

Textuality Study of “*Cohesion*”: Establishing the EFL Students’ Grammatical and Lexical Linking within Written Discourses

Yohannes Telaumbanua¹, Yalmiadi², M. Firdaus³, Masrul⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Corresponding authors

Jurusan Bahasa Inggris Politeknik Negeri Padang; Universitas Dharma Andalas Padang
yohannesnp@yahoo.com; yalmiadi@unidha.ac.id; fauzy2702@yahoo.com; masrulum25@gmail.com

³Mahasiswa PPs Doktor Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Negeri Padang

⁴Jurusan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Pahlawan Tuanku Tambusai Pekanbaru Riau

Abstract—“*Cohesion*” contributes to qualifying sequences of sentences within texts. It grammatically and lexically links sentences together and provides meaning. This essence, therefore, forms the aim of diagnosing it. As a qualitative Case Study research design, the authors were the key instruments whereas Unidha ED students were purposively selected as the object of the research (n=32). The data sourced from the 2nd Year ED students’ Written Texts. The observation was a technique of collecting the data whilst the 1967 Corder clinical elicitation as a method of data analysis. The findings signified that the EFL students’ written texts were ungrammatically and un-lexically linked to each other because the total numbers of ungrammatical and un-lexical cohesion were 143. The unlinked substitution was 18 (12.58%), ellipsis was 23 (16.08%), anaphoric reference was 30 (20.97%) and cataphoric reference was 25 (17.48%), reiteration: repetition was 13 (9.09%), synonym was 4 (2.79%), and collocation was 30 (20.97%). In conclusion, the sequences of the EFL students’ written texts have not yet been grammatically and lexically linked to the textual elements of the texts’ textuality of cohesion correctly. The ELT programs are, therefore, required to highlight the teaching of cohesion and, if possible, integrating it with the other related six criteria of textuality as POWER CONTROL UNITS in connecting the sequences of the EFL students’ English written Texts grammatically and lexically.

Keywords: *textuality; cohesion; grammatical and lexical linking; English text*

1. Introduction

The raison d’être of proposing such a title of “Textuality Study of “*Cohesion*”: Establishing the EFL Students’ Grammatical and Lexical Linking within Written Discourses” strongly rested on two leading theoretical causes. Firstly, cohesion, as proposed by M.A.K Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan, has a leading role in grammatically and lexically tying one’s written or spoken discourses and, more importantly, provide co-textually meaning that it binds. The tying, in grammar well as discourse studies, is a technique of holding the produced discourses together. Theoretically, cohesion has long been clustered into two different species. The classical cluster was grammatical cohesion highlighting on structural content whereas the other one is lexical cohesion placing emphasis on the lexical content along with one’s prior or background knowledge of the world. Other than that, substitution, ellipsis, reference, conjunction and lexical cohesion of reiteration, grammatical and lexical collocations are identified as the five generic categories of cohesive devices (Halliday & Hasan, 1978; Hoey, 1991; Kunz & Steiner, n.d.).

Secondly, the preliminary investigations indicated that the existences of the cohesion along with the other six elements of textuality fade away in most English Department (ED) students’ final projects, papers, articles, and even theses. As a result, the readers, therefore, every now and then mislay the information produced by the writers or the words, phrases, clauses and sentences produced were a lot

repeated within or surrounding the texts. This seems to make senseless grammatically and or lexically as in, ‘the students fail to give a good presentation. *The students (√they) will likely get C’’. This sentence can be understood, however, it is incorrect because the students failed to better apply the correct “reference” to the subsequent sentence. To meet the requirement of a good text, they should have used a reference to show the existence of the connection between sentences. Reference, which aims at pointing to a previous or following constituent or building block, deals with a semantic relationship (Rankema: 1993). Another one is ‘A: What were you doing last night?’ then they wrote, ‘I was dancing last night’ instead of ‘dancing’. To avoid repeating the unnecessary mention, they should have omitted ‘I was...last night’. These are the examples of how the EFL students are coached to impose a corresponding cohesion to their English written discourses. The inaccuracy of making sequences of sentences/utterances as outstanding discourses probably is caused by the naivety of interpreting the textual elements. Consequently, the written discourses produced are often to achieve their sentence-level accuracies (Lange & Lange, 1999).

Shortly, in producing English written texts, the writers, professionals or college/university students, whose first language is not English, are called for seriously mastering it to achieve them as the first-class and high-quality English written texts. Rankema (1993) theoretically confirms that cohesion as the first gate of characterising the produced written texts along with the other six elements of textuality namely coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativeness, situationality, and intertextuality are standardized measure of assessing and qualifying one’s English written texts). In connection with that, education must be well developed so as to be able to support potential student developers, so they are able to face and solve life’s problems that continue to develop. Therefore, it is necessary to provide students with a number of scientific disciplines (Saputra, 2019). Due to the complexity of textuality, this paper purely went on placing the emphasis on diagnosing the five types of cohesion in the ED students written discourses. The following research question to seek to answer was what the sub-types of cohesion that the ED students failed to grammatically and lexically link to within their texts. The learners can evaluate their reading experiences, habits, and attitude in the first, second and the foreign language. Then, they discuss the past and present role of reading in their life for classroom activities in Extensive Reading program (Delvi, 2019)

Theoretically, cohesion “is the linking resulting when the construal of a textual element is reliant to another element in the text. Besides, it connects the existed elements within the texts. (Renkema: 2004) whose primary functions are to avoid the repeated elements of the text such as the recurrence, textphoric, paraphrase, and parallelism. It then compacts the text through the use of devices such as ellipsis and morphological and syntactic devices to communicate the dissimilar classes of associations of tense, aspect, deixis, or theme-rheme relationships” (Bussmann, 1998: 199). According to Halliday and Hassan (1976), Renkema (1993), Hoey, (1991) and Kunz, K. & Steiner, E distinguish five types of cohesion. Firstly, one type of grammatical cohesion is a substitution taking two forms namely substitution per se, which serves as to replace one item by another’, and an ellipsis, in which "the item is substituted by nothing or zero ellipses (Halliday and Hasan 1976). The nominal, verbal and clausal are the three types of substitution (Renkema 1993). Secondly, the ellipsis is another part of the cohesive device occurring when after a more specific mention, words are taken out. The word or phrase does not need to be repeated. The nominal, verbal and clause are groups of ellipsis (Halliday & Hassan: 1994). Thirdly, references being grouped into two referential devices can produce the cohesions of anaphoric reference. This kind of reference emerges when a writer points it back to a person or an object which has been previously identified. These devices are exercised to avoid repetition within sentences. The second one is a cataphoric reference opposing to backwards in the discourse. an Object/person is introduced in the abstract ahead of being named.

Fourthly, a conjunction is a connected fraction in the English language. If it is exercised properly, it can augment almost any type of writing. From various non-academic/informal to academic writings,

the groups of conjunctions of (1) Addition (besides, and, in addition, furthermore, but, or), (2) Causality (cause and effect: because, now that, since), (3) Temporality (after, before, when, while, as, as soon as, since, until), (4) Pair conjunctions (both...and, not only...but also, either...or, neither...nor) aids to construct better sentences. However, exercising it incorrectly or not applying it at all induces in choppy and incoherent writing. The followings are the common conjunction used in sentences (Scribendi, 2014). Lastly, according to (Renkema, 1993) lexical cohesion does not deal with grammatical or semantic connections but the connections are based on the words used. It is accomplished by selecting the correct vocabulary's pairs, exploiting semantically close items. Due to lexical cohesion brings no indication whether it cohesively serves or not, it always requires a reference to the text, to some other lexical item to be deduced correctly. These two species of lexical cohesion are, firstly, reiteration (repetition, synonymy, hyponymy, metonymy, and antonymy) and the second one is collocation consisting of lexical collocations and grammatical collocations. Essentially, collocations are partly or fully fixed expressions that become established through repeated context-dependent use. Such terms as "crystal clear", 'middle management', "unclear family", and 'cosmetic surgery' are examples of collocated pairs of words. The verb-object such as "make" and "decision") and lexical relation (such as antonymy, metonymy, etc) form the basic syntactic relation of collocations. These kinds of knowledge are critical for the competent use of a language. A grammatically correct sentence will stand out as awkward if collocational preferences are debased (Renkema, 1993). As directly quoted, "the co-occurrence, defined as a numerical examination perceiving collocation as the regular appearance in a text of a joint and it pairs, (2) construction, notices collocation either as a association between lexemes and lexical-grammatical patterns, or as a relationship between a base and its collocative partners and (3) expression, a pragmatic view of collocation as a conventional unit of expression, regardless of form are the measures of assessing the collocations. The Free Combination, Bound Collocation and Frozen Idiom are traditionally explained in terms as the three perspectives of a continuum of collocations" (Renkema, 1993).

2. Methodology

The use of the qualitative case study research aimed at diagnosing the students' diagnosing the five types of cohesion in the ED students written discourses (Sugiyono, 2007; Airasian & Gay, 2000; Surdayanto, 1988). The number of respondents was 32 2nd year Universitas Dharma Andalas English Department students. Their ages range from eighteen to twenty. Their foreign language is English while their first language is Minangkabau and Indonesian as their national language. The students have already learnt Grammar I and II, Reading I and II, Listening I and II, Writing I and II, Technical Writing I and II, Speaking I and II, Translation I and II, Workshop on Translation and TOEFL prediction test. The instruments were researchers. The Miles and Huberman model of analyzing, displaying and conclusion drawing or verification and the 1967 Corder Clinical elicitation were processes of collecting the data (Sugiyono, 2007). The interpretational analysis is the process of analyzing the data (Gall, M.D. et al, 2010). The interpretational analysis is the process of examining and grouping elements in case study data in order to fully describe, evaluate, or explain the errors being studied. The goal of using this interpretation analysis is to identify the errors of cohesion that best make meaning of the data from a case study. Once all data segments have been coded into categories, the researchers then refined the set of categories through constant comparison. The constant comparison is a process of comparing the data which have been analyzed to the theory. In this comparison, the researchers went to match the specific categories to the theory of cohesion used to find out whether the errors made by the students were in accordance with or not in accordance with the theory of cohesion (Sugiyono, 2007; Gall, M.D. et al, 2010).

3. Result and Discussion

The identified incorrectly uses of sub-types of cohesion in the English department students' English writings are quantified by calculating the frequencies of occurrences of types of cohesion errors. The formula used to calculate the errors made by the students is $P = \frac{F}{n} \times 100\%$, P=percentage, F=frequencies/number of errors in each item, and n= the total numbers of all errors made by the students (Sudjana: 1986). Then, the representations of the students' errors were counted if they arose frequently (at least more than one error). In the following table, the table shows the frequencies of occurrences of errors of cohesion are significantly high. The students make 143 errors in total. The frequency of occurrences of errors of substitution is 18, the ellipsis is 23, anaphoric reference is 30 meanwhile cataphoric reference is 25, reiteration: repetition is 13 and the synonym is 4 and lexical collocation is 30. In addition, the percentage of errors of substitution is 12, 58 %. The total number of errors made by the students is 143 times.

Table 1. Types of cohesion errors found in the students' English writings

Types of Cohesion	Sub-Types of cohesion errors	Examples of incorrect uses of sub-types of cohesion	(F)	% (P)
Substitution	Incorrect Substitution of nouns	<i>Incorrect:</i> These computers have been reconditioned. The technician placed <i>these computers</i> in the Multimedia laboratory.	18	12.58 %
		<i>Correct:</i> ("These computers have been reconditioned. The technician placed <i>reconditioned ones</i> in the Multimedia laboratory")		
F= OCCURRENCES/FREQUENCY				

The problem faced by the students is the use of nominal substitution. This can be seen from the frequent number of errors made by the students. The number of errors in this first sub-type of cohesion is 18 times or 12.58 per cent. The substitution, according to Halliday and Hassan (1994), is the replacement of one item to another. Additionally, it is a relation in the wording rather than in the meaning. The different types of substitutions are defined grammatically rather than semantically. The substitute one/ones functions as HEAD of a nominal group and can substitute only for an item which is itself HEAD of a nominal group. For example, "These computers have been reconditioned. The technician placed these computers (the reconditioned ones) in the Multimedia laboratory". Here, these computers are the HEAD of the nominal group and ones are the reconditioned ones which substitute these computers. In this example, the meaning of substitution ones is to function as HEAD in the nominal group. It is a substitution counter put in to fill the "HEAD" slot. In the typical instance the substitute 'carries over' only the HEAD itself; it does not carry over modifying elements by which this may have been accompanied. Therefore, the students should have been able to use and function ones as the HEAD of the nominal group to mean 'the reconditioned ones as these computers'.

	Incorrect Substitution of verbs	<i>not found</i>	-	-
	Incorrect Substitution of clauses	<i>not found</i>	-	-
Ellipsis	Incorrect Nominal Ellipsis	<p><i>Incorrect:</i> The tourists brought <i>their flashlight</i> when they came in the Japanese tunnel. Meanwhile their guide did bring <i>his flashlight</i> in lighten up the lane.</p> <p><i>Correct:</i> The tourists brought <i>their flashlight</i> when they came in the Japanese tunnel. Meanwhile their guide did bring <i>his</i> in lighten up the lane.</p>	23	16.08 %

The ellipsis can be interpreted as the form of substitution in which the item is replaced by nothing or the omission of an item. It is something left unsaid. Even though it is something left unsaid, there is no implication that what is unsaid is not understood. It is understood that there is a sense of ‘going’ without ‘saying’ (Halliday & Hassan, 1994). In the students writing, for example, they wrote, “The tourists brought their flashlight when they came in the Japanese tunnel. Meanwhile, their guide did bring his flashlight in lighten up the lane”. In this example, “flashlight “in “their guide brought his flashlight in lightening up the lane” should have been omitted by because the reader will definitely understand the interpretation of the omitted word that precedes it. Referring to the sentences, clauses, etc. whose structure is such as to presuppose some preceding items serve as the source of the missing information. The number of errors found in this second subtype of cohesion was significant high. The frequency of occurrences of using incorrect ellipsis was 23 times or 16.08 per cent.

	Incorrect verbal Ellipsis	<i>not found</i>	-	-
	Incorrect clausal Ellipsis	<i>not found</i>	-	-
References	Incorrect anaphoric Ref	<p><i>Mr President SBY</i> delivered his political speech before the <i>political leaders</i>. <i>President SBY</i> hoped the <i>political leaders</i> able to create a peaceful condition before and after the 2014 general election, (“...<i>he</i> hoped <i>them</i> able to...”).</p>	30	20.97 %
	Incorrectcataphoric Ref	<p>Because <i>Mr. Akil</i> corrupts, <i>Akil Mochtaris</i> being imprisoned by the KPK (“...<i>he</i> is being...”) In <i>his corruption</i>, <i>he</i> deserves to be jailed (“...<i>Akil Mochtar</i> deserves...”).</p>	25	17.48 %

The recurrent number of incorrect use of anaphoric reference is 30 times or 20.97 percentage. The failure to take to mean the anaphoric reference as a word of referring back to the other ideas in the text for its meaning caused by the students’ incapability of appreciating the central tenet of anaphora (Halliday and Hassan, 1994). The ideas are for diverse rationales for and on dissimilar stages: first,

anaphora indicates how discourse is established and maintained; second, anaphora binds different syntactical elements together at the level of the sentence; third, anaphora provides an effort to innate language processing in computational linguistics in, since the classification and identification of the reference can be complex; and fourth, anaphora tells some things about how language is appreciated and processed, which is relevant to fields of linguistics interested in cognitive psychology (McEnery, T: 2000). This example, “Mr President SBY delivered his political speech before the political leaders. President SBY hoped the political leaders able to create a peaceful condition before and after the 2014 general election, showed that the students were still unable to interpret Mr President SBY which is found in the refers back to another idea (previous sentence). To denote the act of referring back, they had to denote Mr President to “he” and political leaders to “them”. Then, cataphoric reference is the opposed one, anaphora. It is a reference forward as contrasting to backwards in the discourse. Something is established in the abstract ahead of being identified. The example found in the students’ writing, “Because Mr Akilcorrupts, AkilMochtar is being imprisoned by the KPK”. This example indicated that the students were still unable to insert an expression or word that co-refers with a later expression in the discourse. The inability is also seen from the number of incorrect use of cataphoric reference was 25 times or 17.48 per cent.

Conjunctions	Incorrect Addition	<i>not found</i>	-	-
	Incorrect Causality	<i>not found</i>	-	-
	Incorrect Temporality	<i>not found</i>	-	-
	Incorrect Pair conjunctions	<i>not found</i>	-	-
Reiteration	Incorrect Repetition	A riot happened in Makasar. In this demonstration, there were two main building burnt by the students (“...in this riot there were...”)	13	9.09 %
	Incorrect Synonym	A riot happened in Makasar. There were two main building burnt by the students in this riot (“...there were two... in this unrest”)	4	2.79 %

The function of reiteration is to restate in order to emphasize the keyword from the previous statement. However, in the students’ English writing found that they restated the keywords to the next statement as in “A riot happened in Makasar. In this demonstration, there were two main building burnt by the students”. The students should have repeated, “riot” to emphasize that caused incendiarism while “riot” in another sub-types of synonym, was repetition as seen in this examples, “A riot happened in Makasar. There are two main building burnt by the students in this riot”. In this example, the students should have not repeated “riot” however, they had to look for another word equating. The incapacity of reaffirming, replicating and looking for a synonym is mainly induced by the lack of understanding and interpretation of reiteration. The incorrect uses of these lexical cohesions were 13 and 4 times or 9.09 per cent and 2.79 per cent respectively. The conjunctions were, on the contrary, correctly applied.

	Incorrect Hyponymy	<i>not found</i>	-	-
	Incorrect Metonymy	<i>not found</i>	-	-
	Incorrect Antonymy	<i>not found</i>	-	-
Collocation	Incorrect Lexical Collocation	"... <i>have</i> vacation (v+n)..." instead of "... <i>take</i> vocation..." "... <i>small</i> rain (adj+n)..." instead of "... <i>light</i> rain..." "... <i>really/fully</i> forget(adv+v)..." instead of "... <i>completely</i> forget..." "... <i>total</i> awesome (adv+adv)..." instead of "... <i>totally</i> awesome..." "... <i>tired to</i> (adj+pre)..." instead of "... <i>tired of</i> ..." "...a <i>business MoU</i> (n+n)...." Instead of "...a <i>business deal</i> ..."	30	20.97 %

The semantic errors in the use of lexical collocations make both oral and written communication difficult. These errors can be seen from the occurrences of errors of lexical collocation. The frequency of occurrences of lexical collocation was 30 times or 20.97 per cent. The inability to use of lexical collocations in their written text is caused by the students' awareness and comprehension of pairing words/phrases correctly as the native ones. They tend to pair the words as they did in their native language, Indonesian for example, "most Indonesian students tended to write, "I really forget to accomplish my homework" instead of "I completely forget to accomplish my homework". They have not yet understood the importance of pairing words. They tend to pair the words/phrases as Indonesian students did in their native language. In corpus linguistics, a collocation is a series of lexicons co-occurring frequently than would be expected by chance. Phraseologically, collocation is a sub-type of phraseme. The case in point of a phraseological collocation, as proposed by Michael Halliday (1966), is the turn of phrase of "puts someone into a problem." While the identical sense could be conveyed by the nearly corresponding *makes someone a problem, this phrase is considered incorrect by the English speakers. In opposition, the resultant turn of phrase for computer, powerful computers are preferred over *strong computers. The phraseological collocations of idioms are based on derived meaning whereas collocations are mostly compositional. It, therefore, should be confused with these to terms. Adjective+noun, noun+noun (such as collective), verb+noun, adverb+adjective, verbs+prepositional phrase (phrasal verbs), and verb+adverb are the six main species of lexical collocations.

4. Conclusion

The EFL students flopped to better establish the Grammatical and Lexical Linking within Written Discourses. The incorrect uses of substituting and misplacing the nominal, verbal and clausal elements; the negligence of referring backwards or forwards to the objects/persons previously or subsequently talked about, and the incapability of linking the lexical cohesions of reiterations and collocations induced the the produced written discourses of the EFL students textually senseless. The failures of establishing the Grammatical and Lexical Linking within Written Discourses, therefore, benefit the language teachers to seriously consider designing the Grammatical and Lexical cohesion Linking into ELT and learning programs.

References

- Airasian, P and Gay, L.R. 2000. *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis Application*. New Jersey. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- BBC World Service. 2014. Anaphoric reference. Bush House, Strand, London WC2B4PH, UK retrieved on March 23, 2014 at <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/knowledge-database/anaphoric-reference>.
- Baldick, C. 2008. *Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* 3rd ed., edited by Chris Baldick, Oxford University Press.
- Bussmann, H. (Ed.). (1998). *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics*; translated and edited by Gregory Trauth and Kerstin Kazzazi. London: Routledge.
- Center for Writer. 2014. Paragraph Coherence. Retrieved on March 4, 2014 at www.cameron.edu/~carolynk/par_coherence.html.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). —The significance of learners' errors, *International Review of Applied Linguistics*. 5: 160–170, doi: 10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161.
- De Beaugrande, R., & Dressler, W. U. 1981. *Introduction to text linguistics* / Robert-Alain De Beaugrande, Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler. London ; New York : Longman.
- De Beaugrande, Robert /Dressler, Wolfgang. 1996. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. New York. P. 84 – 112.
- Delfi, S, Diah F.S, Safriyanti M (2019) Reading Experiences on Exploring Personal Reading Histories of English Study Program Learners of University of Riau. *Journal of Educational Sciences Vol. 3 No. 3 (Sept, 2019) 303-317*
- Dunning, Ted (1993): "Accurate methods for the statistics of surprise and coincidence". *Computational Linguistics* 19, 1 (Mar. 1993), 61-74.
- Dunning, Ted (2008-03-21). "Surprise and Coincidence".blogspot.com. Retrieved 2012-04-09.
- Firth J.R. (1957): *Papers in Linguistics 1934–1951*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fraith P. & Gledhill C. (2005): "Free-Range Clusters or Frozen Chunks? Reference as a Defining Criterion for Linguistic Units," in *Recherches anglaises et Nord-américaines*, vol. 38 :25–43.
- Gall, M.D. et al. 2010. *Applying Educational Research: How to Read, Do, and Use Research to Solve Problem of Practice*. Boston. Person Educational, Inc.
- Geocities. April 1, 1999. Textuality in Written and Oral Text. Retrieved on March 4, 2014 at www.geocities.com/~talk/lic/LIC990329p3.htm
- Gledhill C. (2000): *Collocations in Science Writing*, Narr, Tübingen
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1966. "Lexis as a Linguistic Level", *Journal of Linguistics* 2(1)
- Halliday, M.A.K; and Hasan, Ruqayia (1994): *Cohesion in English*. New York: Longman.
- Halliday, M.A.K; and Ruqayia Hasan (1976): *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hausmann F. J. (1989): *Le dictionnaire de collocations*. In Hausmann F.J., Reichmann O., Wiegand H.E., Zgusta L.(eds), *Wörterbücher : ein internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie*. Dictionaries. Dictionnaires. Berlin/New-York : De Gruyter. 1010-1019.
- Hawthorn, Jeremy. 2000. *A Gossary of Contemporary Literary Theory, 4th ed., Oxford University Press*.
- Hunston S. & Francis G. (2000): *Pattern Grammar — A Corpus-Driven Approach to the Lexical Grammar of English*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins
- Hoey, Michael (1991): *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: OUP.
- Iaroslav. 2013. *Coherence and Cohesion*. Retrieved on March 1 2014 at <http://blogonlinguistics.wordpress.com/2013/11/04/coherence-and-cohesion/>
- Kunz, K. & Steiner, E. (n.d.). *Towards a comparison of cohesion in English and German – concepts, systemic contrasts and a corpus architecture for investigating contrasts and contact*, in: Taboada, Maite, Suárez, Susana Doval and González Álvarez, Elsa. Forthcoming. *Contrastive Discourse Analysis. Functional and Corpus Perspectives*. London: Equinox
-

-
- Lange, Janet and Lange, Ellen. 1999. *Writing Clearly. An Editing Guide*. 2nd Edition. California. Heinle and Heinle Publisher.
- Lewis, & Gough, C. 1997. *Implementing the Lexical Approach: Putting Theory into Practice*. Hove. Language Teaching Publication.
- Moon R. (1998): *Fixed Expressions and Idioms, a Corpus-Based Approach*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Wyrick, Jane. 1987. *Steps to Writing Well. A Concise Guide to Composition*. 3rd Edition. Florida. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Oshima, Alice and Hogue, Ann. 1981. *Writing Academic English. A Writing and Sentence Structure Workbook for International Students*. New York. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company Inc.
- Renkema, J. J. 2004. *Introduction to Discourse Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub.
- _____. 1993. *Discourse Studies: An Introductory Textbook*. Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Corp.
- Saputra A, Zulkarnain and Saragih S (2019) Application of Cooperative Learning Models of Think Pair Share Type to Improve Student Mathematics Learning Outcomes. *Journal of Educational Sciences Vol. 3 No. 2 (May, 2019) 237-248*
- Sinclair J. (1996): "The Search for Units of Meaning", in *Textus*, IX, 75–106.
- Scribendi. 2014. *The Functions of Conjunctions. A detailed guide to using conjunctions properly*. Retrieved on March 28, 2013 at http://www.scribendi.com/advice/the_functions_of_conjunctions.en.html.
- Smadja F. A & McKeown, K. R. (1990): "Automatically extracting and representing collocations for language generation", *Proceedings of ACL'90*, 252–259, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- Sugiyono. 2007. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan Research and Development (R&D)*. Bandung. CV Penerbit Alfabeta.
- Surdayanto. 1988. *Metode Penelitian Bahasa*. Yogyakarta. Duta Wacana Press.
- Norguist, Richard. 2014. *Textuality*. retrieved on March 1. 2014 at <http://grammar.about.com/od/tz/g/textualityterm.htm>
- Writeenglish.net. 2010-11. *Writing Right English: Paragraph Unity and Coherence*. Retrieved on March 4. 2014 at <http://writeenglish.net/paragraphunity1-1.php>.
- Werlich, E. (1976) *A text grammar of English*. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.
-