The Analysis of Cohesive Devices Used by Tertiary English Students in Writing English Paragraphs

Eka Finastie Nurhidayat; Eka Apriani; Sarwo Edy

Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Curup, Bengkulu, Indonesia

Abstract

The present research aimed at investigating kinds of cohesive devices and the problems of using those cohesive devices in writing English paragraphs. 10 undergraduate English students from an institute in Curup, Bengkulu, Indonesia were involved as the participants purposively. Document analysis was conducted towards students' written paragraphs to garner the data about kinds of cohesive devices, and they were then interviewed to reveal information with respect to their problems of using cohesive devices. The data were analyzed using an interactive model. The present research revealed that the students had used some kinds of cohesive devices such as references in the form of personal pronoun and demonstrative reference. They used conjunctions in the form of additive, adversative, and clausal conjunctions. They used reiteration in the form of making repetitions of the same words. This condition indicated that they had moderately been able to use general cohesive devices. However, there were some more cohesive devices they had not used because of their complexities. In terms of problems, they had no problems of using references. However, they had varied problems in using substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, reiteration, and collocation. It implied that English writing lecturers needed to help students cope with such problems of using cohesive devices by applying explicit teaching..

Keywords: *Cohesive Devices; English,;Paragraph Writing; Writing Skill*

Introduction

In Indonesia, the socio-political position of English which is as a foreign language leads to a staging of English communication which is more oriented towards a written mode compared to the spoken mode (Anggraini et al., 2021; Bella et al., 2020; Kirkpatrick, 2018; Lauder, 2008). As a matter of fact, of all English skills, writing is the most difficult due to its complexities of idea organization and the yardstick of language structures (Abdelwahab & Rahmtallah, 2020; Ebadi & Rahimi, 2019; Ma'azi et al., 2018). Writing plays a role as a way that a writer delivers his ideas into texts. It also refers to the process of describing a language, so that the message delivered by the author can be understood by the readers (Wolf et al., 2018). In writing, there are two common purposes which entail communicative and academic purposes (Ai et al., 2018; Ebadi & Rahimi, 2019; Lin et al., 2020). Those purposes are realized into some forms such as paragraphs, letters, papers, articles, journals, project reports, theses, essays, and etc

(Hidayah, 2017). It indicates that writing has a vital role in language production. In addition, with the mastery of writing skill, writing skill itself will function not merely as a means of interactions and transactions, but it can also provide chances for students to study abroad (Craig et al., 2015).

In the process of writing, students should be able to express all of their ideas effectively and accurately because as aligned with the essence of writing, it is to make the readers easy to understand the written text (McDonough & Crawford, 2020). Writing English as a foreign language is not easy for students. Grammar becomes the basis to put words together and to arrange sentences correctly and in a convenient way resting upon English rules (Deepa & Gayathridevi, 2017). Along with it, good idea organization is also a way to help construct meaningful arrangements of words and grammar in writing (Mauludin, 2018). As an example, in writing a paragraph, students must focus on the topic sentence because it states the main idea of the paragraph. Supporting sentences as to support the main idea are usually constructed in the form of descriptions or detailed presentations which lead the readers to specific and important information as intended by the writer. Therefore, in a paragraph writing process, students should express their ideas, and continuously write down all of their constructed ideas across writing elements including word choices, grammatical sentences, and punctuation in a proper way. Last but not least, the other aspect that should also be mastered by the students in order to write a good paragraph is cohesive devices (Abu-Ayyash & McKenny, 2017).

Cohesive devices are the interrelatedness between one element to another element in a discourse or text. According to Halliday and Hasan (2014), cohesion is a potential for relating one element in the text to another, wherever they are and without any implication that everything in the text has some parts in it. Cohesion is the unity of discourses or texts which connect the meanings among sentences, paragraphs, or other levels of writing. If an English user reads a passage containing more than one sentence, he can normally decide without difficulty whether the passage forms a unified whole, or it is just a collection of unrelated sentences (Apriani, 2016; Apriani et al., 2019). The unified whole text means there is cohesion in it because in one sentence and the other one has related meanings, while a collection of unrelated sentence has no cohesion in that text. Cohesion has an important role in writing (Apriani, 2017; Edy, 2014). It can be in the word, sentence, paragraph, or in the whole text levels. The word level means that in one sentence, there is one or more cohesive devices. For example, "I and you go to campus". There are two types of cohesive devices in that sentence, *I* and *you* as personal reference, *and* as additive conjunction. The sentence level means there is a relationship between two or more sentences. For example "Sasa eats the rice. She eats with her family in the kitchen". *She* and *her* in the second sentence refers back to *Sasa* in the first sentence. Cohesion is the tool in making connection between the sentences. By using cohesive devices the whole text can stick together, both in lexical and grammatical cohesive devices. In line with Hoey (1996), cohesion is the way certain words or grammatical features of a sentence can connect to its predecessors and successors in a text. It means that cohesion is an element to make a sentence has an important role in connecting the meaning to another sentence.

Grounded in the importance of writing elements including cohesive devices, the researchers already conducted a preliminary study that probed into the writing skill of tertiary EFL students at one of the institutes in Curup, Bengkulu, Indonesia. In this attempt, the researchers invited some sixth semester students to voluntarily write a paragraph whose topics had previously been selected by the researchers. The researchers found that some of them got problems in their writing projects, especially in cohesive devices. The researchers continuously asked the students about cohesive devices. They responded that they did not understand about cohesive devices. The researchers also took some time to discuss an issue concerning lexical and grammatical cohesions, and most of them did not yet understand about these points.

There have been a number of previous studies conducted in the field of English cohesive devices. Those studies are essential due to giving insights to the researchers with respect to English cohesive

devices. A study conducted by Ketabi and Jamalvand (2012) deployed a cohesion theory to analyze the similarities and differences of the use of conjunctions as cohesive devices between the English textbooks of international law and their Farsi translations. In so doing, their study made use of four English international law textbooks and their Farsi translated books. Their study revealed that the use of conjunctions as cohesive devices in the English textbooks of international law and their Farsi translations have more similarities compared to differences. The Farsi translation results of conjunctions from the English versions have been made in a properly equivalent way. Al-Pachachi and Naser (2016) conducted a study with the aim of seeing the interrelatedness of cohesive devices deployed in adults' drama texts and Children's drama texts. Subsequently, their study was aimed at finding out the most commonly used cohesive devices in the two types of drama texts. Also, their study sought to reveal the differences and similarities of cohesive devices used in both drama texts. Their study revealed that there is the interrelatedness of cohesive devices used in both drama texts, and seemingly adults' drama texts use more cohesive devices than children's drama texts. Of the two types of drama texts, reference becomes the most commonly used cohesive device. Continuously, ellipsis is found to be widely employed in adults' drama texts. In a different way, lexical cohesive devices are used more often in children's drama texts compared to adults' drama texts.

A study conducted by Hinkel (2001) sought to find out specific similarities and differences in the uses of explicit cohesive devices in a native English speakers' corpus and a non-native English speakers' corpus. The corpora were taken from 897 academic essays. The non-native English speakers were those of Japan, Indonesia, Korea, and Arabic, and the native speakers were British. His study revealed that both native English speakers' and non-native English speakers' texts used cohesive devices. However, non-native English speakers' texts seemed to use limited varieties of cohesive devices even for the advanced second language users. Their limited varieties of cohesive devices led to problems in terms of text unity. Subsequently, Nugraheni (2015) also conducted a study with the aim of finding out the cohesive device of conjunctions used by eight learners in their English essays. She uncovered 37 forms and 12 types of conjunctions deployed by learners. However, she also found some improper uses of conjunctions in learners' English essays. Such improper uses represented unclassified, wrong mechanism, first-language interference, wrong forms of conjunctions, and grammatical error.

The above studies have contributed to giving insights as regards English cohesive devices for the present study. Nevertheless, the present study is different from the reviewed studies above. Anchored in the encountered phenomenon as presented above as well as as a way that fills out the void from the highlighted prior studies, the present study is designed and conducted to reveal types of English cohesive devices in paragraph writing used by college students from an English department at an institute in Curup, Bengkulu, Indonesia. In addition, this study also seeks to uncover the problems faced by English college students in using English cohesive devices in writing paragraphs.

Review of Literature

Cohesion

Cohesion means "unity" (Manser & McGauran, 2003). In this case, cohesion refers to the unity of meanings within a text or discourse (Abu-Ayyash & McKenny, 2017). Cohesion is categorized as an element of discourse, wherein discourse itself refers to the biggest umbrella context of on-going written communication (Ahmed, 2010). Cohesion represents how written communication is kept aligned with the on-going discourse. Halliday and Hasan (2014) said that cohesion is defined as the set of possibilities that exist in the language for making text hung together: the potential that the speaker or writer has at his disposal. Then, they argued 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. Next, cohesion refers to the range of possibilities that exist for linking something with what has gone before (Kang, 2009). Cohesion is classified into two, namely grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. The grammatical cohesion is correlated with grammar, and lexical cohesion is related to vocabulary. This way lies because cohesion is expressed partly through grammar and partly through vocabulary" (Halliday & Hasan, 2014)

Grammatical Cohesion

Halliday and Hasan (2014) have provided five kinds of cohesive devices in English. They are Reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. The first is reference. Reference is one of the cohesive devices from grammatical cohesion (Arifani, 2019). Reference can be an endoporic and exophoric. Halliday and Hasan (2014) point out that reference features cannot be semantically interpreted without referring to some other features in the text. In reference, there are exophora and endophora. Endophoric is divided into anaphora (to preceding text) and cataphora (to following text). Anaphora occurs when a writer refers back to something that has been previously mentioned. For example: "There are *three beautiful girls*. *See how they* walk!". In this example the pronoun 'they' refers back to the "three beautiful girls". Cataphora occurs when the writer refers forward to something that has not been mentioned. For example: "When *he* arrived, *Andi* was surprised to see that his door is open". Here, the pronoun *he* is cathaphoric reference because it refers to *Andi* that is introduced later in the text. Exophoric reference is used to describe abstraction (a focus or an idea) without ever identifying them (in contrast to anaphoric and cataphoric reference).

The second is substitution. Halliday and Hasan (2014) define substitution as the replacement of one item by another, and the ellipsis is the omission of an item. Substitution is the replacement of nouns, verbs, or clauses to replace some information presented in prior (Yasuda, 2019). There are three types of substitution; nominal substitution, verbal substitution, and clausal substitution. Nominal substitution occurs in the nominal group, the replacement item is "one/ ones". The substitute "one/ ones" presupposes some noun that is to function as the head in the nominal group. The substitute *one/ ones* always functions as the head of nominal group, and can substitute only for an item which is itself the head of a nominal group. Verbal substitution occurs on the verbal group, the replacement item is the verb "do" (do, does, doing, did, done). The verbal substitute in English is "*do*". This operates as head of a verbal group. Clausal substitution occurs on the clausal group. The words used as substitute are *so* and *not*.

The third is ellipsis. Ellipsis is omitting information that is presented previously (Wang & Cho, 2010). Ellipsis is the omission of words, group or clauses. Halliday and Hasan (2014) define ellipsis as the omission of an item. For example: A: Do you have *white shoes*? B: Yes I *have*. From this example, the utterance "*white shoes*" is omitted, and it is enough by mentioning "*have*". The complete sentence in B is "Yes I have white shoes". There are three types of ellipsis, nominal, verbal and clausal ellipsis. Nominal ellipsis occurs within the nominal group. Nominal ellipsis is the omission of an utterance because it has been clear enough without putting that one. Verbal ellipsis occurs in the group of verbal. There are two kinds of verbal group; lexical and operator ellipsis. For lexical ellipsis, it will be remembered as the ellipsis 'form the right': the final element in the verbal group, the lexical verb, is omitted, and preceding elements may be omitted, all except the initial operator. Operator ellipsis is ellipsis 'from the left': the initial element in the verbal group (finite verbal operator, if finite; otherwise first nun- finite operator) is omitted, and following elements may be omitted, all except the lexical verb. Clausal ellipsis is the omission of a clause or an element of a clause.

The fourth is conjunction. Conjunction does not signal information present in the text. Conjunction can be defined as the way the writer wants the reader to relate what is about to be said to what has been said before (Mohammed, 2015). For example: "there was nobody there, *and* it was night time, *but* he preferred to wait for them". The word "*and*" is an additive conjunction and the word "*but*" is

an adversative conjunction. There are four items of conjunction namely additive, adversative, causal and temporal. For example, "my little sister asks me to buy some doll, (a) *And* buy new shoes (*additive*); (b) *At the same time* she asks me to buy the new clothes (*adversative*); (c) *So* she is crying loudly (causal); (d) *Then*, I accompany her going to the market (*temporal*).

The fifth is lexical cohesion. It is the cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary (Halliday & Hasan, 2014). The two basic categories of lexical cohesion are reiteration and collocation. The first is reiteration. It is one of the types of lexical cohesion. Halliday and Hasan (2014) classify reiteration into four types: the same word (repetition), a synonym/near-synonym, a superordinate (metonym), and a general word (hyponym). The second is collocation. It deals with the relationships between words on the basis of the fact that these often occur in the same surroundings. According to Rankema (2004), collocation deals with the relationship between pairs of words or basis of the fact that these often occur in the same surroundings or similar environment. The examples are: "green and red", "nose and eye". These two words "green and red" are two words having the relationship in the same surrounding or environment that is color.

Problems of Using Cohesive Devices

The complexities of cohesive devices oftentimes make students face some problems when they use cohesive devices during writing. Absorbed from a variety of information provided by some prior studies and theories related cohesive devices, there are some related problems which can be identified. According to Reid (1993), non-native English students tend to use cohesive devices differently from their actual usages as native English users commonly do during writing. Such differences in the use of cohesive devices are identical from students' less-knowledge about the ideal use of cohesive devices. McCarthy (1991) also elucidated that non-native English students often fail to use cohesive devices to bind logical ties among each idea which is written. The foregoing indicates that non-native English students most often seem to have less understanding of how to deal with the logic behind the functions of cohesive devices.

According to Hinkel (2004), non-native English students often use monotonous cohesive devices. The foregoing demonstrates that non-native English students oftentimes cannot effectively use variations of cohesive devices in negotiating their ideas during writing. Nugraheni (2015) also added that non-native English Students often pay less attention to the accuracy of using cohesive devices. It means that non-native English students seem to face difficulties in determining the proper choices of cohesive devices when playing with the logics related to their written arguments. Subsequently, Ahmed (2010) emphasized that non-native English students incline to have less-competent at using cohesive devices. It means that even though some students might have known the concept of cohesive devices, they still suffer from incapability in deciding the ideal use of each cohesive device.

According to the elaborations above, it can be summarized some key problems non-native English students tend to face in terms of using cohesive devices during writing. Those problems are: 1) Using cohesive devices differently from the way native English users do: 2) Less knowledge about cohesive devices; 3) Failure at using the logical ties of cohesive devices; 4) Less understanding of the logic behind the use of cohesive devices; 5) Using monotonous cohesive devices; 6) Knowing only a small number of variations of cohesive devices; 7) Paying less attention to the accuracy of using cohesive devices; 8) Having no idea to determine the proper choices of cohesive devices during writing; 9) Less competent at using cohesive devices; and 10) knowing the concepts of cohesive devices but being incapable of applying that cohesive devices-related knowledge.

Method

This research applied a descriptive qualitative approach (Ary et al., 2010; Fraenkel et al., 2012; Gall et al., 2003) to probe into the kinds of cohesive devices used and the problems in the use of cohesive devices in English paragraphs written by sixth semester students from an English department at an institute in Curup, Bengkulu, Indonesia. The nature of cohesive devices in the context of this research was classified into six components which subsumed reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, reiteration, and collocation. The aforesaid components became the primary orientation of our attempt to analyze students' paragraphs. Ten tertiary English students who took their sixth semester were involved as the participants purposively. Grounded in the principle of purposive sampling technique (Ary et al., 2010), we assigned a number of criteria to select those students as the participants. The ten participants were, first, the students who had completely taken the classes of writing 1, 2, 3 and 4. Second, they were the students who received a low score or equal to C as the average of scores of their 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th writing subjects. The foregoing criterion was important because a part of the present research purposes was to find problems regarding the use of cohesive devices. Students who receive low scores in writing subjects were considered affiliated with having such problems. Third, they were willing to be engaged as the subjects of this research. The extent to which they were willing was important in this sense because one of the basic characteristics of a purposive sampling technique was that the subjects voluntarily wanted to join the research.

We made use of document analysis and interviews as the techniques of collecting data. To reveal the data about the uses of cohesive devices, we deployed document analysis. Subsequently, to probe into the data about students' problems in using cohesive devices, we conducted interviews with student participants. The data of the present research were analyzed using an interactive model of analysis as recommended by Miles et al. (2014). Drawing upon this model, there four steps we took in an interconnected way, namely data collection, data condensation, data display, and drawing conclusion. As regards data collection, as previously explained, the data about the uses of cohesive devices were collected from document analysis, and those regarding the problems of using cohesive devices were garnered from interviews. Associated with data condensation, all raw data were grouped based on the emerging themes. Appertaining to data display, the data were displayed in the form of tables, related explanations, and related discussion. Lastly, concerning drawing conclusion, the findings and discussion were summarized comprehensively and representatively.

Findings and Discussion

The data with respect to kinds of cohesive devices used by students in writing paragraphs were collected from document analysis. In such a way, the students were already asked to write out one English paragraph each based on the topic selected by the researchers. Because the Covid-19 pandemic was an international hot issue while the researchers were garnering the data, the researchers chose to bring the issue of education during the Covid-19 pandemic as the topic that the students had to write out. Thus, each student participant wrote one English paragraph under that topic. The results of document analysis of students' paragraphs can be seen in table 1 below:

Table 1. Results of document analysis

No	Kind of cohesive devices	Indicators	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
1	Reference	Personal pronoun	Their;	It;	-	I; my	-	Our; us; them; their	-	Their;	-	Them
		Demonstrative reference	-	This;	There	This	this	This	-	This	This	This
		Comparative reference	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	Substitution	Nominal substitution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Verbal substitution	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-
		Clausal substitution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	llipsis	Nominal ellipsis	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Verbal ellipsis	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	Conjunction	Clausal ellipsis Additive conjunction	- and	- and	- and	-	-		- and	- and	-	- and
		Adversative conjunction	Consequently; accordingly;	In addition	-	Moreover	-	Even;	Therefore	-	-	-
		Clausal conjunction	-	so	So that; that; if	Because	Where	Where	When	that	Where; that; since	That; so; who; because
		Temporal conjunction	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	Reiteration	The same word (repetition).	school	Pandemic	Online learning	online	teachers	teachers	Teachers; students; teaching; learning	Online; methods	-	-
		A synonym/near-synonym.	-	-	-	-	-	-	educators	-	-	-
		A superordinate (metonym).	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		A general word (hyponym)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	Collocation	Relationship between pairs of words or basis of the fact that these often occur in the same surroundings or similar environment.	Make efforts	Impact on	-	-	Different from	Face-to-face	Because of	Dealing with	Teachers; students	Impact of

As depicted in the above table, mostly, student participants used references in the form of personal pronoun and demonstrative reference. They used conjunctions in the form of additive conjunction, adversative conjunction, and clausal conjunction. They used reiteration in the form of making repetitions of the same words. This condition indicated that they had moderately been able to use general cohesive devices. However, there were some more cohesive devices they had not used, such as comparative reference, nominal substitution, verbal substitution, clausal substitution, nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis, clausal ellipsis, temporal conjunction, and reiterations in the form of a synonym or near-synonym (to be noted, there was one student who used this device), a superordinate (metonym), and a

general word (hyponym) (see Halliday and Hasan's (2014) explanations for more details regarding these devices). Cohesive devices that most students did not use were indeed considered difficult ones, and those who could use them were commonly associated with advanced writers.

As the next step, this research also investigated some problems the students faced when using cohesive devices in writing paragraphs. The data about their problems were obtained from interviews. In the analysis, the raw interview data were coded on the basis of several themes that emerged. Those themes represented the core problems addressed by the participants. The coded interview data can be seen in the following table:

Table 2. Core data of interviews

No	Cohesive devices	Problems coded	Students
1	References	-	-
2	Substitution	Getting confused about using the correct substitution	Students 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9
		Misunderstanding of the usages of substitution	Students 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10
3	Ellipsis	Having less knowledge about ellipsis	Students 1, 5, 6, 7, 10
		Misunderstanding of the usages of ellipsis	Students 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9
4	Conjunction	Getting confused about the correct usages of conjunctions	Students 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9
		Having few words as conjunction vocabularies	Students 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
		Misunderstanding of the contexts of using conjunctions	Students 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
		Less understanding of English clauses leading to mistaken uses of conjunctions	Students 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
	Reiteration	Knowing very little about proper uses of reiteration	Students 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
	Collocation	Knowing only few word pairs or collocations	All students

As shown in table 2, most of the students had problems in using cohesive devices, except for reference because this cohesive device was relatively easy to use. As regards substitution, they were confused about using correct substitutions and misunderstood the usages of substitutions. Substitutions are one of the patterns of native English ways in writing (Abu-Ayyash & McKenny, 2017). For Indonesian students who use English as a foreign language, using substitutions is of course challenging because their mental language is constructed from a combination between Indonesian and English mental languages. They need to take time to improve their interlanguage (Morganna, 2017) so that they can naturally use substitutions well. In terms of problems in using ellipsis, the participants expressed that they had less knowledge about ellipsis and misunderstood the usages of ellipsis. This condition is natural because ellipsis is just like substitution in the sense of its nature as the typical characteristic of native

English native speakers' communicative habit. Indonesian students with their engagement into English as a foreign language will find it difficult to use ellipsis because the pattern of their English communication is associated with the pattern of English as a lingua franca (Rahatlou et al., 2018). As Mauranen (2018) argued, the users of English as a lingua franca will tend to maintain mutual intelligibility, wherein such certain types of native English ways can probably be excluded.

With respect to the problems of using conjunctions, the student participants expressed that they were confused about the correct usages of conjunctions, had few words as conjunction vocabularies, misunderstood the contexts of using conjunctions, and less understood English clauses leading to mistaken uses of conjunctions. These problems could arise because the usages and functions of conjunctions are indeed very complex. As explained by Swan (2005), conjunctions extend to coordinate, subordinate, relative, and clause-related conjunctions. All of them are affiliated with respective complexities of uses and functions. In terms of the problems in using reiteration, the student participants expressed that they knew very little about proper uses of reiteration. In terms of writing, the use of reiteration is associated with the styles of idea presentation. Advanced writers can play with reiterations to demonstrate their creative styles of writing (Wells, 1997). At some point, the foregoing argument impliedly indicates that the student participants were not yet advanced in playing with varied creative styles during writing so that they found it difficult to make use of varied reiterations in writing. As regards the problems of using collocations, the student participants expressed that they knew only few word pairs or collocations. Difficulty in using English collocation is associated with less-advanced skill of writing because collocation uses are corresponding to the capability of using natural English words (Feng et al., 2018; Rezaee et al., 2015). Viewing a number of problems the students faced as revealed by this research, there is an implication that English writing lecturers have to take account of. In this case, English writing lecturers are expected to teach students writing cohesive devices explicitly. It is such as the thing argued by Webb and Nation (2017) that explicit learning of English is to some extent needed in case incidental learning does not really work in certain conditions.

Conclusion

The present research found that all students use cohesive devices in writing paragraphs in a moderate way. They use references in the form of personal pronoun and demonstrative reference. They use conjunctions in the form of additive conjunctions, adversative conjunctions, and clausal conjunctions. They use reiteration in the form of making repetitions of the same words. This condition indicates that they have moderately been able to use general cohesive devices. However, there are some more cohesive devices they have not used, such as comparative reference, nominal substitution, verbal substitution, clausal substitution, nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis, clausal ellipsis, temporal conjunction, and reiterations in the form of a synonym or near-synonym. Concerning the problems in using cohesive devices, they have no problems of using reference. However, they have varied problems in using substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, reiteration, and collocation. It implies that English writing lecturers need to help them cope with such problems of using cohesive devices by applying explicit teaching.

References

Abdelwahab, E., & Rahmtallah, E. (2020). EFL Students' Coherence Skill in Writing: A Case Study of Third Year Students of Bachelors in English Language. *English Language Teaching*, *13*(8), 120–126. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n8p120

Abu-Ayyash, E. A. S., & McKenny, J. (2017). The flesh and the bones of cohesive devices: towards a comprehensive model. *Journal of World Languages*, *4*(2), 94–117. https://doi.org/10.1080/21698252.2017.1417687

Ahmed, A. H. (2010). Students' Problems with Cohesion and Coherence in EFL Essay Writing in Egypt: Different Perspectives. *Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal*, *December 2010*, 211–221. https://doi.org/10.20533/licej.2040.2589.2010.0030

Ai, B., Kostogriz, A., Wen, D., & Wang, L. (2018). Student presentations as a means of teaching and learning English for Specific Purposes: an action research study. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2018.1557136

Al-Pachachi, A. O., & Naser, A. A. (2016). The use of cohesive devices in English drama texts for adults and children. *Angloamericanae Journal*, *1*(1), 28–60. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1069659

Anggraini, D., Hidayah, J., Edy, S., & Ariani, D. (2021). Indonesian EFL Teachers' Attitudes and Perceptions of Interculturality in English Learning. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, *8*(2), 435–451.

Apriani, E. (2016). A New Literacy: The Role of Technology to Develop Student's Character. *Ta'dib: Journal of Islamic Education*, *21*(1), 59–72.

Apriani, E. (2017). Utilizing preservice teachers strategies and classroom management Junior High School in Rejang Lebong Regency. *English Franca*, *1*(2), 149–194.

Apriani, E., Supardan, D., & Sartika, E. (2019). Utilizing ICT to develop student's language ethic at Islamic university. *POTENSIA: Jurnal Kependidikan Islam*, *5*(1), 1–14.

Arifani, Y. (2019). The application of small group and individual flipped model with WhatsApp to foster EFL learners' cohesive writing skill. *Library Hi Tech News*, *36*(4), 10–12. https://doi.org/10.1108/LHTN-12-2018-0075

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C. K., Walker, D. A., & Razavieh, A. (2010). Introduction to research in education. In *Measurement* (8th ed., Vol. 4, Issue 43). Wadsworth, Cengage Learning. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Bella, I. I., Hidayah, J., & Edy, S. (2020). Indonesian EFL Teachers' Attitudes towards Intercultural Communicative Competence as a Goal of EFL Learning. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, *7*(9), 410–422.

Craig, C. J., Zou, Y., & Poimbeauf, R. (2015). Journal writing as a way to know culture: Insights from a travel study abroad program. In *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice* (Vol. 21, Issue 4, pp. 472–489). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2014.968894

Deepa, R., & Gayathridevi, K. S. (2017). Outcome Assessment of a Writing Skill Improvement Initiative for Management Graduates. *International Journal of Educational Sciences*, *19*(1), 71–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/09751122.2017.1355607

Ebadi, S., & Rahimi, M. (2019). Mediating EFL learners' academic writing skills in online dynamic assessment using Google Docs. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *32*(5–6), 527–555. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1527362

Edy, S. (2014). The Effectiveness of Extensive Reading on Students' Reading Comprehension Achievement as Observed from Students' Motivation. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, *2*(1), 54–58.

Feng, H., Crezee, I., & Grant, L. (2018). Form and meaning in collocations: a corpus-driven study on translation universals in Chinese-to-English business translation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, *26*(5), 677–690. https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1424222

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Gall,M.D.,Gall,J.P.,&Borg, W. R.(2003).*Educational research:An introduction*(7th ed.).Allyn and Bacon.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (2014). *Cohesion in English*. Routlage.

Hidayah, J. (2017). Speaking and writing assessment applied by English lecturers of state college for Islamic studies (STAIN) at Curup-Bengkulu. *English Franca*, *1*(1), 1–18.

Hinkel, E. (2004). *"Rhetorical Features of Text: Cohesion and Coherence", Teaching Academic ESL Writing: Practical Techniques in Vocabulary and Grammar*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hinkel, Eli. (2001).Matters of cohesion in L2 academic texts. *Applied Language Learning*,*12*(2),111–132.

Hoey, M. (1996). *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford University Press.

Kang, J. Y. (2009). Referencing in a second language: Korean EFL learners' cohesive use of references in written narrative discourse. *Discourse Processes*, *46*(5), 439–466. https://doi.org/10.1080/01638530902959638

Ketabi, S., & Jamalvand, A. A. (2012). A corpus-based study of conjunction devices in English international law texts and its Farsi translation. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *4*(4), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i4.2578

Kirkpatrick, A. (2018). The development of English as a lingua franca in ASEAN. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M.

Dewey(Eds.),*The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp.138–150). Routlage.

Lauder, A. (2008). The status and function of English in Indonesia: A review of key factors. *Makara, Social Humaniora*, *12*(1), 9–20.

Lin, V., Liu, G. Z., & Chen, N. S. (2020). The effects of an augmented-reality ubiquitous writing application: a comparative pilot project for enhancing EFL writing instruction. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1770291

Ma'azi, H., Janfeshan, K., & Wang, S. (2018). The effect of Edmodo social learning network on Iranian EFL learners writing skill. *Cogent Education*, *5*(1), 1536312. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1536312

Manser, M. H., & McGauran, F. (2003). *Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary*. Oxford University Press.

Mauludin, L. A. (2018). Dynamic assessment to improve students' summary writing skill in an ESP class. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, *36*(4), 355–364. https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2018.1548296

Mauranen, A. (2018). Conceptualising ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & D. Martin (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 7–24). Routlage.

McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press.

McDonough, K., & Crawford, W. J. (2020). Identifying effective writing tasks for use in EFL write-to-learn language contexts. *Language Learning Journal*, *48*(4), 469–480. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2018.1465990

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Mohammed, A. S. (2015). Conjunctions as Cohesive Devices in the Writings of English as Second Language Learners. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *208*, 74–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.182

Morganna, R. (2017). Teachers' attitudes towards conducting interlanguage analysis to prepare better instructions. *International Journal of Pedagogy and Teacher Education (IJPTE)*, *1*(2), 127–138. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.20961/ijpte.v1i2.15080

Nugraheni, R. (2015). Cohesive Devices in Learners ' Writing. *LLT Journal*, *18*(1), 51–62.

Rahatlou, M. B., Fazilatfar, A. M., & Allami, H. (2018). English as a lingua franca in Iran: An attitudinal investigation into the in-service teachers. *Cogent Education*, *5*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1499215

Rankema, J. (2004). *Introduction to Discourse Studies*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Reid, J. (1993). *Teaching ESL writing*. Prentice Hall.

Rezaee, A. A., Marefat, H., & Saeedakhtar, A. (2015). Symmetrical and asymmetrical scaffolding of L2 collocations in the context of concordancing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *28*(6), 532–549. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2014.889712

Swan, M. (2005). *Practical English Usage (3rd Ed)*. Oxford University Press.

Wang, X., & Cho, K. (2010). Computational linguistic assessment of genre differences focusing on text cohesive devices of student writing: Implications for library instruction. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *36*(6), 501–510. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2010.08.006

Webb, S., & Nation, P. (2017). *How vocabulary is learned*. Oxford University Press.

Wells, N. A. (1997). Class journals, grading writing, and teaching writing style. *Journal of Geoscience Education*, *45*(4), 314–316. https://doi.org/10.5408/1089-9995-45.4.314

Wolf, M. K., Oh, S., Wang, Y., & Tsutagawa, F. S. (2018). Young Adolescent EFL Students' Writing Skill Development: Insights From Assessment Data. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *15*(4), 311–329. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2018.1531868

Yasuda, S. (2019). Children's meaning-making choices in EFL writing: The use of cohesive devices and interpersonal resources. *System*, *85*, 102108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102108

Copyrights