

## **AN ANALYSIS OF THE COHESION AND COHERENCE OF STUDENTS' ENGLISH WRITINGS AT THE SECOND GRADE OF SMAN 1 LABUAPI WEST LOMBOK**

**AYUB<sup>1</sup> SEKEN, K<sup>2</sup> SUARNAJAYA, W<sup>3</sup>**

Language Education Study Program, Postgraduate Program  
Ganesha University of Education  
Singaraja, Indonesia

e-mail: ayub@pasca.undiksha.ac.id. [ketut.seken@pasca.undiksha.ac.id](mailto:ketut.seken@pasca.undiksha.ac.id).  
[wayan.suarnajaya@pasca.undiksha.ac.id](mailto:wayan.suarnajaya@pasca.undiksha.ac.id)

### **Abstract**

This study aimed at analyzing students' writings in terms of: (1) the types of cohesive devices used; (2) the types of topical progressions; and (3) the problems of coherence. The subjects investigated were 30 second grade students of SMAN 1 Labuapi. There were two kinds of data collected: written and verbal data. In collecting the data, the students were given a writing task and the students and the English teacher were interviewed. The data were analyzed qualitatively based on Halliday and Hasans' theory of cohesion (1976) and Topical Progression Analysis of Lautamatti (1978) in Hoenisch (2009) and Almaden (2006). The results of study were (1) the students used the five types of cohesive devices to serve the coherence of their writings of which reference 40.84% with personal reference as the dominant use. Lexical cohesion was used 37.99% dominated with repetition. Then, it was followed by conjunction 19.60 %, ellipsis 1.35%, and substitution 0.29%; (2) the topical progression used was parallel progression with the percentage 56.84%, sequential progression 24.19%, and extended parallel progression 18.25%; (3) some problems in coherence of students' writings were reference, conjunction, lexical cohesion, tenses, auxiliary 'to be', passive voice, infinitive, gerund, subject-verb agreement, noun, preposition, and text structure. The result of the study indicates that cohesion and coherence have to be the emphasis in teaching writing and the English teachers have to be competent in evaluating the coherence of students' writings by applying TSA.

**Keywords:** *cohesive devices, topical progression, cohesion, coherence.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Based on the 2004 curriculum, the general objective of teaching English in Indonesia is to develop students' communicative competence, comprising the mastery of the four language skills, listening, speaking, reading, and writing. (Depdiknas, 2004: 171).

Relating to the teaching of English writing in the classroom, there are two

different perspectives. On the one hand, writing is one of the four language skills besides speaking, listening and reading, which is considered to be a fundamental skill so that students need to learn it (Tribble, 1997 in Mawardi, 2011: 1). It can also be said that writing is an important language skill because it is a productive skill that shows how skillful the student is in using the language and discovers the

talented students in this field. In addition, writing is a way through which a student can express his/her ideas or thoughts on the paper (Harsyaf and Izmi, 2009: 4). With awareness of these necessities, writing is getting more and more attention in English language teaching in Indonesian context. Corbett, et.al (in Utama, 1997: 4) say that the main focus of the teaching of writing is to develop ability in creating good writing. In line with this, Harmer, (1998: 79) states that the reasons for teaching writing to students of English as a foreign language include reinforcement, language development, learning style, and, most importantly, writing as a skill in its own right.

On the other hand, writing as one of the four skills in English is considered as the most difficult and most challenging skill compared to the other skills either for most students or even for teachers. There are many cases in which both teachers and students have difficulties in producing good compositions. The difficulties lie not only in generating and organizing ideas, but also in translating these ideas into readable text. The skills involved in writing are highly complex. Second language writers have to pay attention to higher level skills of planning and organizing as well as lower skills of spelling, punctuation, word choice and so on. The difficulty then becomes more pronounced if their language proficiency is weak. Because of this, writing is the least popular language skill and most students consider writing to be the least useful language skill (Harsyaf and Izmi, 2009: 1)

A good writing requires unity, coherence, and adequate development, with coherence as the most important factor (Almaden, 2006: 127). The teachers are required to assist students in generating, organizing, and ordering the content of a text so that the text they produce becomes coherent. Therefore, the topic of coherence is necessary in the teaching of writing and English learners and teachers are to have clear understanding of the concept of cohesion and coherence. This is because cohesion

and coherence are components of writing skill which constitute the crucial part of writing quality and a virtual guarantee of writing quality. Murcia and Olshtain (2000:125) claim that cohesion and coherence are two important features of well-written text that should be considered in writing a text.

However, for many students, it is not easy to write cohesive and coherent text. Research into students' writing shows that one of the major problems is the lack of coherence in the flow of ideas through a composition (Guo & Wang, and Mao, in Mawardi, 2011:4). The research found that many students had the tendency to write less unified paragraphs. The students were able to find exact words in their writings but were not able to connect them logically throughout the sentences in the paragraphs which cause the problem to occur.

Another problem is that students focus more on the lexical and sentence level than on discourse level. Usually, teachers find students using transitional links in their writing without really creating a coherent piece, and more often than not, students turn out cohesive pieces of writing when they work more on the underlying coherence (thought progression) in the relationship of ideas (Almaden, 2006: 128). This relationship is what may have allowed Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) in Almaden (2006:128) to claim that "continuity of sense is the foundation of coherence, being the mutual access and relevance within the configuration of concepts and relations". Without such continuity, any piece of writing is just plain writing, without making much sense to the reader about the point it makes. It can be said that coherence in writing is achieved when writers are able to successfully establish relationship among the underlying semantic features of a text and its concepts (Almaden, 2006: 128). In other words, a text must have texture (Eggins, 1994: 85). As a concept, a texture is wholly proper to express the feature or property of being a text. It is what holds the sentences of a text

together to make them unity (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 2). In binding sentences, they need tie that is commonly called cohesive tie.

Based on the phenomena illustrated above and with the purpose of improving the quality of teaching writing and improving the students' skill in writing good text due to the fact that the teaching of English as foreign language is based on genre-based approach, it is necessary to conduct a study to analyze cohesion and coherence of the students' English writings in senior high school level.

### **THEORETICAL AFFILIATION**

Analyzing the students' problems in using cohesive devices has been seen as related to students' difficulty in producing coherent writings. Recent scholarship demonstrates that many linguists and composition theorists have reached a conclusion that it is useful to analyze cohesion in writing as it contributes to coherence in prose. Cohesion analysis can help distinguish stages of writing development and might provide methods of explaining concretely some of the differences between good and poor student writings. Also, Halliday and Hasan (1976) contend that through analyzing the use of cohesive devices, one could evaluate or assess writing quality from the perspective of coherence.

According to Halliday and Hassan (1976), cohesion gives a sequence of sentences a coherent texture. Cohesion shows how semantic relationships are set up by lexical and syntactic features. These overt lexical and syntactic features, or the cohesive devices, signal the relationship among the sentences. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 6) state that there are two types of cohesion, namely: *grammatical* cohesion and *lexical* cohesion. In grammatical cohesion, the relationship between and within a text is signaled by means of grammatical elements. This includes *reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction*. Meanwhile, lexical cohesion is signaled by means of lexical elements or vocabularies. It consists of *reiteration* and *collocation*.

To provide a framework for studying and analyzing the cohesion of writing or a text, the five types of cohesive devices, namely: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion are used. These five cohesive devices are linguistic features which tie sentences together. These can make a text an efficient means of understanding and help the reader create meaningful semantic unit of the text for textual interpretation.

Reference relates one element of the text to another for its interpretation. It is semantic relation and potentially cohesive relation because the thing that serves as the source of the interpretation may itself be an element of text.

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 37) divide reference into three types, namely: personal reference, demonstrative reference, and comparative reference.

Personal reference is a reference by means of function in the speech situation, through the category of person. The category of personal reference includes: (a) personal pronouns, e.g. *i, me, you, we, us, him, she, he, her, they, them, and it*; (b) possessive determiners (possessive adjectives), e.g. *my, you, your, his, her, her, their, their, its*; and (c) possessive pronouns, e.g. *mine, his, theirs*.

Demonstrative reference is a reference by means of location, on a scale of proximity. They include the three classes: nominative demonstrative (*this, that, these, those*), circumstantial demonstrative (*here, there, now, then*), and definite article (*the*).

Comparative reference is cohesion in the form of reference that shows comparison between one thing and another. It is divided into two kinds: *general* and *particular* comparison. General comparison means comparison that is simply in terms of likeness or unlikeness, without respect to any particular property: two things may be the same, similar or different (where 'different' includes both 'not the same' and 'not similar'). General comparison is expressed by a certain class of adjectives and

adverbs. Adjectives that are used to express general comparison include identity (*same, equal, identical*), similarity (*similar, such similar*), and difference (*other, different, else*). Meanwhile, adverbs that are used to express general comparison include identity (*identically*), similarity (*so, similarly, likewise*), and difference (*differently, otherwise*) (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:76). Particular comparison means comparison that is in respect of quantity and quality. It is also expressed not by adjectives or adverbs of a special class, but by ordinary adjectives and adverbs in their comparative forms (Halliday & Hasan, 1976:77). Adjectives that are used to express particular comparison include Numerative (*more, fewer, less, further, additional*) and Epithet (*better*).

Next, substitution is a replacement of one component by another within a text. A substitute is word which is used in place of the repetition of a particular item. Substitution subsumes three types, i.e. nominal, verbal, and clause. The nominal substitutions are *one/ones* and *same*. The verbal substitution is *do* including the use of *does, did, doing, and done*. The clausal substitutions are *so* and *not*.

Ellipsis is an omission of an element required by the grammar which is assumed obvious from the context and need not to be raised. In other words, ellipsis occurs when some important elements are omitted from a sentence or a clause and can only be recovered by referring to an element in the preceding text. Like the substitution, ellipsis is of three kinds: nominal, verbal, and clausal ellipsis (Halliday & Hasan, 1976:146). Nominal ellipsis occurs when a common noun that functions as head is omitted and its function is taken on by modifiers. Verbal ellipsis involves the omission of the verb head while the auxiliary remains explicit. It is something that is not explicitly stated in discourse (Zaimar & Harahap, 2009:127), which means that it is not present in discourse, but understandable through the textual context. Clausal

ellipsis represents the omission of a part or whole clause.

Conjunction functions to connect one element of text with another. The element which is connected can be word, phrase, clause, sentence, or even paragraph. Halliday and Hasan (1976:238) divide it into four categories, namely, additive, adversative, causal, and temporal conjunctions. Additive conjunction is a type of conjunction that signals additional relationship between sentences. Adversative conjunction is a type of conjunction that signals adverse relationship between sentences. Causal conjunction is a type of conjunction that signals causal relationship between sentences, while temporal conjunction is a type of conjunction that signals temporal relationship between sentences.

Lexical cohesion refers to how the writer uses lexical items such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs to relate to the text consistently to its area of focus. (Egins, 1994: 101). Lexical cohesion can be classified into two major categories, namely, reiteration and collocation. Reiteration is a form of lexical cohesion in which the two cohesive ties refer to the same entity or event. Collocation is achieved through the association of lexical items that occur regularly in the same environment (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 284).

Like cohesion, coherence is also another element that shows the connection of ideas in a text. In this case, many researchers have defined coherence from different perspectives. Coherence, on the whole, is regarded as the link in a text that connects ideas and makes the flow of thoughts meaningful and clear for the readers (Castro, 2004). In other words, coherence accounts for the meaningful relationship among the elements of a text, stemming from "thematic development, organization of information, or communicative purpose of the particular discourse" (Kuo, 1995 in Mawardi, 2011: 7). While, according to John (in Almaden, 2006: 128)), coherence is "a feature internal to text, either in terms of the

linking sentence (cohesion) or as the relationships among the propositions in the text (sticking to the point).” The most influential interpretation of coherence is derived from Halliday and Hasan (1976: 23). In Halliday and Hasan’s definition, coherence refers to the elements internal to a text which consist of cohesion and register: “A text is 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.” In other words, cohesion, as a major characteristic of coherence with regard to the linguistic properties of the language, gives a sequence of sentences a coherent texture.

Besides analyzing cohesive devices, in an attempt to describe and interpret coherence of students’ writings in discourse level features, the study also dealt with another type of analysis called Topical Structure Analysis (TSA). TSA attempts to examine the development of discourse topic through sequences of subtopics that are ordered hierarchically. There are three classifications of topic progression, namely: (1) parallel progression, (2) sequential progression, and (3) extended parallel progression. In parallel progression, topics of successive sentences are the same, producing a repetition of topic that reinforces the idea for the reader. In sequential progression, topics of successive sentences are always different. In extended parallel progression, the first and the last topics of each are the same but are interrupted with one or some sequential progressions.

As elaborated above, cohesion and coherence are two apparently related concepts but by no means the same things. Therefore, it is essential for English learners and teachers to have clear understanding of the concept of cohesion and coherence. This is because cohesion and coherence are two components of writing skill which are crucial parts of writing quality and a virtual guarantee of writing quality. Besides that, cohesion and coherence are two of the seven standards

for textuality (the property of being a text) (Renkema, 1993:34). In other words, if there is no cohesion and coherence within a text, it is not qualified as a text. In addition, Murcia and Olshtain (2000:125) claim that cohesion and coherence are two important features of well-written text that should be considered in writing a text.

#### **RESEARCH METHODS**

This research used descriptive design with qualitative method. Descriptive design was used because there was no treatment given to the students. It means that the use of cohesion and coherence in the students’ writings were only described as what they were, without giving any treatments (Ary in Sutarna, 1997:85). Qualitative method was used because the problems of this research needed to be investigated inductively. In relation to this point, Sugiyono (2009: 15) states that the data analysis in qualitative method is inductive. This means that the analysis is based on the facts that have been found, then a hypothesis or theory is based on the data. In other words, this study is qualitative since it relies on inductive reasoning processes to interpret and structure the meanings that can be derived from the data.

The subjects of this study were the second grade students of SMAN 1 Labuapi who were divided into three classes; one social program class and two science program classes. In this case, the purposive sampling was used to determine the subjects of the study. It means that in each class, the researcher took ten students as the subjects. So, the total number of students as the subjects of this study was 30 students. These participants were selected due to the nature of research questions which address the issue of cohesion and coherence in English writings produced by the students. The selection was based on the assumption that they had been given the basic knowledge of how to write in English, so they were students who would provide answers to the research questions. And the result of this study could be used as a reference to improve

the students' writings, especially in the case of cohesion and coherence.

There were two kinds of data collected in this study, namely: written and verbal data. The written data in this study were the students' writings in the form of English essay. The students' writings analyzed were the students' tasks that were done during classroom interaction. Meanwhile, the verbal data were the students' feedbacks, information, and perception about the writing process performed in writing English text, especially in their English writings. Besides, the verbal data were the teacher's information about the students' performance and the causes of their performance. The verbal data were obtained through interview.

The techniques used by the researcher in collecting the data were administering writing task and interviewing. Here, administering writing task means that the researcher asked the teacher to spread out the writing task to the students. The teacher asked them to write an essay on free topic; while interviewing means that the researcher interviewed the students in order to get deeper understanding from their comments and perceptions about English teaching in classroom and the problems that they faced during the teaching learning process.

After collecting the students' compositions from the teacher, the researcher conducted an interview to gain feedback and information from the students. This interview was used as the technique to find out the in-depth information from the students. Furthermore, the interview with the teacher was conducted to verify information provided by the students. The interview with the teacher focused on the students' academic performance and the causes of their performance.

Meanwhile, note book, tape recorder, and camera were used as the instrument for collecting the verbal data from the participants. Note book was to write all the conversations with the

participants. In order to record the conversation, the researcher used tape recorder. Meanwhile, camera was used to take the picture of students and the researcher when the interviewing was conducted.

In analyzing the data, there were three methods used: cohesion analysis, coherence analysis, and interview analysis.

In cohesion analysis, the English writings produced by the students were analyzed as follows:

First, students' writings were divided into clauses or sentences. Then, the clauses or sentences were numbered in order to find out the type of cohesive devices within the clauses.

Second, all the types of cohesive devices were classified based on their types and then were put in checklist provided.

Third, the number of cohesive devices was counted in the form of percentage. The formula used was as follows:

$$X = \frac{N\sum}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where,

X = the percentage of types of cohesive devices in students' writing

N = the number of each type of cohesive devices in the students' writing, and

$\sum N$  = the total number of cohesive devices in the students' writings.

Fourth, the result of the identification of cohesive devices would be interpreted based on the realization of cohesive devices in each text and percentage of each type of the cohesive devices. Also, in this step, the uses of cohesion in the students' writing would be interpreted.

In coherence analysis, Topical Structure Analysis (TSA) technique would be used following some steps below that were adapted from Hoenisch (2009) and

Sutama (1997). First of all, the sentences in the students' writings would be numbered.

Secondly, the researcher would identify the sentential topics in each student's writing.

Third, after numbering the sentences and identifying the sentential topics, the researcher determined the topic progressions of the students' sentences through these three categories: (1) parallel progression would be determined if the topics in a number of successive sentences were the same, producing a repetition of topic that reinforced the idea for the reader (<a, b>, <a, >c, <a, d>); (2) sequential progression would be determined if the topics of successive sentences were always different, as the comment of one sentence became, or was used to derive the topic of the next (<a, b>, <b, c>, <c, d>); and (3) extended parallel progression was determined if the last topics of each of text were the same but were interrupted with some sequential progression (<a, b>, <b, c>, <a, d>).

Fourth, the researcher counted the frequency of the use of each type of topic progressions in the students' writings. After that, the researcher put the sentential topics, type of topical progression, and the frequency of the use of each type of topic progressions into the table provided.

Fifth, the researcher counted the percentage of the use of each type of topical progressions with the following formula:

The percentage=

$$\frac{\text{the totalure of progressions}}{\text{total of sentences}} \times 100\%$$

In interview analysis, the researcher read and interpreted the transcript that had been made after

conducting the interview. This activity aimed at finding out the writing process that students used in their essay writings. Also, this activity aimed at explaining why the students had problems and difficulties in writing coherent and cohesive essay or text.

### FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

In answering the questions about the uses of cohesive devices, Halliday and Hasan's theory (1976) was taken into account. Based on the taxonomy of cohesive devices proposed in the theory, data analysis showed that the students used the five types of cohesive devices to build cohesion in their English writings: reference (personal, demonstrative, comparative), substitution (nominal, clausal), ellipsis (nominal, verbal), conjunction (additive, adversative, causal, temporal), and lexical cohesion (repetition, synonym, superordinate, general word, and collocation). In the use of reference, personal reference was dominantly used. In substitution, verbal substitution was not found. In ellipsis, clausal ellipsis was not used. While, in lexical cohesion, repetition is used most frequently.

From the frequency and the percentage of each subcategory, it is concluded that most students knew how to utilize the various cohesive devices in their writing although they were in different frequency and percentage. It also shows that the dominant types of cohesive devices used by the students were reference (40.84%), followed by lexical cohesion (37.99%), conjunction (19.60%), ellipsis (1.35%), and the least substitution (0.29%). It could be clearly seen in Table 1:

Table 1. Types of Cohesive Devices Used in Second Grade of SMAN 1 Labuapi Students' Writings

Writing	Reference		Substitution		Ellipsis		Conjunction		Lexical Cohesion		Total
		%		%		%		%		%	
1	10	37.04	2	7.41	0		1	3.70	14	51.85	27
2	18	33.33	0		0		6	11.11	30	55.56	54
3	28	54.90	1	1.96	2	3.92	4	7.84	16	31.37	51
4	14	35.90	0		0		8	20.51	17	43.59	39
5	6	20.69	0		0		8	27.59	15	51.72	29
6	9	31.03	0		0		7	24.14	13	44.83	29
7	16	33.33	0		1	2.08	13	27.08	18	37.50	48
8	18	37.50	0		1	2.08	12	25.00	17	35.42	48
9	22	47.83	0		1	2.17	10	21.74	13	28.26	46
10	21	44.68	0		0		10	21.28	16	34.04	47
11	19	44.19	0		0		9	20.93	15	34.88	43
12	24	48.00	0		0		11	22.00	15	30.00	50
13	10	33.33	0		1	3.33	5	16.67	14	46.67	30
14	21	56.76	0		0		3	8.11	13	35.14	37
15	21	46.67	0		1	2.22	9	20.00	14	31.11	45
16	24	50.00	0		0		4	8.33	20	41.67	48
17	14	48.28	0		0		7	24.14	8	27.59	29
18	29	49.15	1	1.69	0		8	13.56	21	35.59	59
19	21	53.85	0		0		9	23.08	9	23.08	39
20	16	26.23	0		1	1.64	12	19.67	32	52.46	61
21	14	34.15	0		1	2.44	12	29.27	14	34.15	41
22	15	29.41	0		1	1.96	10	19.61	26	50.98	51
23	16	28.57	0		0		15	26.79	25	44.64	56
24	17	47.22	0		0		5	13.89	14	38.89	36
25	5	13.16	0		0		6	15.79	27	71.05	38
26	3	13.64	0		0		4	18.18	15	68.18	22
27	7	19.44	0		0		9	25.00	20	55.56	36
28	50	53.19	0		2	2.13	18	19.15	24	25.53	94



29	30	38.96	0		5	6.49	23	29.87	19	24.68	77
30	55	59.14	0		2	2.15	17	18.28	19	20.43	93
Total	573	40.84	4	0.29	19	1.35	275	19.60	533	37.99	1403

Related to the analysis of the types of topical progression in the students' writings, the types that were used most frequently were parallel progression (56.84%), followed by sequential progression (24.91%) and the least frequent extended parallel progression (18.25%). This means that the students tended to repeat the topic (theme) from the previous topic (theme) directly. The topic (theme) produced by the students was mostly the repetition of lexical items and pronouns. This was so because the students found it easier to use the repetition of one clause to another at the beginning of the clause. The use of parallel progression in students' writings

also indicated that repetition of sentential topic contributed to the text coherency in that these topic words were just the points of each passage, so there was no doubt that they ran through the whole text and had the highest frequency. Then, the students also put the comment (rheme) as the new topic (theme) in the subsequent clause although it was not as frequent as the first one (parallel progression). At last, the students sometimes used the first and the last topics of a piece of text that were the same but were interrupted with some sequential progression. The use of each progression in each writings was different in percentage. This could be clearly seen in the following table:

Table 2 Types of Topical Progression Used in Second Grade of SMAN 1 Labuapi Students' Writings

Writing	Sentential topic	The Frequency of Each Type of Progressions		
		PP	SP	EPP
1	8	6	1	-
2	15	4	3	7
3	12	4	6	1
4	7	3	2	1
5	8	3	3	1
6	7	3	1	2
7	11	5	2	3
8	10	8	1	-
9	6	-	4	1
10	6	1	1	3
11	9	4	3	1
12	9	7	1	-
13	7	5	1	-

14	9	4	3	1
15	9	2	3	3
16	17	4	9	3
17	8	5	1	1
18	14	3	6	4
19	9	4	2	2
20	10	7	1	1
21	7	4	2	-
22	8	5	1	1
23	11	5	3	2
24	13	7	3	2
25	11	7	1	2
26	7	4	2	-
27	8	4	1	2
28	22	13	2	6
29	17	16	-	-
30	20	15	2	2
Total	315	162	71	52
Percentage		56.84%	24.91%	18.25%

The analysis of data also showed some problems made by students in their writings in the attempt to produce coherent text or essay. They were: the problems in the use of cohesive devices except substitution and ellipsis; the problems in the use of the verb, the tenses, the auxiliary `To be`, the infinitive, the gerund; and the problem in subject-verb agreement. Also, there were some problems related to the use of nouns, prepositions, and text structures. These problems occurred in students' writings because the students did not have adequate knowledge in grammar and they lacked English vocabulary. They did not know exactly how to apply them in sentences and paragraphs. Besides, interference of students' first language (students' interlanguage) was the essential factor in making the problems in students' coherent writings.

#### **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS**

All types of cohesive devices were used in students' writings although their

uses were in different percentage or frequency. Reference, lexical cohesion, and conjunction were dominantly used by students because they were regarded quite easy to apply. While, ellipsis and substitution were hardly used in their writings because they were quite difficult to use. The students didn't know exactly how, where, and when to use them and so they preferred avoiding to use them in their writings.

From all ties between presupposing items and presupposed items, it can be seen that most of them were in the form of anaphoric ways. The function of anaphoric relation is to create cohesion in the text and also to create the meaning of the text.

Meanwhile, in the case of topical progression, it can also be found that most of the students developed their texts by employing parallel progression followed by sequential progression and extended parallel progression.

It could also be stated that the students could produce cohesion of the

texts. However, there were also some intervening sentences that occurred in some texts. These intervening sentences could make the texts less cohesive and automatically not coherent.

The implication of the present study is that cohesion and coherence are better taught, explicitly or implicitly, either through exercises, classroom instructions or comment to students' texts. This also contributes to students in the process of

teaching writing because it gives the view to the students to write a cohesive and coherent text. The teachers can improve the strategies in teaching writing based on the weaknesses of the students.

### LIST OF REFERENCES

- Almaden, Daisy O. 2006. An analysis of the Topical Structure of Paragraphs Written by Filipino Students. *The Asia-Pacific Education Research*, 15(1), 127-153. December 2006. Available at: <http://www.dlsu.edu.ph/research/journals/tapers/pdf/200612/ALMADEN.pdf>. (Downloaded on October 12, 2010).
- Castro, C.D. 2004. Cohesion and the Social Construction of Meaning in the Essays of Filipino College Students' Writing in L2 English, *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 5(2), 215-225.
- Depdiknas, 2004. *Kurikulum 2004: Standar kompetensi Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris Sekolah Menengah Atas*. Jakarta. Kementrian Pendidikan Nasional.
- Eggs, S. 1994. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Wellington House.
- Ellis, Rod. 1986. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Harsyaf, Nurmaini M.Y., and Zakhwan Izmi. 2009. *Teaching Writing: Supplement Module – MGMP - Bermutu*. Jakarta: P3G Bahasa Jakarta.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 1998. *How to Teach English: An Introduction to the practice of English language teaching*. Cambridge: Longman.
- Hoenisch, Steven. 2009. Topical Structure Analysis of Accomplished English Prose. Available at <http://www.criticism.com/da/Topical-Structure-Analysis-of-Accomplished-English-Prose.pdf>. Downloaded on October 24, 2010.
- Mawardi. 2011. An Analysis of the Cohesion and Coherence of the Students' Narrative Writing In the English Language Education Department of Nahdlatul Wathan University Mataram: Unpublished Thesis. Undiksha.
- McCarthy, Michael. 1994. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Glasgow: Bell and Bain Ltd.

- Mulyana. 2005. *Kajian Wacana: Teori, Metode & Aplikasi Prinsip-Prinsip Analisis Wacana*. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.
- Murcia, C. & Olshtain, E. 2000. *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, David. 1993. *Introducing Discourse Analysis*. Victoria: Penguin English.
- Renkema, J. 1993. *Discourse Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sugiyono. 2009. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan: Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: CV Apfabet.
- Sutama, I Made. 1997. *Perkembangan Koherensi Tulisan Siswa Sekolah Dasar*. Unpublished Dissertation. IKIP Malang.
- Zaimar, Okke Kusuma Sumantri & Harahap, Ayu Basuki. 2009. *Telaah Wacana*. Jakarta: The Intercultural Institute.

