



COHESION IN STUDENTS' SPEECHES

(The Case of the Third Semester
English Language Students of UNNES)

Sri Maryati, Sri Suprapti ✉

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History:

Received in October
2018

Approved in November
2018

Published in January
2019

*Keywords: Textuality,
Cohesion, Cohesive Devices,
Speech*

Abstract

Cohesion is the first criterion of textuality which is very important because it is the links that hold text together and give it meaning. This study aims to identify whether the speeches produced by English major sophomores are cohesive or not and to describe the kinds of cohesive devices found in the speeches. The object of this study is the speeches produced by the third semester students of English Department, which then were transcribed into written. The data collected were analyzed based on discourse analysis using cohesive devices based on Halliday and Hasan's theory (1976). The findings show that there are 1040 ties found in the ten speeches which reveals that the five types of cohesive devices occur in the speeches although the distribution of each type is significantly different. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the ten speeches are cohesively produced. In addition, all of five types and sub-types of cohesion are found in the monologues except verbal ellipsis.

© 2018 Universitas Negeri Semarang

✉ Correspondent Address:
B3 Building FBS Unnes
Sekaran, Gunungpati, Semarang, 50229
E-mail: smaryati@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

A text or discourse has texture or textuality which distinguishes it from something that is not text. In other words, texture or textuality is entirely appropriate to express the property of being text (Halliday and Hasan: 1976:2). According to Renkema (2004: 49-51), “textuality has formulated into seven criteria that are cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativeness, situationality, and intertextuality”.

From those criteria, cohesion is the most important criterion because cohesion can distinguish between text and non-text. Cohesion distinguishes texts from non-texts and enables readers or listeners to establish relevance between what was said, is being said, and will be said, through the appropriate use of the necessary lexical and grammatical cohesive devices. Halliday and Hasan remark that:

Cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some elements in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are thereby at least potentially integrated into text. (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:4)

From this idea cohesion can be defined as the links that hold a text together and give it meaning. It can be said that cohesion is used to analyze discourse on how the connection between elements make such unified text since it functions as a device to keep cohesiveness within a text.

Cohesion is divided into grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. Grammatical cohesion is subdivided into reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. While lexical cohesion is subdivided into reiteration and collocation.

1.1 Reference

One of the options that grammar of English offers creating surface links between sentences is reference. Halliday and Hassan (1976) pointed out that reference features cannot be semantically interpreted without referring to some other features in the text. Pronouns are the most common linguistic element as referring devices in a textual environment. However, there are other linguistic elements used to fulfill the same function such as: articles, demonstratives, and comparatives.

Reference can be accounted as “exophoric” or “endophoric” functions. “Exophoric reference directs the receiver ‘out of’ the text and into an assumed shared world” (McCarthy 1991: 41). For example, ‘that must have cost a lot of money’ in this example we have to look out of the situation to retrieve the meaning of the sentences (Halliday and Hassan: 1976). Endophoric function refers to the text itself in its interpretation. Brown and Yule (1983:192) pointed that “where their interpretation lies within a text they are called ‘endophoric’ relations and do form cohesive ties within the text”. Endophoric reference is subdivided into three kinds: anaphoric, cataphoric, and esphoric. The first two are the most common types of endophoric ties found in a text (Suprapti: 2009). Anaphoric relations is all kinds of activities which involve looking back in texts to find the referent. For example: “it rained day and night for two weeks, the basement flooded and everything was under water, It spoilt all our calculations” (McCarthy 1991: 36). Here the first “it” refers to the discourse itself, the second “it” refers to the event of two weeks, or the fact that it rained or flooded; i.e., the whole situation rather than an event in particular, whereas cataphoric relation looks forward to their interpretation, to exemplify the cataphoric reference “she was terribly afraid. All kinds of black memories of her childhood came up to her mind. She could not fight against them as had been her custom because simply Mary Brown was dying at that moment”.

This short text displays a number of cataphoric reference items which involve looking forward to determining what they refer to. In this example, all the pronouns (she /her) refer to Mary Brown.

In this cataphoric reference, the referent has been withheld to the last sentence in order to engage the reader's /the listener's attention.

There are three types of reference. They are personal, demonstrative, and comparative reference (Halliday and Hasan 1976:37).

1) *Personal Reference*

It means reference by means of function in the speech situation, through the category of person. The category of personals includes the three classes: personal pronouns (*I, you, we, he, etc*), possessive determiners (usually called possessive adjectives, such as *my, your, his, etc*), and possessive pronouns (*mine, your, his, etc*).

2) *Demonstrative Reference*

It is reference by means of location, on a scale of proximity it is essentially a form of verbal pointing. It includes neutral and selective demonstrative. Neutral demonstrative represented with the. While selective demonstrative has more item: *this, that, these, those, here and there*.

3) *Comparative reference*

It is indirect reference by means of identity or similarity. There are two kinds of comparison in comparative reference. They are general and particular comparison. General comparison means comparison that is simply in terms of likeness and unlikeness, without to express to any particular property: two things may be the same, similar or different. General comparison is expressed by a certain class of adjectives and adverbs. Particular comparison means comparison that is in respect of quantity or quality. It is expressed by means of ordinary adjectives and adverbs in some comparative form.

1.2 Substitution

Halliday and Hassan (1976) stated that substitution takes place when one feature (in a text) replaces a previous word or expression, for instance: "I left my pen at home, do you have one?" In this example, "one" is replaced or substitution for "pen". There are three types of substitution nominal, verbal, and clausal substitution.

1) *Nominal Substitution*

The substitute one/ones always functions as Head of nominal group, and substitute only for an item which is itself Head of a nominal group. For example: "I shoot the hippopotamus with bullets made of platinum because if I use leaden ones, His hide is sure to flatten 'em." Here "bullets" is head of nominal group "bullet made of platinum" and "ones" is head of the nominal group "leaden ones".

2) *Verbal Substitution*

The verbal substitution in English is "do". This operates as Head of a verbal group, in the place that is occupied by the lexical verbs; and its position is always final in the group. For example:

a)..... the words did not come the same as they used to do.

b)I don't know the meaning of half those long words, and, what's more, I don't believe you do either!

The first do, in (a), substitutes for 'come'; that in (b) substitutes 'know the meaning of half those long words'.

a)Did you sing?

b) Yes, I did.

The answer “did” substituted for sang.

3) *Clausal Substitution*

Clausal substitution is one type of substitution which what is presupposed is not an element within the clause but an entire clause. The words used as substituteds are “so” and “not”. For example:

A: Is he going to pass the exam?

B: I hope so.

In the example, “so” substitutes for “he is going to pass the exam”.

The negative form of the clausal substitution is “not”, as in

Has everyone gone home? – I hope not. (“not” substitutes for “Everyone has not gone home”)

1.3 Ellipsis

The relation between substitution and ellipsis is very close because it is merely that ellipsis is “substitution” by zero (0). According to Hatch (1994), ellipsis can be thought of as a “zero” tie because the tie is not actually said. What is essential in ellipsis is that some elements are omitted from the surface text, but they are still understood. Thus, omission of these elements can be recovered by referring to an element in the preceding text. Harmer defines it: “(...) words are deliberately left out of a sentence when the meaning is still clear.” (Harmer 2004:24). The example of ellipsis:

“Penny was introduced to a famous author, but even before, she had recognized him.”

It appeared that the structure of the second clause indicates that there is something left out “introduced to a famous author”, the omission of this feature kept the meaning still clear and there is no need of repetition. There are three kinds of ellipsis that are nominal, verbal, and clausal ellipsis.

1) *Nominal Ellipsis*

It means ellipsis within the nominal group, where the omission of nominal group is served a common noun, proper noun or pronoun. For example:

A: How did you enjoy the exhibition?

B: A lot (0) was very good, though not all.

In the example, the omission concerned with “the exhibition”.

2) *Verbal Ellipsis*

It means ellipsis within the verbal group where the elliptical verb depends on a preceding verbal group. For example:

A: Have you been swimming? – Yes, I have (0).

B: Were you typing? – No, I wasn't (0).

Here, the omission of the verbal group depends on what is said before and it is concerned with “been swimming” and “typing”.

3) *Clausal Ellipsis*

Clausal ellipsis functions as verbal ellipsis, where the omission refers to a clause.

A: why did you only set three places? Paul's, staying for dinner, isn't he?

B: Is he? He didn't tell him (0).

In this example the omission falls on the “Paul's, staying for dinner”.

1.4 Conjunction

The final types of cohesive relation that we find in the grammar is that of conjunction which is rather different in nature from the other cohesive relations; reference, substitution, and ellipsis. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 226) point out that “conjunctive elements are not primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding (or following) text, but they express certain meanings presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse”.

Conjunction is the semantic system whereby speakers relate clauses in terms of temporal sequence, consequence, comparison, and addition. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976:238), there are four types of conjunction that are additive, adversative, causal, and temporal.

Williams (1983) summarized the different kinds of conjunctions in a text, based on the work of Halliday and Hassan (1976) in the following table.

Family	External/ External Relationship	Example
Additive	Additive ‘proper’	And , in addition, moreover
	Negative	Or, else, alternatively
	Expository	that is, in other words
	Exemplification	i.e. for instance, for example, such as
	Similar	likewise, similarly, in the same way.
Adversative	Adversative “proper”	Yet, though, but, however, nevertheless, whereas
	Avowal	In fact, actually, as a matter of fact
	Correction of meaning	On the contrary, instead
	Dismissal	In any /either case
Causal	Dismissal	At any rate
	Causal, general	So ,then ,hence, consequently, for, because, for
	Reversed causal	this reason
	Reason	it follows
	Result	As a result, in consequence,
	Purpose	for this purpose, to this end,
	Conditional (direct)	then , that being the case
	Conditional (reversed polarity)	under the circumstances
	Respective (direct)	Otherwise ,under other
	Respective (reversed polarity)	circumstances , therefore
Temporal	Sequential	In this respect /regard
	Summarizing	Otherwise, in other respects
	Past	(at) first, to start with, next,
	Present	finally, in conclusion
	Future	To sum up, in short ,briefly
	Durative	Previously, before this /that
	Interrupted	hitherto ,at this point, here
	Simultaneous	From now on, hence
	forward meanwhile, in the	
	meantime	
	Soon, after a time	
	Just then, at the same time.	

Table 1.1. Different types of conjunctions

1.5 Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion is created for the choice of a given vocabulary and the role played by certain basic semantic relations between words in creating textuality (Halliday and Hasan: 1976). Thus, they divide lexical cohesion into two main categories: reiteration and collocation.

1) *Reiteration*

Reiteration is a form of lexical cohesion which involves the repetition of a lexical item at one end of the scale; the use of general word to refer back to a lexical item, at the other end of the scale; and a number of things in between the use of a synonym, near synonym, or superordinate. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 279) have categorized reiteration into repetition, synonym or near-synonym, superordinate, and general word.

a) *Repetition*

Restate the same lexical item in a later part of the discourse.

e.g.: what we lack in a newspaper is what we should get. In a word, popular newspaper may be the winning ticket. (The lexical item “newspaper” reiterated in the same form).

b) *Synonym*

It is used to express a similar meaning of an item.

e.g.: You could try reversing the car up the slope. The incline isn't all that steep (“Slope” refers back to “incline” of which it is a synonym)

e.g.: I turned to the ascent of the peak. The climb is perfectly easy.

c) *Superordinate*

It involves the use of general class words.

e.g.: Henry's bought himself a new Jaguar. He practically lives in the car.

From the example, “car” refers back to “jaguar”. Car is a name for a more general class (as “vehicle” is a superordinate of car, spoon of teaspoon cut of pare, and so on).

d) *General Word*

It is used to refer back to a lexical item such as: person, people, man, woman for human nouns; things, object for inanimate, concrete countable nouns; stuff for inanimate, concrete uncountable; place for location ...etc.

e.g. A: Did you try the steamed buns?

B: Yes; I didn't like the things much.

The word “Things” is general word that refers back to “buns”.

e.g. There's a boy climbing that tree. The idiot's going to fall if he doesn't take care.

2) *Collocation*

Collocation is the tendency of some words to co-occur together. The Syntactic relations of words in which we have a combination of words by expectation; i.e., we predict the following items of a given combination by looking at the first item. The co-occurrence of certain words from a chain to ensure unity and centrality of the topic of this text. These words in chain form the lexical cohesion of the text. Nunan argued that:

Lexical cohesion is, in many ways, the most interesting of all the cohesive categories. The background knowledge of the reader or listener plays a more obvious role in the perception of lexical relationships than in the perception of other types of cohesion. Collocation patterns, for example, will only be perceived by someone who knows something about the subject at hand. (Nunan 1993: 30)

Thus, collocates can be words used in the same context or it can be words that contribute to the same area of meaning (Kennedy: 2003). For example, a text dealing with the chemical treatment of food contains lexical chains such as: fruit, skin, citrus, lemon, orange, chemicals, products, laboratory ...etc. these words can be said to belong to the same register and contribute to the same topic.

Sophomores are students in the second year of study at college. In other word, English major sophomores are the third semester of English departent's students. In Indonesia, the third semester of English department's students are expected to make a good monologue since they have been trained to make cohesive monologue from junior high school. Brown points out that there are 16 microskills of oral communication which one of them is using cohesive devices in spoken discourse. It means that cohesion is taught to make a good monologue. However, although cohesion is taught from junior high school, the students of English Department still face problem in applying cohesive devices. It was proved by Sri Suprapti (2009) who did the research by using the junior students of English Department of UNNES as the subject. In the research, she concluded that there were some cohesive problems in the investigated data both of grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. The problems in the grammatical cohesion could be sub-categorized into: (a) wrong use of conjunction; (b) wrong use of demonstratives; (c) wrong use of pronominals. Then, the lexical cohesion problems are in forms of (a) lexical repetition with irretrievable referents within the texts; (b) naming: the use of a more specific term (subordinate term) in place of a more general (super-ordinate) one.

The present article will look into the English students' ability in using cohesive devices to make their monolog cohesive both the grammatical and lexical cohesion based on Halliday and Hassan's theory.

METHODS

The method used to collect the data was by administering a test which was Speaking for General Purposes final test. The test was meant to get the students' speeches to be scored as their final exam in the subject. The students were given some choice of topics which could be used in creating the speeches. They were asked to choose one of five topics as the topic of their speeches. One week was time which was given to them to prepare their speeches before present it in front of class. When presenting the speeches, they were recorded one by one by using camera recorder. After all of the students had been recorded, I transcribed the data into written.

Ten out of twenty speeches were chosen to be analyzed because some reasons. First, the sounds of the recorded data could not be heard clearly. Second, it was not possible to rerecord the speeches which were not clear because it would be quite difficult to make them made the speeches twice. Then, the ten speeches are labelled A to J with each clause/clause complexes.

In analyzing the data, the observation is done in seven steps; dividing and numbering the sentences into clauses, identifying the cohesive devices within the clause, applying the coding system as suggested by Halliday and Hassan (1976), putting the text types into tables based on the types, calculating the cohesive devices used in all the percentage of each device, triangulation, and interpreting the findings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The findings and the discussions indicate that the five types of cohesive devices occurred in the speeches although the distribution of each type is significantly different. There are totally 1040 ties found in the speeches. The most occurrences are on lexical cohesion, which mostly reiteration type are 575 cases (55.3%). Repetition of the same words have the bigger number rather than

synonym or general words. It is because the intention in making emphasis on the certain topics that the speakers talking about. For example in speech D the speaker repeated the word 'resolution' many times because her topic is about New Year resolution.

The second dominated cohesive device belongs to reference with 223 cases (21.44%). In this case personal reference frequently used by the speaker such as *it* which refers to the particular object which has been stated in the preceding clause. Next is conjunction that is 197 cases (18.94%). The additive conjunction often occurs which is expressed by the words *and*, *for example* and *or*. Meanwhile the occurrences of substitution is higher than ellipsis. There are 19 cases (1.82%) of substitution which is higher than the occurrence of ellipsis with 13 cases (1.25%).

The first types of cohesion is reference, the findings reveal that there are 223 occurrences of reference which subdivided into personal reference, demonstrative, and comparative. There are many personal reference found in the speeches. The first item which is used in the speeches as personal reference is *I* which is anaphoric in speeches B clause 28 and D clause 32. They are included as cohesive devices since they are in quoted speech which anaphorically refer to 'the cyber dating user' and 'listener'. Another example is using *you* as personal reference which make the speech cohesive like in speech I clause 39. In addition, the personal reference *it*, *they*, *their*, *them*, *she*, *he* and *her* are also found in the speeches which the first item is the dominant.

Demonstrative reference is expressed by the words *the*, *this*, *that*, *these* and *those* which is *the* word *the* is commonly used than others. The example *the* can be found in the speech (A) clause 31 which is functioned as modifier only. Another demonstrative reference *that*, *this*, *these* and *those* can be functioned as head or modifier. For example, the word *that* which used as head can be seen in the speech (A) clause 11, while *that* in clause 12 is functioned as modifier which modifies the word 'question'. Besides, the third subtypes of reference also occurs in the speeches which is expressed by the word *healthier* and *more* which indicate comparison.

Second type of grammatical cohesion is substitution. Substitution is the replacement of an item by another. There are totally 19 occurrences of substitutions which divided into nominal, verbal, and clausal. The nominal substitution is expressed by the word *one* which can be seen in the speech (D) clause 29. The occurrences of verbal substitution are expressed by the word *do* like in the speech (D) clause 21 and 50. The last is the occurrence of clausal substitution which is expressed by the word *not* in speech (E) clause 33.

Next, ellipsis is the lowest type of cohesion which is found in the speeches. However, only nominal and clausal ellipsis are found. Nominal ellipsis is expressed by numerative such as *the first*, *the second*, and *etc.* functioned as head like in the speech (B) clause 8, 9, 10 and 15. Clausal ellipsis means ellipsis which misses not only an element within the clause, but it needs the whole clause to complete the clause. Clausal ellipsis can be found in the speech (C) clause 18 and (D) clause 21 expressed by the word *why* and *no*.

The last type of grammatical cohesion is conjunction. There are 197 cases of conjunction in the speeches which exist in additive, adversative, causal and temporal conjunction. The speakers use *and*, *or*, *for example* and *I mean* to add information to previous clauses which are categorized as additive conjunction. Adversative conjunction is also found in the speeches expressed by the word *but* to give a contrary connection to previous clause. Then, there are only two kinds of causal conjunction found in the speeches that are *so* and *because*. For example, the word *so* in (A) (12) and (B) (13) which are functioned as a form of simple clausal relation. They clearly show that they provide cohesive relation with previous clauses. The last, temporal conjunction is found which is expressed by the words *then* and *enumeration: first, second, and etc.* Moreover, another type of conjunction is also found which do not belong to the four categories. It is called as 'continuatives conjunction'. The words *well* and *of course* are used to express continuatives conjunction in the speeches.

The last type of cohesion is lexical cohesion which is commonly used in the speeches. There are two types of lexical cohesion which are reiteration and collocation. Reiteration includes repetition, synonym, and general word. Repetition in the same word is happened at the most because in spoken discourse, it commonly happens to keep the cohesiveness of the speeches. Synonym and general word also exist in the monologues although they are in small cases. The second type of lexical cohesion is collocation. It is achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly co-occur. Furthermore, it deals with the relationship between words on the basis of the fact that they occur in the same surroundings. It means that when someone thinks about something, he or she will also think about the elements that build the thing. The example of collocation can be found in the speech (B) (37) and (38) which show that there is relation between the word *man* and *woman* in the preceding clause. There is obviously a systematic relationship between *woman* and *man* which are related by a particular type of oppositeness called Complementarity. This relation constitutes as collocation and it provides cohesive relation. Thus the text above is cohesive. Collocational relation is not limited to a pair of words. It can be a long cohesive chain in a text. And they are freely both within the same clause and across clause boundaries because they are not dependent on grammatical structure. It can be seen in the speech (B) (18), (19), (20), (25), (28) and (29). There is connection among '*cyber dating...internet...chatting...long distance*'. Those items are related to each other because they occur in the same context. Likewise, in (B) clauses (25), (28) and (29), the word '*relationship...single...got engaged*' also associated one to another because they occur in a same context of cyber dating.

CONCLUSIONS

Finally, I come up with some conclusions which can answer the research questions of this study.

The findings show that the speeches produced by the third semester students of English Department are cohesive since there are many cohesive ties found. It is supported by the findings of the unstructured interview which indicate that they have ability to make cohesive speeches.

Second, the students use both grammatical cohesion which are reference (personal, demonstrative and comparative), substitution (nominal, verbal and clausal), ellipsis (nominal and clausal ellipsis), and conjunction (additive, adversative, causal, and temporal) and lexical cohesion which covers reiteration and collocation.

REFERENCES

- Alterman, G. 2005. *Creating Your Own Dialogue*. New York: Allworth Press.
- Bagarić, V. 2007. *Defining Communicative Competence*. Metodika, Vol.8, page 94-103.
- Boardman, C. A. 2001. *Writing To Communicate: Paragraph and Assays*. New York: University of Clifornia Berkeley Extention.
- Brown, G. and G Yule. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, H. D. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. San Fancisco: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Celce-Murcia, M. 1995. *Communicative Competence: A Pedagogically Motivated*. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 6, No.2, 5-35.

- Cook, G. 1989. *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Egins, S. 1994. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Pinter Publisher Ltd.
- Gerot, Linda and Peter Wignel. 1994. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar: an introductory workbook*. Australia: Gerd Stabler.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and R. Hasan. 1989. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspect of Language in a Social Semiotic Perspective*. Victoria: Deakin University.
- _____. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London and New York: Longman.
- Harmer, J. 2004. *How to teach Writing*. Person Educated Limited.
- Hatch, Evelyn. 1994. *Discourse and Language Education*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Hidayah, A. 2010. *Cohesive Devices in English Speeches Made by the Participants of Speech Contest in Esa Week 2009*. Semarang: Final Project English Department FBS UNNES.
- Hughes, R. 2002. *Teaching and Researching Speaking*. Great Britain: Person Education.
- Kennedy, G. 2003. *Structure and Meaning in English*. Person Educated Limited.
- McCarthy, M. 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, J. L. 2001. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Malden: Balckwell Publishing.
- Mellisa. 2014. available at (What Is the Origin of Freshman, Sophomore, Junior and Senior_.html)
- Miles, M. and A M Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis: an Expanded Source Book*. London: Sage Publication.
- Nunan, D. 1993. *Introducing Discourse Analysis*. London: Penguin.
- Mujiyanto, Y. 2011. *Panduan Penulisan Skripsi*. Semarang: Semarang State University.
- Nunan, D. 1993. *Introducing Discourse Analysis*. England: Penguin Books.
- Olatunde, J. A. 2002. Cohesion As Aspect of Textuality in Vacancy Advertisement in Newspaper in BAbatunde, S.T. and Adeyanju, D. S (end). *Language, Meaning And Society*, 312-313.
- Ratnaningtyas, Natria. 2010. *The Cohesive Devices Used by the Finalists of Story Retelling Contest in Esa Week 2009*. Semarang: Final Project English Department FBS UNNES.
- Renkema, J. 1993. *Discourse Studies: An Introduction Textbook*. Amsterdam/philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- _____. 2004. *Introduction to Discourse Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Suprapti, S. 2009. Learners' Problems with the Textuality. *LANGUAGE CIRCLE Journal of Language and Literature* Vol. IV, 1-10.

Thompson, G. 1996. *Introducing Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.

Wibowo, A. H. 2010. *Cohesion in Students' Hortatory Exposition Texts (A Case of the Texts Produced by Eleventh Grade Students of SMA Negeri 1 Pati)*. Semarang: Final Project English Department FBS UNNES.

Widdowson, H.G. 2007. *Discourse Analysis*. UK: Oxford University Press.

Williams, R. 1983. Teaching the Recognition of Cohesive Ties in Reading a Foreign Language, in reading a foreign language. *A Journal of the Language Studies Unit, University of Aston in Birmingham*, V.1 N. 1 March 1983 p.p35-52.

Wikipedia. Available at (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Textuality>)

Zaenudin, M. 2012. *Cohesive Devices in Hortatory Exposition Texts Posted in Class Blog by Eleventh Grade Students of SMA Negeri 1 Temanggung*. Semarang: Final Project English Departments FBS UNNES.