

**e. The Use of Conjunction**

The conjunctives used in the text are *because, however, then, finally, in the first time, but, so that, and, and besides*. *Because* in sentence (2), (3) and (7) creates a cohesive chain through *reversed-causal-simple* relation. While *however* in sentence (5), it connects sentence (4) with (5) with a cohesive chain. The cohesive chain forms an *adversative-contrastive-emphatic* relation. The conjunctive *then* in sentence (7) provides a cohesive chain between sentence (6)
and (7) through a temporal sequential relation. Then, the word finally in sentence (10) creates a cohesive chain between sentence (10) and the preceding sentences (1-10). The cohesive relation formed by this conjunctive is temporal-conclusive. The first time in sentence (11) forms a cohesive chain with sentence (10) and sentence (12). Then the cohesive chain is strengthened by the conjunctive but in sentence (12). Those conjunctives create cohesive chains respectively through temporal-sequential and adversative relations. Concerning so that in sentence (13) and (14), this conjunctive forms a causal-simple. Lastly, about and and besides which are respectively in sentence (14) and (15), they form a cohesive chain through additive relation.

e. The Use of Lexical Cohesion

The lexical cohesion applied dominantly in the text is repetition. It can be seen from the repetition of the words: school in sentence (2), knowledge in sentence (4), father in sentence (6) and (7), and life in sentence (7). However, collocation also occurs in sentence (2), (5), (10), and (13), i.e. study-school, continue-study, and obey-regulation.

4.1.11. The Use of Cohesive Devices in Text 4

Text 4

(1) It happened when I was in my hometown. (2) At that time, I and my youngest sister went to the market to buy some food. (3) We went there by motorcycle. (4) The road was crowded enough, so it “spent” much “time”. (5) After buying some food, we went home. (6) The “road” was still “crowded”. (7) I “rode” my “motorcycle” carefully. (8) Suddenly a rider rode his “motorcycle” fastly. (9) He hit the bottom of my “motorcycle”. (10) They gave me the first aid. (11) Fortunately, I and my sister weren’t really injured. (12) Then, we went home. (13) At home, my parents were angry at me. (14) They said that I rode the
“motorcycle” carelessly. (15) I only cried. (16) I said sorry to them. (17) I told the “story” to him, so they forgave me. (18) I promised I would never do that again. (19) Since that, my father was never let me to “ride” the “motorcycle” again. (20) It was my bad experience about my “motorcycle”.

a. The Use of Reference (Pronominal)

The pronominals found in the text are it, his, he, they, them, and him. The pronoun/pronominal it in sentence (1) has unclear reference. Therefore, it results in ambiguity. In this case, this pronoun does not have a clear preceding or following presupposed item. However, it in sentence (4), it has a quite clear reference. It refers to the immediate context of situation. While his and he refer to the same person, i.e. a rider as mentioned in sentence (8). But these two pronominals have different functions. The former functions as deictic-possessive while the latter functions as head-determinative. An ambiguity of reference also occurs in the use of pronoun they in sentence (10) and that of pronoun him in sentence (17). Meanwhile, the pronouns them in sentence (16) and they in sentence (14) and (17) have the same identity of referent item. These two items refer to the writer’s parent mentioned in the preceding sentence, so the cohesive chains in the semantic relation of the sentences are thoroughly anaphoric references.

b. The Use of Reference (Demonstrative)

There are three demonstratives found in the text, i.e. the, there and that. The in sentence (2) and (4) is self-defining, so it is commonly called homophoric reference. But the in sentence (9) is cataphoric reference. It is due to the existence of information (presupposed item) in the following phrase. So, the word the bottom in that sentence refers to the bottom of his motorcycle. The word the in
sentence (6) refers anaphorically to the word the road in sentence (4). The word the in sentence (10), (14), and (19) tends to be self-defining, so I consider them referring to the immediate context of situation. Meanwhile, there in sentence (3) refers anaphorically to the word the market mentioned in sentence (2). The demonstrative that is considered to be anaphoric reference due to the fact that it refers to the events illustrated in the preceding sentences (8-11).

c. The Use of Conjunction

The conjunctives found in the text are at that time, after buying some food, suddenly, fortunately, then, and since that. Those conjunctives are respectively considered to be external enhancing, external enhancing, external extending, external enhancing and external enhancing. The conjunctive at that time forms a cohesive chain between sentence (1) and sentence (2) of which the conjunctive relation is temporal-simultaneous. While the phrase after buying some food provides a cohesive chain between sentence (4) and (5) by a temporal-correlative-sequential conjunctive. Concerning the conjunctive suddenly, it gives a cohesive chain between sentence (7) and (8) by a temporal-complex-interrupted relation. And I also found an adversative-emphatic relation in conjunctive fortunately. This conjunctive provides a cohesive chain between sentence (10) and (11). Whereas the conjunctive then, it creates a cohesive chain by a temporal-sequential relation. Finally, the conjunctive since that, it also produces a cohesive chain by a temporal-sequential relation.
d. The Use of Lexical Cohesion

The repetition of the words road in sentence (6), crowded in sentence (6), motorcycle in sentence (7), (8), (9), (14), (19), and (20), and story in sentence (17) shows the application of collocation. Another phenomenon of lexical cohesion in the text is collocation. This lexical cohesion appears in the relationship of the word spent and time in sentence (3), rode and motorcycle in sentence (7), rider and road in sentence (8), and the word ride and motorcycle in sentence (19).

4.1.12. The Use of Cohesive Devices in Text 5

Text 5

(1) Talking about Bali is very interesting. (2) When I was in senior high school. (3) I went to Bali and visited some amazing places. (4) I enjoyed the trip very much. (5) First of all, I went to Tanah lot. (6) But I could not see anything. (7) Because I arrived there in the evening. (8) And it was so dark. (9) In the morning I went to Sanur Beach. (10) The scenery was beautiful. (11) Everybody went there to see the “beautiful” sunrise. (12) After that I “bought” a “souvenir” in Sukawati market. (13) My friend, Dita “bought” a lot of “things”. (14) Because she “had” a lot of “money”. (15) Then, I went to Sangeh. (16) But I just stayed outside. (17) Because I was afraid of the monkey. (18) Next, I “enjoyed” the “sunset” in Kuta “Beach”. (19) I liked Kuta “Beach” very much. (20) There were many foreign tourists. (21) I also took a walk along Legian Street (22) Due to the fact that there were many shops and handsome boys. (23) Moreover I visited Art Center, Bedugul, Kintamani, Celuk and Joger. (24) And I was exhausted, yet I still felt happy (25) I wish I can go there again.

a. The Use of Reference (Pronominal)

I only found two pronominals in the text. They are it and she. The pronominal/pronoun it in sentence (8) refers to the immediate context of situation. As a consequence it is considered to have provided exophoric reference. Regarding she in sentence (14), it refers to the writer’s friend Dita, which is
illustrated in the preceding sentence. Thus, the type of reference of the two
pronounalns is Stack and anaphoric.

**b. The Use of Reference (Demonstrative)**

The demonstratives found in the text are *the* and *there*. The
demonstrative *the* in sentence (4), (10), (11), and (17) are self-defining, so it is
homophoric. But the word *there* in sentence (7) tends to refer back to the word
*tanah Lot* in sentence (6) and *there* in sentence (11) presupposes the word *Sanur
Beach* mentioned in sentence (9). As a consequence, these two demonstratives are
considered to be anaphoric. Regarding *the* in sentence (18) provides homophoric
reference. The word *there* in sentence (25) refers back to the word *Bali* in the first
sentence. This is a typical reference called remote anaphoric reference.

**c. The Use of Conjunction**

The conjunctives found in the text are *first of all, but, because, after that, because, then, but, because, next, due to the fact, moreover, and, and yet*. They
respectively create cohesive chains through: temporal-correlative-sequential,
adversative-contrastive, causal-simple, temporal-sequential, causal-simple,
temporal-sequential, temporal-sequential, adversative-containing ‘and’, causal-
simple, temporal-sequential, causal-simple, additive, additive, and adversative-
simple. The conjunctives considered to have provided external extending relation
are *but* and *yet*. The rest is regarded as having provided the external enhancing
relation.
d. The Use of Lexical Cohesion

I found a phenomenon of the application of lexical cohesion. It is represented by word repetition, word collocation and antonymy. The phenomenon of repetition can be seen from the repetition of the word bought in sentence (12) and (13), beach in sentence (18) and (19), and the word beautiful in sentence (10). And the collocated words are bought – souvenir in sentence (12) and bought – things in sentence (13), had – money in sentence (14), and enjoyed – sunset in sentence (18). The antonymy relation appears in the relation of the word sunrise in sentence (11) and sunset in sentence (18). And the last one is general word. It occurs in sentence (12) and (13) (the word souvenir – things).

4.1.13. The Use of Cohesive Devices in Text 6

Text 6
(1) Doing PKL (Job Training) is one of the English Department of UNNES subjects that has to be taken by the students. (2) Because I’m one of them, I did it. (3) I was in Dinas Perhubungan Telekomunikasi of Central Java. (4) It was a really nice place for doing my work practice. (5) The official sent me to Karimunjawa Island. (6) I was sent because of my English skills. (7) They considered that my “English” was good enough for doing the job. (8) I had to survey the tourist especially for the foreigners. (9) It was aimed to vote the foreigners opinion about Karimunjawa Island and Kartini ship. (10) I met a lot of “foreigners”. (11) One of them named Jerry. (12) I met her on the ship. (13) Jerry came from Czech Republic. (14) She was a nice women. (15) Fortunately, she was an English voulenteer lecturer of UNNES English Department. (16) So, it made me easier to get in touch with her. (17) After the meeting, day by day, we became a close friend. (18) A really close friend. (19) We shared and loved each other. (20) An incident happened. (21) It was really horrible. (22) When I had dinner with her and my friend named Eko. (23) Suddenly, both of them kissed each other in front of my face. (24) Jerry was the one who started. (25) I shocked and couldn’t think clearly. (26) It “broke” my “heart” by the way. (27) She tried to explain to me that it was kind of culture. (28) It was permitted to kiss our friend. (29) But not for me here, an Indonesian guy. (30) I considered that it was a kind of betrayal. (31) But now, I realize that it was kind of culture. (32) No one had to be blamed but my stupidity made her gone.
a. The Use of Reference (Pronominal)

I found five kinds of pronominal, those are *them*, *it*, *they*, *her*, and *she*. The pronoun *them* in sentence (2) refers anaphorically to the word *the students* in the previous sentence. The word *it* in sentence (2) refers to the phrase *doing PKL (Job Training)* in sentence (1). By using the pronoun *they* in sentence (7), the writer probably intends to refer to the word *the official* in the previous sentence. However, it seems ambiguous due to the fact that the word *they* is actually a personal plural pronoun. Meanwhile, *the official* is singular. So, it does not match. Therefore, it creates ambiguity. In order to prevent ambiguity, the writer should have added –s after the word *the official*. As for the word *them* in sentence (11), it refers to the word *foreigners* in the previous sentence. The *her* in sentence (12), (22), (32), it refers to the same referent *Jerry* in sentence (11). This pronoun is personal determinative which functions as a head. And *she* in sentence (14), (15), (27) also refers to the same person *Jerry* in sentence (11).

b. The Use of Reference (Demonstrative)

The demonstratives found in the text are *the* and *here*. *The* in sentence (1), (5), (7), (8), (12) and (24) is self defining. So, it is considered to be homophoric. And *here* in sentence (29) interprets the immediate context of situation and functions as an adjunct. Therefore, it provides exophoric reference. Yet, *the* in sentence (9) creates anaphoric reference.

c. The Use of Substitution

The phenomenon of substitution in the text can be seen from the use of the word *one* in sentence (1), (2), (11), and (24), and the word *no one* in the last
sentence. The word *one* in sentence (1) substitutes the immediate context of situation. Meanwhile, the word *one* in sentence (2) substitutes for *a person who belongs to the part of a group of people: the part of the students* illustrated in the previous sentence. Regarding the word *one* in sentence (11), it substitutes for *a person who belongs to the part of a group of people: the part of the foreigners* mentioned in sentence (10). Then, the word *one* in sentence (24), it substitutes the person who did an action illustrated in sentence (23). And the word *no one* in the last sentence, substitutes for *a person illustrated in the immediate context of situation.*

**c. The Use of Conjunction**

The conjunctives found in the text are *because, fortunately, so, after the meeting, suddenly, but, and but now.* All of these conjunctives are considered to be *external conjunctive relations* due to its reference to the real world dimension. The conjunctive *because* in sentence (2) connects sentence (1) with sentence (2) by a cohesive chain whose conjunctive relation is *enhancing causal-simple.* Concerning *because* in sentence (6), it creates a cohesive chain by an *enhancing causal-emphatic* relation. The conjunctive *fortunately* in sentence (15) gives a cohesive chain to sentence (14) and (15) by an *extending additive-complex* conjunctive relation. Regarding the conjunctive phrase *after the meeting* in sentence (17), it has no clear cohesive chain. It is due to the fact that there is no clear element to be connected by the conjunctive phrase. The conjunctive *suddenly* in sentence (23) creates an *enhancing temporal-complex-interrupted* relation, which then forms a cohesive chain between sentence (22) and (23).
Regarding *but* in sentence (29), it creates a cohesive chain by an *extending adversative-contrastive-simple* relation between sentence (28), (29), and (30). And the conjunctive *but now* in sentence (31) is the combination of *adversative* and *temporal* relation. But it tends to be dominantly adversative. It creates a cohesive chain between sentence (30) and (31).

d. The Use of Lexical Cohesion

The use of lexical cohesion can be seen from the *repetition* of the words *English* and *foreigners* in the text. Besides, the cohesion is also found in the application of *collocation*. This type of cohesion occurs in the relationship of the word *broke* and *heart* in sentence (26).

4.1.14. The Use of Cohesive Devices in Text 7

Text 7

(1) When I studied in Senior High School, there was a great flood in my village. (2) *Initially*, a weather was very “hot”. (3) *Suddenly*, it had clouded. (4) *At the end*, the rain was down. (5) *It* continued during three days. (6) I was worried *because* the rain had not stopped. (7) *In addition*, I had two homeworks from my teacher. (8) On Wednesday, I had to submit *it*. (9) *The day before*, I still went to school. (10) *And the next day*, *that* was Wednesday, I tried to go to school. (11) Although *it* needed a long time to arrive at school. (12) *After* I arrived at my school, *then* I attended *the* lessons until *it* finished. (13) *Before* I went home, I submitted my homeworks. (14) I was surprised when I saw the school yard had been fullled by *the* water. (15) I was very confious. (16) I and my friends waited a few minutes in school. (17) *May be the* rain would stop a few minutes again’ thought us. (18) Almost an hour we waited, *at the end* we decided to go home. (19) We walked about nine kilometers. (20) In journey, we had to fight *the* greatness of water flow. (21) I arrived in my house at 06.00 p.m. I was very tired. (22) *The next day*, I did not go to school because *the* bridge near my school could not be passed by bus. (23) *Until now*, I really can not forget *that* event
a. The Use of Reference (Pronominal)

There is only one pronominal in the text, i.e. *it*. The pronoun *it* in sentence (3) and (5) refers anaphorically to the word *weather* mentioned in sentence (2). While *it* in sentence (8), it has unclear reference. Maybe, the writer intended to refer to the word *homeworks* but this word is not appropriately written. It is because the word belongs to uncountable noun, so it should always be in singular form. Thus, the writer has mistyped the word. In order that there is no ambiguity, the writer should have omitted the suffix –s. Meanwhile, the word *it* in sentence (11), it presupposes the immediate context of situation. And the word *it* in sentence (12) interprets anaphorically the word *the lesson* in the previous sentence.

b. The Use of Reference (Demonstrative)

I found two types of demonstrative applied by the writer, i.e. *the* and *that*. All the words *the* in the text are homophoric. It is due to the fact that those words are self-defining. Concerning *that* in sentence (10), it refers anaphorically to the word *the next day*. Finally, the word *that* in the last sentence interprets the situation illustrated in the context of situation. So, it provides an exophoric reference.

c. The Use of Conjunction

The conjunctives found in the text are *initially*, *suddenly*, *at the end*, *because*, *in addition*, *the day before*, and *the next day*, after *I arrived at my school*, *then*, *before*, *the next day*, and *until now*. Those conjunctives create cohesive chains respectively by enhancing temporal-sequential, enhancing temporal-complex-interrupted, extending temporal-conclusive, enhancing causal-

d. The Use of Lexical Cohesion

There is one phenomenon of lexical cohesion. It can be seen from the application of collocation as described in sentence (2). The sentence says: *Initially, a weather was very “hot”*. In the sentence, there is a cohesive chain or cohesive tie between the word *a weather* (which should have been written *the weather*) and the word *hot*. This cohesive tie is similar to the relation between *patient* and *sick* or *patient* and *doctor*. This phenomenon is generally called collocation.

4.1.15. The Use of Cohesive Devices in Text 8

*Text 8*

(1) I had a friend named Jaka. (2) *He* lived in Panjaitan Street. (3) *He* was my friend when we were at elementary school. (4) Usually, after praying ashar, we “played” “football” together in the square. (5) At Junior High School, we enroll at different school. (6) I was at SLTP I and he was at SLTP II. (7) *And finally*, we studied at different “school”. (8) Someday, I “felt” “bored” with my activities and I realized that I had not met *him* for one year. (9) On Sunday morning, I decided to go there. (10) When I arrived at his house, I felt the things around the “house” had been changed. (11) *Then*, I opened the gate and walked to his “house”. (12) I knocked the door, suddenly an old man opened the “door”. (13) I was confused, because I had not met him before.(14) *Then*, I asked him. (15) Was it Jaka’s house? (16) *He* answered “yes”, sit down please. (17) An old man entered to call my friend. (18) *Then*, he came with a child. (19) We were looking at each other. (20) *Suddenly*, an old man said, this was Jaka my son. (21) I hesitated and realized that I had looked for the wrong person. (22) *His* father explained to me
that your friend had moved since six months ago. (23) **It** happened **his** name of **his** son same as my friend.

**a. The Use of Reference (Pronominal)**

There are four types of pronominal in the text. They are *he, him, his,* and *it.* The pronouns *he, him,* and *his* have the same reference (anaphoric). They refer to the same item, i.e. the word *Jaka* in sentence (1). Yet, they have different function. *He* and *him* functions as a *head-determinative,* while *his* functions as *deictic-possessive.* Regarding *it* in sentence (15), it refers cataphorically to the word *Jaka’s house.* And *it* in the last sentence refers to the immediate context of situation (cataphoric reference).

**b. The Use of Reference (Demonstrative)**

There are two types of demonstrative in the text, i.e. *the, there* and *this.* The in sentence (4) is *self-defining,* so it is called homophoric reference. The word *the* in the phrase *the things* in sentence (10) presupposes the phrase which comes after it, i.e. *(things) around the house,* so it creates a cataphoric reference. But *the* in the phrase *the house* in that sentence refers anaphorically to *his house* which means a house of the writer’s friend. And *the* in the phrase *the gate* in sentence (11) also anaphorically presupposes *(the gate) of the house.* Regarding the *the* in the phrase *the door,* it has the same referent identity as *the* in sentence (12). Then, about *there* in sentence (9), this demonstrative has ambiguity of reference. To avoid ambiguity, the writer should have given the presupposed item in the preceding sentence. And *the* in sentence (21) is *self-defining.* Finally, concerning the word *this* in sentence (20), it refers cataphorically to the word *Jaka.*
c. The Use of Conjunction

The conjunctive and finally provides an enhancing temporal-sequential relation, which creates a cohesive tie between sentence (6) and (7). Regarding and in sentence (8), it cohesively ties two clauses in sentence (8) by an extending additive relation. The conjunctive then in sentence (11) connects sentence (10) and (11) by an enhancing temporal-sequential relation. And suddenly in sentence (12) creates a cohesive chain/tie between sentence (11) and (12). This (enhancing) conjunctive relation also occurs between sentence (19) and (20). Meanwhile, a causal-simple relation occurs in sentence (13). And from sentence (13) up to sentence (18), cohesive chains have been created by the use of two enhancing temporal-sequential conjuntives, i.e. the conjunctive then in sentence (14) and (18).

d. The Use of Lexical Cohesion

The repetition of the word school, house and door is the realization of the use of lexical cohesion. Besides, collocation also occurs in the text, i.e. in the relation of the word played – football in sentence (4), and felt – bored.

4.1.16. The Use of Cohesive Devices in Text 9

Text 9

(1) I have a story when I was in Yogyakarta. (2) My “story” is about ordering coffee at a traditional “coffee” shop who called Angkringan. (3) I always “had” a nice cup of “coffee” every night in Semarang. (4) It gave me a great feeling in the “night”. (5) So when I was in Yogyakarta, I looked for a “coffee” shop (Angkringan). (6) Finally, I found a nice Angkringan with many people queuing to order. (7) Quite confidently I jumped into the queue. (8) Then a very friendly man asked me if he could help me. (9) I said that I would like to have a cup of “coffee”. (10) Then he asked me what kind of coffee I would like to order, black “coffee” or Joss “coffee”? (11) My quick response, but with some confusion,
said black “coffee” please. (12) But I still confuse. (13) I didn’t know what actually Joss “coffee” was. (14) I only knew that “having” “tea” is normally with or without milk. (15) Next day I had a cup of “coffee” at the same place with my friend and I saw a man “drinking” “coffee” with charcoal in it. (16) Then I asked “can I say that you are having a Joss coffee”?” she said, “yes you can. (17) Finally, I understood that Joss coffee is charcoal which still burn added with coffee.

a. The Use of Reference (Pronominal)

There are only three types of pronominal in the text; those are he, it, and she. He in sentence (10) refers to the word a very friendly man in sentence (8), whereas it in sentence (15) interprets the word a cup of coffee in the first clause of the sentence. Meanwhile, she in sentence (16) has an unclear reference. Maybe, the writer intended to refer to the word a man drinking coffeee in sentence (15), but the pronoun used to refer to this phrase was inappropriately written. It should have been changed into the pronoun he (not she), because a man drinking coffee is a masculine proper name, so the pronoun should be he.

b. The Use of Reference (Demonstrative)

I only found one type of demonstrative in the text. It is the in sentence (4) and (7). The conjunctives the in the two sentences have the same type of reference. They are homophoric. It is due to the fact that they are self-defining. Therefore, they are considered to be homophoric reference.

c. The Use of Reference (Comparative)

The phrase the same place in sentence (15) contains a comparative reference. This phrase refers to the phrase a nice Angkringan mentioned in sentence (6).
d. The Use of Ellipsis

I found a phenomenon of clausal ellipsis in the text. It can be seen from sentence (16). The sentence says: Then I asked “can I say that you are having a Joss coffee”? she said, “yes you can. If we take a look at the last clause: she said, “yes, you can”, we will understand that there are some items/elements which are left unsaid. If they are not left unsaid, the complete sentence will be yes, you can (say that you are having a Joss coffee).

e. The Use of Conjunction

The conjunctives found in the text are so, finally, then, and but. The conjunctive so (sentence 5) is an extending additive and the conjunctive finally is found in sentence (6) and (16), while then can be found in sentence (8), (10), and (16), and but is in sentence (12). The conjunctives finally and then have created cohesive chains by enhancing temporal-sequential relations. Meanwhile, a cohesive chain has also been created by an extending adversative relation through the use of but.

f. The Use of Lexical Cohesion

The repetitions of the words story, coffee, and night have given a description of the use of lexical cohesion. Yet, the use of lexical cohesion is also found in the application of collocation. It is in sentence (15). The collocation occurs in the phrase a cup of coffee. The words cup and coffee have a cohesive chain. It is because those words have shared the same lexical environment as the collocation occurring in the words king and crown. Collocated words are also
found in sentence (3), (14), and (15). They are respectively had – coffee, having – tea, drinking – coffee.

4.1.17. The Use of Cohesive Devices in Text 10

Text 10

(1) I had an unforgettable experience when I was in Senior High School. (2) I was a new student in that time and all the new students had to join in Boy Scout. (3) I enrolled to be member of “Boy Scout”, so I had to do all the “Boy Scout” activities. (4) The committee of “Boy Scout” held agenda for new members. (5) It was a new “members” inauguration. (6) It was held on Saturday morning until Sunday “morning”. (7) All new “members” had to join in it without exception. (8) I joined in it and made a group with my friends. (9) My group consisted of 15 “students”. (10) They chose me as their leader. (11) The agenda was started with opening ceremony in the “school” field. (12) After that, the “committee” gave us “Boy Scout” materials. (13) Then we got breaking time on 2 pm until 7 pm. (14) The agenda was continued on the night. (15) They brought us to the forest near the “school”. (16) They gave us a task to each group to finish a puzzle with “answering questions”. (17) My group had “answered” 3 “question” and we had to answer 2 questions again. (18) When we walked to reach next “question”, suddenly there was something white in front of us. (19) It was a ‘pocong’. (20) We felt afraid and all of my group members ran and left me. (21) It approached me and suddenly I hit his shoulder with my “Boy Scout” stick. (22) Then I ran I reported it to the “committee” and gathered with my group. (23) The “committee” got angry because we did not finish our task but they gave us dispensation. (24) The next agenda was Renungan Malam and then we got a resting time. (25) The last “agenda” was closing ceremony. (26) I joined in it although I was tired. (27) Suddenly, one of the “committee” “members” walked and approached me. (28) He said “Thank you because you did not hit my head.” (29) When I “heard” his “saying”, I could not say anything. (30) I just laughed.

a. The Use of Reference (Pronominal)

It in sentence (5), (6), (7), and (8) anaphorically refers to the same phrase, i.e. to the phrase a new members inauguration mentioned sentence (5). And it in sentence (19) and (21) anaphorically presupposes the word pocong mentioned in sentence (19). They in sentence (10), (15), and (16) also anaphorically refers to the same phrase i.e. to the phrase my friends mentioned in
sentence (8). The word they in sentence (23) refers to the phrase the committee in the same sentence (first clause). Concerning his in sentence (21), it has an ambiguous reference. But, he in sentence (28) anaphorically refers to the phrase one of the committee stated in sentence (27).

b. The Use of Reference (Demonstrative)

The in sentence (2) is self-defining (homphoric), whereas the in sentence (3) anaphorically interprets the phrase Boy Scout. The word the in the phrase the committee of Boy Scout in sentence (4) tends to be self-defining, so it is homophoric reference. This reference also occurs in the phrase: the agenda and the night in sentence (11) and (14), and the forest and the school in sentence (15). Meanwhile, the in the phrase the committee in sentence (12), (22), and (27) anaphorically presupposes the committee in sentence (4). The in the phrase the next agenda in sentence (24) cataphorically refers to the word Renungan Malam and the in the phrase the last agenda in sentence (25) cataphorically refers to the word closing ceremony.

c. The Use of Conjunction

The conjunctives used in the text are after that, then, and suddenly, because, and, and then. The conjunctive after that forms a cohesive chain between sentence (11) and (12) by an enhancing temporal-sequential relation. Concerning then in sentence (13), it has a cohesive tie to connect sentence (12) and (13). The cohesive tie is formed by an enhancing temporal-sequential relation. Meanwhile, the conjunctive and suddenly in sentence (21) is a combination of additive and temporal-complex-interrupted relation. It connects the first clause and the second
one of in the sentence. An *enhancing temporal-sequential* relation is also found in the conjunctive *then* in sentence (22). It creates a cohesive chain between sentence (21) and (22). Concerning *because* in sentence (23), it forms a cohesive tie for the first and second clause in the sentence by an *enhancing causal-simple* relation. This relation also occurs in sentence (28). Regarding the conjunctive *and then* in sentence (24), it is an *enhancing temporal-sequential* relation. It connects the two clauses in the sentence by a cohesive chain formed by the relation (*additive and temporal-sequential relation*).

**d. The Use of Lexical Cohesion**

The use of lexical cohesion appears in the repetition of some words such as *Boy Scout* in sentence (3), (4), (12), (21); *member* in sentence (5), (7), (27); *school* in sentence (11), *morning* in sentence (6), *committee* in sentence (12), (22), (23), (25), (27); *student* in sentence (9), *agenda* in sentence (25) and *question* in sentence (18). Lexical cohesion also appears in the application of *collocational relationship* in the text. It can be found in the relation of the word *answering – question* (sentence 16), *answered – question* (sentence 17), and the word *heard – saying* (sentence 29).

**4.1.19. The Use of Cohesive Devices in Text 11**

*Text 11*

(1) I “felt” “disappointed” when I knew that I failed in the UMPTN last year. (2) *But* I was not hopeless. (3) My friend and I looked for an information about an acceptance of new students through parallel class in UNDIP which is located in Tembalang and in UNNES which is located in Gunung Pati. (4) Both of us never went to there. (5) Nevertheless, we were returned safely from Semarang. (6) *On the other days* I registered in “UNNES”, my choosing is English department. (7) *For a while* I decided to staying in my family house in Krobokan because there
are some tests that I must followed to accepted in the “campus”. (8) One day in the morning I went to “UNNES” from Krobokan by PRPP-Klipang bus and I want to stopped on Karyadi hospital. (9) But I did not know exactly, where is the Karyadi “hospital” location. (10) So I asked to assistant to a driver to stopped on Karyadi. (11) But may be he forgot to gave me the information that the Karyadi “hospital” had passed. (12) I felt too long, my cousin said that it just five up to ten minutes to reach the place. (13) I asked to the student in the bus, and he answered that the Karyadi “hospital” had passed. (14) So, he helped me to chose the right bus to “UNNES”. (15) I was very happy because there is somebody who had helped me. (16) Until now I did not meet him again.

a. The Use of Reference (Pronominal)

There are only two types of pronominal found in the text, i.e. he and him. The pronoun he in sentence (11) anaphorically refers to the word assistant to a driver mentioned in sentence (10) and he in sentence (13) also anaphorically presupposes the word the student in the first clause of the sentence. Concerning the pronoun him in the last sentence, it anaphorically refers to the word the student in sentence (13).

b. The Use of Reference (Demonstrative)

The writer has applied two types of demonstrative; those are the and there. The in sentence (1) and (7) is self-defining, so it belongs homophoric reference. The article the in sentence (12) anaphorically refers to the word the Karyadi Hospital mentioned in sentence (11). Regarding the in the phrase the student in sentence (13), it refers to the items somewhere in the context of situation. If there is a question of which student the writer means, the answer will be the student in the bus. So, the phrase in the bus serves as the presupposed element. This type of reference belongs to exophoric reference. Another demonstrative found in the text is there. This demonstrative functions as an adjunct. It anaphorically refers to the word UNNES mentioned in sentence (3).
c. The Use of Conjunction

The conjunctives used in the text are *but, nevertheless, on the other days, for a while, because, and until now*. They respectively form: *external-extending-adversative, external-extending-adversative-contrastive, external-enhancing-temporal-complex-repetitive, external-enhancing-temporal-simultaneous, external-enhancing-causal-simple, and external-enhancing-temporal-complex-terminal* relations. They have respectively created cohesive chains between: sentence (1) and (2), sentence (4) and sentence 5), sentence (5) and (6), sentence (6) and (7), clauses in sentence (7), clauses in sentence (8), sentence (8) and (9), sentence (9) and (10), sentence (10) and (11), clauses in sentence (13), sentence (13) and (14), clauses in sentence (15), sentence (15) and (16).

d. The Use of Lexical Cohesion

The application of lexical cohesion appears in the repetition of the word *hospital* in sentence (9), (11), and (13). Lexical cohesion also appears in the *equivalently related word campus and UNNES* in sentence (5, 7, 8).

4.2. The Level of Cohesiveness of the Students’ Writing

The level of cohesiveness means, “how cohesive are the students’ writings?”. To measure the level of cohesiveness of a writing, we should know the number of cohesive devices used in the writing. The more the students use the cohesive devices the more chance to be cohesive their writings will be. Yet, it is also important to know how they manage to use the cohesive devices appropriately in the perspective of grammatical and lexical cohesion. So, the more
the students use the cohesive devices inappropriately, the more chance to be less cohesive their writings will be. Thus, there are two parameters of measuring the cohesiveness of writing; those are:

1. How many cohesive devices does a writer apply and which of the cohesive devices provides *endophoric reference*?

2. Does s/he apply the cohesive devices appropriately in the perspective of grammatical and lexical cohesion

*In this sub-chapter, I would like to show a table of the research findings covering the above parameters, as follows:*  

**Table 6. (Reference)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Text 1</th>
<th>Text 2</th>
<th>Text 3</th>
<th>Text 4</th>
<th>Text 5</th>
<th>Text 6</th>
<th>Text 7</th>
<th>Text 8</th>
<th>Text 9</th>
<th>Text 10</th>
<th>Text 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronominal</td>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
<td>Pronominal</td>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
<td>Pronominal</td>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7 (Substitution and Ellipsis)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Text 1</th>
<th>Text 2</th>
<th>Text 3</th>
<th>Text 4</th>
<th>Text 5</th>
<th>Text 6</th>
<th>Text 7</th>
<th>Text 8</th>
<th>Text 9</th>
<th>Text 10</th>
<th>Text 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Text 1</td>
<td>Text 2</td>
<td>Text 3</td>
<td>Text 4</td>
<td>Text 5</td>
<td>Text 6</td>
<td>Text 7</td>
<td>Text 8</td>
<td>Text 9</td>
<td>Text 10</td>
<td>Text 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8 (Conjunction)**

The above tables show the number of cohesive devices and ambiguity applied by the students in their narrative writings. A student’s writing will be considered to have the highest level of cohesion if it has the biggest in number of the application of cohesive devices and the lowest in number of the occurrence of ambiguity. The ambiguity occurred in the text is resulted from the inappropriate use of cohesive devices in the perspective of grammatical and lexical cohesion.
Some of the inappropriate uses of cohesive devices are due to the inappropriate use of references and some others are because of that of conjunction and lexical cohesion. The details can be referred back to the previous description. The following table shows the total number of cohesive devices and of the occurrence of ambiguity of each text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Number of Sentence</th>
<th>The Total Number of Cohesive Devices</th>
<th>The Total Number of Ambiguity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Text 1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Text 2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Text 3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Text 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Text 5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Text 6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Text 7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Text 8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Text 9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Text 10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Text 11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that text (10) has the highest probability to be the most cohesive writing. It can be seen from the total number of cohesive devices he applied. Besides, it also amounts 51 cohesive devices with only one ambiguity. And Text (3) has the highest probability to be the least cohesive writing. To be sure of the level of cohesiveness, all of the writings should be re-analyzed to find the internal properties of each text, especially the types of reference of each text. If text (10) has the highest number of endophoric reference, the assumption that this text is the most cohesive writing is true. Therefore in the next sub-chapter I will draw the chart of the pattern of reference, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. However, based on the table, at least we can presume that the students’ narrative writings have different level of cohesiveness from each other.
Concerning the typical tie relations as I mentioned in page 37, the data have shown that the students make use of reference at the highest number compared with the other cohesive devices. Meanwhile, the use of substitution and ellipsis has the lowest number. The total number of occurrence of each cohesive device in the students’ writing is respectively as follows:

1. Reference: 256 times
2. Substitution and ellipsis: (5 + 2) times
3. Conjunction: 137 times
4. Lexical cohesion: 85 times

Therefore, the most frequent use of the cohesive devices goes to co-reference relation followed by co-classification, and co-extention.

4.3. The Texture of the Students’ Writings

It has been stated in chapter two that a text has texture, and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text. It can also be said that texture is the property of ‘being a text’ (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 2). Texture is a matter of meaning relations. The texture of a text is manifested by certain kinds of semantic relations between its individual messages. The students’ narrative essays which have been analyzed in the previous sections also show the existence of texture. The texture is provided by the cohesive relations existing in the students’ writings. Based on the data analysis and in the perspective of cohesion concept, the texture of the students’ writings is realized by the cohesive devices applied in the writings. The cohesive devices have created texture due to the fact that texture is the result of coherence and cohesion. Referring to the findings, the texture appears in the cohesive relations created by the cohesive devices, such as
reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. The texture is however mostly realized by reference. While the texture resulting from the use of substitution and ellipsis, it does not seem to be dominant.

4.4. The Reference Chains of the Students’ Writings

To capture the reference pattern in a text, Martin (1992: 14) in Eggins (1994: 99) has developed a form of presentation known as reference chain. I am interested in using this chart of reference to help me display the pattern of reference in the students’ writings that I have analyzed. Yet, I do not adopt all parts of Martin’s chart. I combine this chart with the chart suggested by Gerot and Wignel (1994:179). Through this chain, the reference pattern of a text can be clearly seen. Then, it will be able for us to answer some questions as illustrated by Eggins (1994: 100), as follows:

1. Who is the text actually concerned with?
2. Is the text highly cohesive with mostly endophoric reference?
3. To what extent is the text context dependent?

In the following part of this section, I have drawn 11 chart of reference displaying the pattern of reference of each of the students’ writings. And in order to make the chart easily readable, I also give some notes relating to the symbols I used in this chart. The symbols are as follows:

@ = exophoric reference
# = homophoric reference
* = esphoric reference
^ = anaphoric reference
! = ambiguous reference
> = cataphoric reference
From the above chart, we can see that the longest reference chain has shown the most dominant participant contributing the text. So, this text is basically concerned about the story of the writer’s profession (a singer). And the number of symbol (^) has shown that this text is highly cohesive due to the
dominant occurrence of endophoric reference which is contributed by 10 anaphoric reference and 2 *esphoric reference*.

**Text 2**

1. that
2. The#
3. scientific lesson
4. this^ Choices
5. choices
6. The^ the#
7. !
8. The# it.
9. My close friend
10. She^ Social program
11. that^
12. the#
13. The# the#
14. The# the#
15. The# the@
16. the@ the same
17. the@ the same
18. my mother
19. she@
20. same
The internal property which contribute cohesion of the above text is only five items of anaphoric reference. The above text shows that the most dominant participants contributing the text are those which provide contextual properties. It can be seen from the dominant occurrence of exophoric and homophoric reference. Homophoric reference occurs 7 times, while exophoric reference occurs 3 times.

**Text 3**

1. it
2. my father
3. he
4. better
5. that
6. He
7. he
8. the
9. it
10. The
11. their
12. them

The above text shows that the most dominant participants contributing the text are those which provide contextual properties. It can be seen from the dominant occurrence of exophoric and homophoric reference. Homophoric reference occurs 7 times, while exophoric reference occurs 3 times.
The chart shows the longest reference chain goes to the reference *he*, which refers to the writer’s father. It means that this narration is mostly about the writer’s father. The cohesiveness of the text is contributed by 7 *anaphoric reference* (internal property), while coherence of the text is only contributed by 3 *contextual properties*, i.e. 2 *homophoric reference* and 1 *exophoric reference*.
The longest reference chain goes to pronominal *they* and *them* which have the same referent, i.e. *the writer’s parents*. So, this text is mostly concerned about the writer’s parents. If we read the whole text, we will see that the text dominantly tells us about the response of the writer’s parents to his experience. There are 9 internal properties including 8 *anaphoric reference* and 1 *cataphoric reference*, which contribute the cohesiveness, while contextual property is only contributed by 5 *homophoric reference* and 1 *exophoric reference*. So, this text is considered to be mostly cohesive.

**Text 5**

1. Bali
2. (3)
3. (4) the #
4. (5)
5. (6) Tanah Lot
6. (7) there ^
7. (8) it @
8. (9) Sanur Beach
9. (10) The #
10. (11) there ^
11. (12) the #
12. (13) Dita
13. (14) she
14. (15)
15. (16)
16. (17) the #
17. (18) the #
18. (19)
19. (20)
The longest reference chain is created by the demonstrative *there* which refers to the word *Bali* in the first sentence. It means that this narration is mostly concerned about the story of the writer’s visit to *Bali*. The cohesion in this text is only supported by 4 *anaphoric reference*, while the contextual properties includes 4 *homophoric reference* and 1 *exophoric reference*. Therefore, this text is not mostly cohesive.
Based on the chart, the longest reference chain is created by the anaphoric reference provided by the word \textit{she} and \textit{her} which refers to the writer’s friend \textit{Jerry}. So, this narration mostly talk about \textit{Jerry}. This text is mostly cohesive due to the biggest number of \textit{anaphoric reference} (11 \textit{anaphoric reference}). The contextual property is only supported by 6 \textit{homophoric reference} and 1 \textit{exophoric reference}.

Text 7
1. 
2. weather
3. it ^
4. the #
5. It ^
6. the #
7. !
8. it
9. the next day
10. that ^
11. it @
12. the #
13. it ^
14. the #
15. 
16. 
17. the #
18. 
19. 
20. the #
21. 
22. the #
23. that @
The text is not cohesive because it is dominated by *homophoric* (7 items) and *exophoric reference* (2), which contribute the contextual property not the internal one. From the chart showing the dominance of the external property, we can assume that the text is mostly concerned about the context of situation, i.e. *the bad weather* and *flood*. The anaphoric reference occurs only four times.

**Text 8**

1. Jaka
2. He
3. He
4. the #
5. the #
6. there.
7. him
8. his
9. the>
10. the #
11. the>
12. the>
13. him
14. him
15. it>
16. Jaka’s house
17. he>
18. he>
19. his>
20. his>
21. the>
22. his>
The text tell us mostly about Jaka, the writer’s friend. It can be seen in the longest reference chain provided by pronoun he, him, and his which anaphorically refer to Jaka. The internal property of the text is supported by 11 anaphoric reference and 3 cataphoric reference. While the contextual property is contributed by 5 exophoric reference and 2 homophoric reference. Thus, this text is considered mostly cohesive due to the bigger number of anaphoric and cataphoric reference compared with the number of homophoric and exophoric reference.

**Text 9**

(1) the #
(2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) the # (8) a friendly man (9) (10) he ^ (11) (12) (13) (14) (15) a cup of coffee it ^ the same (16) she (17)

Due to the longest reference chain provided by the phrase the same, we can say that the referent item of this comparative element is the main topic of the
text. Based on the number of occurrence of the *endophoric reference* of the text compared with the exophoric and homophoric one, we can say that this text is quite cohesive despite not being fully cohesive. According to the chart, the total number of *anaphoric reference* is 3 and the number of *homphoric reference* is 2.

**Text 10**

1. the # Boy Scout
2. the ^
3. the #
4. The committee #
5. It ^ new member inauguration
6. it ^
7. my friends
8. it ^
9. They ^
10. The #
11. the ^
12. The #
13. They ^
14. The ^
15. They ^
16. They ^
17. They ^
18. It * pocong
19. !
20. It ^ / his
21. the ^
22. The committee
23. they ^
24. The > renungan malam
25. The > closing ceremony
26. it
27. one of the committee
28. He ^
29. 

The chart shows that the longest reference pattern goes to the *anaphoric reference* referring to *the committee*. Thus, we can say that the text is mostly
about the committee of the inauguration program in which the writer joined. The total number of the anaphoric reference is 12, while homorphic reference occurs 4 times, and cataphoric reference and esphoric reference occurs twice. No exophoric reference occurs in the text. This text is considered to be mostly cohesive.

Text 11
1. the #
2. 
3. UNNES
4. there^
5. 
6. 
7. the #
8. 
9. 
10. assistant to a driver
11. he ^ the Karyadi Hospital
12. the ^
13. the student @ he ^
14. he ^
15. 
16. him ^

The internal property (cohesion) of the text is contributed by 6 anaphoric reference, while the external/contextual property is supported by 2 homoric reference and only one exophoric reference. So, the text is mostly cohesive.
4.5. The Conjunctive Recticulum of the Writings

The use of conjunctive recticulum, as suggested by Martin (1992) in Eggins (1994: 108), is to present:

1. what kind of logical relations structure the text (elaboration, extension, or enhancement)
2. whether the logical relations derive from an external or an internal organization of the text

**Text 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>external</th>
<th>Lexical item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*)</td>
<td></td>
<td>extending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>enhancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>After that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td>enhancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*)</td>
<td></td>
<td>because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>elaborating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td></td>
<td>From my ......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td></td>
<td>enhancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*)</td>
<td></td>
<td>and because</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Text 2

\textbf{Internal} \hspace{2cm} \textbf{external} \hspace{2cm} \textbf{Lexical item}

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5) \textit{enhancing} \hspace{2cm} \textit{In the end of .....}

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10) \textit{enhancing} \hspace{2cm} \textit{Then}

(11)

(12) \textit{enhancing} \hspace{2cm} \textit{After .....}

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17) \textit{enhancing} \hspace{2cm} \textit{because}

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24) \textit{enhancing} \hspace{2cm} \textit{Then}
### Text 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>external</th>
<th>Lexical item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>enhancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>enhancing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*)</td>
<td>extending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>so that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*)</td>
<td>extending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>so that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*)</td>
<td>extending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Besides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Text 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>external</th>
<th>Lexical item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>At that time,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>After ....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>extending</td>
<td>Suddenly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>extending</td>
<td>Fortunately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>Then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>Since that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Text 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>external</th>
<th>Lexical item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>First of all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>extending</td>
<td>But</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>Because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>After that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>Then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>extending</td>
<td>But</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>Because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>Next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>extending</td>
<td>Due to the fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>extending</td>
<td>Moreover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>extending</td>
<td>And yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Text 6

Internal               external               Lexical item

(1)
(2) enhancing          Because
(3)                     
(4)                     
(5)                     
(6)                     
(7)                     
(8)                     
(9)                     
(10)                    
(11)                    
(12)                    
(13)                    
(14)                    
(15)                    
(16)                    
(17)                    
(18) extending         Fortunately
(19) extending         So
(20) enhancing          After ....
(21)                     
(22)                     
(23)                     
(24)                     
(25)                     
(26) extending          Suddenly,
(27)                     
(28)                     
(29)                     
(30)                     
(31)                     
(32) extending          But
(33)                     
(34) extending          But now
(35)
Text 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>external</th>
<th>Lexical item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>Initially,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>extending</td>
<td>Suddenly,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>At the end,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>extending</td>
<td>In addition,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>The day before,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>And the next day,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>After</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>at the end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>The next day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>Until now</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Text 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>external</th>
<th>Lexical item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>And finally,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>Then,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>suddenly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>Then,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>enhancing</td>
<td>Then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>extending</td>
<td>Suddenly,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>external</td>
<td>Lexical item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) extending
(2) enhancing
(3) enhancing
(4) extending
(5) So
(6) Finally
(7) Then
(8) Then
(9) But
(10) Next day
(11) Then
(12) Finally
4.6. The Lexical Cohesive Chain of the Students’ Writings

The following charts give a description of the pattern of lexical cohesive chain in the students’ narrative essays. These charts will enable us to identify in what way one lexical item correlates with the others in the perspective of lexical
cohesion (reiteration or collocation). Besides, they will also visualize how each lexical item forms internal properties of text to create texture. The texture is clear in the creation of cohesion.

**Text 1**

(1)

(2) continue —— study (coll.)

(3) subject (equiv.)

(4) have —— money —— pay (coll.)

(5) singer —— job

(6)

(7) singer (rep)

(8) player (rep)

(9) players —— job

(10) job —— money (rep)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14) job

(15) songs —— sung (coll.)

(16) fulfilled —— necessity (coll.)

(17) continue —— study (coll.)

(18) job (rep.)
Text 2

(1) lesson
(2) school (coll.)
(3)
(4) lesson
(5) lesson.
(6) Choices
(7) choice (rep.)
(8) lesson—lesson (rep.)
(9)
(10)
(11) lesson (rep.)
(12)
(13)
(14)
(15)
(16)
(17)
(18) class
(19) class
(20) class (rep.)
(21)
(22)
(23) solve—problem (coll.)
(24) problem
(25)
(26)
(27) problems (rep.)
Text 3

(1)
(2) continue study — school school
(3) continue study
(4) knowledge knowledge
(5) continue study
(6) father life
(7) father life
(8)
(9) continued study
(10)
(11)
(12) obeyed regulations
(13) knowledge
(14)
(15) knowledge

Text 4

(1)
(2)
(3)
(4) road — crowded (rep.)
(5)
(6) road — crowded (coll.)
(7) rode — rider — motorcycle (coll.)
(8) rode — motorcycle (coll.)
(9) motorcycle
(10)
(11)
(12)
(13)
(14) rode (coll.) — motorcycle (coll.)
(15)
(16)
(17) told — story (coll.)
(18)
(19) motorcycle
(20) motorcycle
Text 5

1. Beach (rep.)
2. beautiful (rep.)
3. beautiful (ant.)
4. sunrise (ant.)
5. bought (coll.)
6. souvenir (coll.)
7. bought (coll.)
8. things (gen.)
9. had (coll.)
10. money (coll.)
11. Beach
12. Beach
13. sunset
14. walk (coll.)
15. Street (coll.)
16. felt (coll.)
17. happy (coll.)

Text 6

1. Island (rep.)
2. Island (rep.)
3. English
4. doing work (coll.)
5. doing job (coll.)
6. doing job (coll.)
7. Foreigners
8. foreigners (rep.)
9. foreigners (rep.)
10. English (rep.)
11. English (rep.)
12. English (rep.)
13. English (rep.)
14. English (rep.)
15. English (rep.)
16. English (rep.)
17. English (rep.)
18. English (rep.)
Text 7
(1)
(2) weather—hot
(3)
(4)
(5)
(6)
(7)
(8)
(9)
(10)
(11)
(12)
(13)
(14)
(15)
(16)
(17)
(18)
(19)
(20)
(21)

Text 8
(1)
(2)
(3) school.
(4) played football (coll.)
(5) School—school (rep)
(6)
(7) school
(8) felt bored (coll.)
(9)
(10) house—house (rep.)
(11) house
(12) door—door (rep.)
(13)
(14)
(15) house
(16)
(17)
(18)
(19)
(20)
(21)
(22)
Text 9
(1) story (rep.)
(2) story coffee coffee (rep.)
(3) night (rep.) cup coffee (coll.)
(4) night
(5) coffee
(6)
(7)
(8)
(9) coffee
(10) coffee coffee coffee
(11) coffee.
(12)
(13) coffee
(14) having tea (coll.)
(15) coffee coffee
(16)
(17) coffee.

Text 10
(1) School
(2) student new students Boy Scout.
(3) Boy Scout members (rep.)
(4) Boy Scout (rep.)
(5) new (rep.) members (rep.)
(6) morning
(7) morning
(8) new members
(9)
(10) students (rep)
(11)
(12) school (rep)
(13) Boy Scout committee
(14)
(15)
(16) school
(17) answering questions
(18) answered question answer questions
(19) question
(20)
(21) members
(22) committee
(23) committee (rep.)
(24) agenda
(25) agenda
(26)
(27) committee members
(28)
(29) heard saying (coll)
(30)
Text 11

1. felt—disappointed (coll.)
2. information (rep.) located—located (rep.)
3. UNNES (equiv.)
4. 
5. 
6. 
7. campus
8. UNNES
9. hospital
10. information
11. hospital
12. hospital (rep.)
13. 
14. 
15. UNNES

From the above charts of reference, conjunction, and lexical cohesion, the former assumption that text (10) is the most cohesive is appropriate. It is due to the fact that it has the highest number of cohesive devices and of the internal property of contributing cohesion: endophoric reference. However, the assumption that sentence 3 is the least cohesive, is not appropriate because the analysis tells us that text (7) is mostly dominated by contextual properties contributed by homophoric and exophoric reference. In fact, contextual properties do not contribute the creation of cohesion. These properties only support the creation of coherence. However, the writings, which are mostly coherent cannot be considered to be the bad ones. Both cohesiveness and coherence are important to contribute the production of good writing.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

A text is considered to be the good one if it fulfills two properties. Those are cohesion and coherence. Text can be spoken or written. Therefore, in making a narrative writing, we should consider the aspect of cohesiveness. It is because cohesiveness/cohesion is one of the properties by which a writing is consider to be good or not. To know the level of cohesiveness of a writing, one should analyze how many cohesive devices used and how many ambiguities occurs in the writing. The bigger the number of cohesive devices used and the fewer number of ambiguity occurs in the writing, the bigger chance for the writing to be more cohesive. On the other hand, the lower the number of cohesive devices used and the bigger number of ambiguity occurs in the writing, the bigger chance for the writing to be less cohesive. Additionally, to know the level of cohesiveness of a writing, we should identify the occurrence of endophoric reference. Endophoric reference is the main contribution for cohesion. It is due to the fact that cohesion is internal properties. In other words, cohesion has something to do with textual meaning, while coherence deals with contextual meaning.

The data analysis has shown that the students’ narrative writings (essays) of the ‘Remedial Class of Writing 2’ at the English Department of Semarang State University has different level of cohesiveness. In other words, the students have produced the writings in different quality. It is because they have made use the cohesive devices in various proportions. It is also due to the fact that the occurrence of ambiguity in their writings is different in number. With regard to
the typical tie relations, the data have shown that the students make use of reference at the highest number compared with the other cohesive devices. While the use of substitution and ellipsis, it has the lowest number. Thus, the most frequent use of the cohesive devices goes to co-reference relation followed by co-classification, and co-extension. Based on the analysis, I can say that most of the English students’ writings that I analyze is cohesive enough, at least compared with the rest of the narrative writings that I did not analyze. I put this assumption on the fact that there are 46 narrative essays I did not include in my analysis due to their big number of grammatical errors. The cohesiveness of the text I analyzed is strongly felt in the application of cohesive devices, which contribute the existence of internal properties of text.
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