



## COHESION AND COHERENCE IN THESES WRITTEN BY UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS OF THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MATARAM

Nur Fitriyanti Aspany<sup>1\*</sup>, Untung Waluyo<sup>2</sup>, Nawawi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1 2 3</sup> English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,  
University of Mataram, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author: [nfspany@gmail.com](mailto:nfspany@gmail.com)

---

**Abstract:** The issue of cohesion and coherence has long been recognized as a serious problem among students of English who write theses. However, it remains unresolved up to now. This present study aims to analyze the cohesion and coherence contained in students' theses based on the theoretical constructs developed by Halliday & Hasan (1976) and Oshima & Hogue (2006). The study employs a descriptive qualitative approach. The data were taken from the top 8 selected theses written by undergraduate students of the English department at the University of Mataram. The data taken from the students' thesis manuscripts were categorized and analyzed based on the aforementioned theoretical perspectives. Results of the analysis show on the whole students' theses under investigation generated four issues related to the use of cohesion and coherence. The first issue dealt with the use of grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. The second issue contained errors in the use of cohesion devices and lexicon. The third was related to discrete coherence such as repeating key nouns, using consistent pronouns, using transition signals, and arranging ideas in logical order also found in the thesis. Fourth, incoherent theses were found because of misused repeating key nouns, inconsistent pronouns, and transition signals used. Thus, all aspects of cohesion and coherence in theses found in the theses but not comprehensive.

**Keywords:** cohesion; coherence; theses

---

**Received:** Nov 4, 2021

**Accepted:** Nov 16, 2021

**Published:** Dec 31, 2021

How to cite (in APA style):

Aspany, N. F., Waluyo, U., & Nawawi (2021). Cohesion and coherence in theses written by undergraduate students of the English department at the University of Mataram. *JEEF (Journal of English Education Forum)*, 1(2), 26-39.

---

### INTRODUCTION

One of the requirements to fulfill by the students of the English department at the University of Mataram before graduating is to accomplish a final project in the form of a written thesis in English. This requirement is stated in the Regulation of the Minister of Research, Technology and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia Number 44 of 2015 concerning graduates of undergraduate. To support this necessity, the English department at the University of Mataram equips students with several writing subjects each semester, such as paragraph writing, argumentative writing, essay writing, and academic writing. Besides, there are several classes such as grammar, syntax, semantics, vocabulary, and other subjects given to support the process of writing classes. In brief, the expected output after taking those classes is that the students can produce coherent and cohesive results of thesis writing which follows the rules of academic writing. Therefore, theses can be a credible source of knowledge and widely used as references for related disciplines.

However, the quality of the theses especially written by undergraduate English department students in terms of language and content is unidentified. In other words, the expectations regulated such as zero mistakes and errors in terms of writing and a low level of



plagiarism is not evaluated. This is evidenced by the fact that even dozens of theses are published by the faculty, still, there has been no previous research related to this problem conducted. When these matters repeatedly happen, then the writing classes provided every semester will not afford good results.

Moreover, the lack of ability of students in writing might be found due to the difficulty of students in understanding and mastering the components of the English language such as the use of cohesion and coherence. As quoted from Suwandi (2016), the fact found in the field is that the text written for the most part does not produce related paragraphs, is illogical, and uses disorganized phrases. Even English major students who have learned all skills in English still have difficulties in writing cohesively and coherently.

Accordingly, to produce structured, intact, and understandable theses writing, students must use cohesion and coherence devices. As cited by Hasanah (2017), Meyer (2009) defined cohesion as continuity processes that provide a relatedness between clauses. Besides, Yule (1993) characterized cohesion as ties and connections which exist within the text. Moreover, Halliday & Hasan (1976) stated that the concept of cohesion refers to the relationship of meanings that exist in the text and which defines it as a text. Cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some elements in the text depends on other elements. In a sense, a cohesive relationship is formed if there are cohesive ties integrated into a text. Cohesive ties have a function to link and connect sentences, causing a text to be in one piece, not a group of unrelated sentences. Halliday and Hasan (1976) also grouped cohesive ties into grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion.

In a wider explanation, grammatical cohesion is the coherence of writing that is achieved using elements and grammatical rules in the form of references, substitutions, ellipsis, and conjunctions. Reference refers to a specific item in the text or discourse. Reference cannot be interpreted semantically in its meaning but create a reference to something else for its interpretation. For more detail, reference is divided into 3 types which consist of personal references, demonstrative references, and comparative references. Personal references included: 1) personal pronouns consist of I/me, you, they/them, we/us, he/him, she/her, and it;

possessive pronouns are mine, yours, theirs, hers, hers, hers, ours; and 3) the final possessive determiner is mine, theirs, yours, her, hers, ours, mine. The demonstrative categories consist of the definite article (the), circumstance demonstrative (here, now, there, then), and nominative demonstrative (that, these, this, those). Whereas, comparative reference is used to refer to items through identity and similarity. Comparative reference is also classified into two types, i.e., particular and general comparison. Particular comparison expresses the equivalence between things relating to a particular property while general comparison reveals the similarity and divergence between two objects.

Furthermore, the next classification of grammatical cohesion is substitution. Substitution is a replacement of items with common words to avoid repetition. For better understanding, Halliday & Hasan divided substitution into three parts: 1) normal substitution is a substitute used to replace the same word in a nominal group by using *same*, *one* or *ones* substitution; 2) verbal substitution is the replacement of an element in the verb by using *do*, *does*, *did*, *done*, *so*, and *can*. 3) clausal substitution is used to substitute the entire clause. The items used are *so* and *not*. The following category is ellipsis. Ellipsis has the same function as



substitution, but the item is not replaced, it is removed or omitted. Because ellipsis and substitution are similar, the ellipsis subtype is divided identically into substitution: nominal, verbal, and clause. Nominal ellipsis is an item in the nominal group and usually becomes subject to the sentence. Verbal ellipsis is the omission of an item of the verbal group in a sentence. The previous verbal group is not fully mentioned in the next verbal group. Clause ellipsis is eliminating items in nominal and verb groups. And the last one is a conjunction which has a function as a cohesive tie. The conjunction has four categories divided by Halliday and Hasan (1976), the first one is additive conjunction. This type of conjunction is the most direct relationship, where the writer, after mentioning one thing, wants to continue to talk about other similar things. The second one is adversative conjunction which expresses the contradiction or contrast between two statements. Meanwhile, the third type is causal conjunction. It is used to introduce causes, reasons, or explanations for certain actions in a sentence.

Then, lexical cohesion deals with the relationships between lexical items in the text such as words and phrases that link sentences to one another. Additionally, this type of lexical cohesion can take place by reiteration and collocation. Halliday & Hasan (1976) explained that reiteration is the repetition of a lexical item or the occurrence of synonyms. Repetition is classified into four types: same word (repetition), close synonym, superordinate (metonym), and common word (hyponym). On the other hand, collocation is defined as a combination of several words that occur automatically and regularly in a language. This combination of words can occur between a verb with a noun, a noun with a noun, or a noun with an adjective.

As a complete and whole discourse, the theses written also should contain coherent devices. A text is called coherent if it is possible to construct a coherent representation of the text. In other words, the coherence relationship is a series of facts and ideas that are arranged in an orderly and logical manner. This also can occur implicitly because it is related to the field of meaning which requires various interpretations according to the context (Brown, 1983). It can be concluded that those two elements have an important factor in determining the level of readability and comprehension of a result of writing. By that explanation, Oshima and Houge (2006) stated that there are four ways to achieve coherence in writing; repeating key nouns, using consistent pronouns, using transition signals to link ideas, and arranging ideas in logical order.

Repeating key nouns has a function to create the smoothness of the sentences' flow and to help the reader understand and remember the main ideas in the text. Therefore, to make the correlation of each paragraph becomes coherent, the writer needs to look for similar words and simplify the common words repeated for the topic written. Besides, to create a coherent paragraph, using a consistent pronoun is a necessary because consistent pronoun in the written text makes the paragraph becoming clear and flawless. Additionally, using transition signals is needed to achieve coherent writing because the reader is being guided by the use of transition signals from one idea to the next idea since transition signals are words or phrases that add meaning to logically connect sentences and coherence in paragraphs. While arranging ideas in a logical order is also a must to create coherent text. There are three kinds of logical order, such as chronological order, logical division of ideas, and comparison/contrast. The explanation of chronological order is the idea in writing is instructed by the sequence of events or stages in doing the procedure. Meanwhile, logical division of ideas means dividing a topic chosen into several parts and explaining it one by one or step by step whereas comparison or



contrast in logical order discusses some of the similarities and/or differences of two or more things in the paragraph.

Empirically, there were several previous studies related to this present study as the references and comparisons, for instance, Liyana (2014) reported the findings of her research that there were four things related to cohesion and coherence. First, the theses were analyzed by using grammatical and lexical cohesion devices. Second, the error of cohesion devices was found in the use of references and conjunctions. Third, coherent devices were used and found. Fourth, there were several errors coherence of theses and the explanation of the problems obtained.

This research study aimed to analyze the types of cohesion and to explore the use of coherence in theses written by undergraduate students of the English education department at the University of Mataram.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed descriptive qualitative research focused on analyzing the use of cohesion and coherence in the theses written by undergraduate students of the English Education Department at the University of Mataram. The results of data analysis were described and presented in an explanation in the form of a descriptive sentence. Therefore, the researcher was enabled to describe, explain and reveal the data obtained in the field naturally. The steps of analysis were supported by the statement of Bogdan and Biklen (1982) which stated that qualitative research has descriptive nature so that the data can be collected in the form of documents, notes, or interviews. Eventually, the data were processed in sentences or words and presented as research findings.

The present study was conducted in the library of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education at the University of Mataram. The theses were analyzed through document analysis. There were several criteria for the theses to be analyzed such as 1) among the five chapters written in the thesis, the researcher analyzed the use of cohesion and coherence devices in chapter four about the findings and results; 2) the theses analyzed were theses written by students who have graduated with A score. The consideration is if students achieved perfect scores in thesis writing, that is, the theses they have written are errors free in the use of cohesion and coherence; 3) the theses analyzed were the theses for the last 3 years so that the result of the data was able to enrich and update existing knowledge. In addition, there were 8 theses collected and analyzed. Besides, for publication ethics and the thesis writers' confidentiality, the theses writers' names and titles were withheld.

The data were collected from documents in the form of the theses of undergraduate students which were taken from the library. As a data source, archival documents were used to gain the students' insights in the areas of cohesion and coherence, identify the uses for cohesion and coherence in their writing, and explain the identification results found. Furthermore, the process of documentation was provided into several steps. First, the researcher asked permission from the academic staff of the study program to research the theses of undergraduate students. Second, after the permission was granted, the researcher then asked the data of students who got an A for their theses in the last 3 years. The number of theses analyzed were eight theses. After the data were obtained, the researcher analyzed cohesion



and coherence devices used in theses writing by doing a checklist as a data instrument.

In analyzing the data, the researcher used the qualitative analysis proposed by Miles and Huberman (1994). According to them, the technique of data analysis consists of three steps, which are data reduction, data display, and conclusion. At the first step, the researcher selected the relevant data needed and cleaned unnecessary data. Then the data were grouped into several categories. In this research, the data that has been analyzed is the use of cohesion devices consisting of grammatical cohesion (reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction) and lexical cohesion (reiteration and collocation). Meanwhile, the use of coherence devices consists of repeating key nouns, using consistent pronouns, using transition signals to link ideas, and arranging ideas in logical order in chapter four of the undergraduate students' theses. The second step of data analysis is data displaying. Selected and categorized data then presented by narrating the data. After the data were obtained, the researcher copied, summarized, and interpreted it as a basis for understanding the topic studied. In this study, the data analysis process had started since the data collection was carried out by sorting out which data were important or not. The last step was giving a conclusion which aimed to cover all important information related to cohesion and coherence devices found in the students' theses.

## **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

The findings of this research were presented into two categories based on the research questions formulated. The first category discusses the cohesion devices use in English education undergraduate students' theses. In this section, the two major devices of cohesion such as grammatical and lexical cohesion based on the theory of Halliday & Hasan (1976) will be described in detail with errors or misuses in their use in theses. The second category discusses coherence elements according to Oshima and Hogue's (2006) theory in English education undergraduate students' theses along with samples and also their errors in using coherence elements. Thus, the findings are illustrated and presented by showing several selected samples.

### **Cohesion Devices in English Education Undergraduate Students' Theses**

In this study, all categories of cohesion devices use were obtained. Besides, the misuses of the cohesion devices are also found. Accordingly, the following explanation provided several examples of using the devices of cohesion in the theses written by undergraduate students.

#### **Grammatical**

##### **Cohesion References**

Reference refers to a specific item in the text. Reference cannot be interpreted semantically in its meaning but create a reference to something else for its interpretation. Several types of reference were found in the theses and explained below:

##### ***Data 1***

*Data from the interview revealed that a number of teachers admitted their problems with the application of the scientific method.. (p. 37/T3)*

The data above is a personal reference that refers to plural possessive pronoun. In the first sentence, **a number of teachers** functions as the subject of the plural pronoun. Meanwhile, in the second sentence, there is a possessive pronoun **their** which also refers to the plural. That is, it can be concluded that the possessive pronoun **their** in the second sentence refers to **a number of teachers**.

#### **Data 2**

*Before delivering his opinion, Corbuzier said “gue kan kenal lu udah cukup lama ya” which translates to “I’ve known you for quite a while right”. By uttering **those** words, Corbuzier tried to raise the common ground between him and Makarim by presupposing their familiarity. (p. 42/T4)*

The data above uses demonstrative reference **those** which used to count plural noun. **Those** is used because in the context of the sentence above, the writer does the process of translating some words from Indonesian to English so that they become **those words**. Visibly, plural noun referred to **words** (*By uttering those words*).

Briefly, the previous data explained the proper use of references in the theses analyzed. In addition, there are also inappropriate uses of references, especially in personal and demonstrative references pointed. Here is the example and explanation:

#### **Data 3**

*[The] study finds that in general, the students’ perceptions about the teaching and learning of TEYLclass in online learning is positive. (p. 38/T5)*

#### **Correction:**

*[This] study finds that in general, the students’ perceptions about the teaching and learning of TEYLclass in online learning is positive.*

Actually, **the** and **this** are both demonstrative references. However, **the** is a definite article in demonstrative, while **this** is circumstantial demonstrative. Both have different uses. As explained by Halliday & Hasan (1976), **the** is a definite article that functions to indicate a noun specifically, while **this** is a nominative demonstrative that is used specifically as a pointer. That is, demonstrative reference **this** is more appropriate to be used to show the study. In other words, demonstrative pronouns used is **this** serves as a pointer to **study**.

### **Substitutions**

Halliday and Hasan (1976) divide substitution into three types which consist of normal substitution, verbal substitution, and clausal substitution. However, in this study, the researcher found that only two types of substitution used. Those are nominal substitution and verbal substitution. The following data presents the substitution found in students’ thesis:

#### **Data 4**

*On the first podcast video, when discussing about how Indonesian education is still in need of improvements, Makarim stated that the three major education organizations in Indonesia (PGRI, Muhammadiyah, and NU) should re-join the POP program because they are the **ones** who have already been in the educational field even before Indonesia exist as a nation. (p. 37/T6)*

The sentences on data 4 applies the used normal substitution. The word **ones** is a substitution for plural numbered object for the things mentioned in previous sentence written which were ‘...*the three major education organizations in Indonesia (PGRI, Muhammadiyah, and NU)*’.

### Conjunctions

Conjunction has four categories. Those are additive conjunction, adversative conjunction, causal conjunction, and temporal conjunction. All of the categories were found in the theses. Here is the selected explanation:

#### **Data 5**

*Then, she tried to arrange the seat position randomly. As a result, the students were more active and feel comfortable with the new seat's position (p. 39/T8)*

The conjunction used in sentences on data 5 is causal conjunction with item **as a result**. The function of this item is used to explain the reason phenomenon in the second sentence can occur. Of course, it is because the statement from the first sentence which written ‘*Then, she tried to arranged the seat position randomly*’. This sentence indicates a cause occurs so that a random sitting position is managed. Certainly, there is also the expected result of the teacher in the sentence above, specifically that students become more active.

Apart from the explanation related to the use of conjunction cohesively, the researcher also observed category of conjunction misuses. Those are:

#### **Data 6**

*The same thing was also expressed by T7 "I think learning models are too difficult for a Grade 7 junior high school if the science is good, there is research." [And] T9 also expressions his opinion about the learning method. "I still feel less familiar in this contextually based learning. Sometimes, I forgot the order of the lesson. If problem-based learning I know ". [However, on the other hand], some teachers do not know or understand the existing methods.*

#### **Correction:**

*The same thing was also expressed by T7 "I think learning models are too difficult for a Grade 7 junior high school if the science is good, there is research." [Besides], T9 also expressions his opinion about the learning method. "I still feel less familiar in this contextually based learning. Sometimes, I forgot the order of the lesson. If problem-based learning I know ". [On the other hand], some teachers do not know or understand the existing methods. (p. 41/T3)*

In the data above, the writer placed two errors in the use of conjunctions. The first mistake is the improper use of additive conjunctions **and**. The conjunction **and** is used to link two clauses that have coordination in one sentence. Therefore, the most appropriate conjunction to use is **besides**. The second error in the data above lies in the inappropriate use of adversatives, which is repetition. The writer stated ‘*Sometimes, I forgot the order of the lesson. If problem-based learning I know*’. [**However, on the other hand**], some teachers do not know or understand the existing methods.’ The writer used two adversative conjunction items **however** and **on the other hand**. These two items have the same function as a conjunction to express contradiction. The writer should only use one adversative item in the



sentence so that cohesion is achieved.

### Ellipsis

Nominal and clause ellipsis were found in the theses. Despite of the proper use of ellipsis category in sentences written in the theses, there are several errors obtained. Further explanation can be seen as follows in sequence:

#### *Data 7*

*Most students showed little interest and made a disruption in the classroom when the teaching-learning process happened. (p. 39/T3)*

In data 7, **most students** after **and** is omitted by the writer. Supposedly, **most student** could be the subject of the second clause. However, even so, the reader can understand that there is a subject that is omitted because there is an ellipsis element which is a cohesive bond that has been formed in the sentence. So, the sentence above is a nominal category ellipsis.

#### *Data 8*

*But, even though his entire schoolmates did not want to be friends with him, Auggie was still nice to them. Moreover, the fact that he did not do any resistance [and] [did not] report the bullied to anyone, even Mr. Tushman, shows a good behavior, a relieved, a kindness. (p. 41/T1)*

#### **Correction:**

*But, even though his entire schoolmates did not want to be friends with him, Auggie was still nice to them. Moreover, the fact that he did not do any resistance [or] ~~did not~~ report the bullied to anyone, even Mr. Tushman, shows a good behavior, a relieved, a kindness.*

The error in the sentence above mainly lies in the use of verbal ellipsis in the second sentence. As it is known that ellipsis is the omission of words in the sentence to achieve a cohesion relationship. Therefore, the verb that comes after the conjunction **or** should be omitted so that the sentence becomes 'Moreover, the fact that he did not do any resistance or report the bullied to anyone, even Mr. Tushman, shows a good behavior, a relieved, a kindness.'

### Lexical Cohesion

#### *Data 9*

*...the formation of a new perspective in the speech given, but clearly it is still fairly equivalent of meaning in semantic. In the data 68 above, the perspective changed when the scene where 'Red' as the main character saw pigs not wearing even a single piece of clothing, made the translator look for an equivalent semantically. (p. 31/T1)*

In the example above, the writer still used repetition by using a noun **perspective** in the first and the second sentence. In the first sentence, the writer gave an idea about a **new perspective** formation. Then, in the second sentence, the writer still wrote the repetition of **perspective** but by adding demonstrative reference which means to give clearer intention about the **perspective** that the writer meant. Therefore, the repetition of **perspective** in the data were found as claimed by Halliday & Hasan (1976).



**Data 10**

*In the second video podcast with Rahmawati Kekeyi, Corbuzier and here were discussing about what **career path** Kekeyi wants to pursue in the future, she replied that she wants to be a **comedian**. (p. 31/T6)*

In data 10, collocation occurred in the form of words **career path** which then in the context of the sentence has a close relationship with the **comedian**. In short, the two words are related. This is because comedian is one of the career paths that can be chosen.

In addition to the data above, another data that explain the inappropriate use of lexical cohesion devices which results incoherent in writing is involved. Here is the example:

**Data 11**

*Via POV above shows that Auggie is **beloved**. He is **beloved** by her and their parents, Like the sun, Auggie is surrounded by them. (p. 34/T1)*

The use of repetition is intended to provide coherence to the discourse by repeating the same words. Repetition is one of the elements in lexical cohesion in the form of repetition of lingual units in the form of syllables, words, or parts of sentences that are considered important to apply stress in a context. However, the use of repetition in the second sentence is not necessary because the word **beloved** at the beginning of the sentence already explains that Auggie is **loved** by all his family members.

**Coherence Devices in English Education Undergraduate Students' Theses**

The order of writing sentences or paragraph coherently in the text must use cohesion devices properly. The development from one sentence to the next must be smooth and logic. Coherence will not be achieved if this process is not appeared. Here are the elements of cohesion pointed in the theses:

**Data 12**

*In addition, **the teacher** also facilitates students well, with a regular schedule, with intense meetings and discussions, good material exposure with various teaching materials, and there are goals to be achieved from the online learning process. **The teacher** encourages students to continue to be active in the learning process so that the class does not become passive and students do not just fill in online absences and then receive material without understanding what is being learned. **The teacher** will direct students so that during the discussion the material does not come out of the learning topic. (p. 43/T5)*

The paragraph above has **the teacher** which functions as a key noun. The writer of the thesis mentioned **the teacher** three times. The purpose of repeating this key noun is so that the written paragraph provides a clear purpose and intention. By repeating the teacher's key noun, the paragraph above can be categorized as a paragraph that has coherence. To be considered, there are no definite rules about how often key nouns should be repeated or when they should be replaced with pronouns (Oshima & Hogue, 2006).

**Using Consistent Pronouns****Data 13**

*In picture 19 and dialogues 13, the writer viewed that the media such a book was able to stimulate the*



*student's interest in expressing his feeling. It can be seen when **Raju** express **his** feeling confidently about the impress of **his** experience 203 class. On the contrary, it was being shock for all the students in the class, where **Raju** was a shy person. **He** rare to made conversation with another students in the class. So that it made **his** classmates did not know him well. (p. 50/T8)*

In the paragraph above, there is a consistent use of pronouns from the first to the last sentence, possessive pronoun **his** and personal pronoun **he** which refers to the same noun **Raju**. The use of pronouns is also appropriate, because both **his** and **he** are third person singular pronouns for **Raju** which is third person singular. Thus, the consistency of pronouns used achieved coherence in the paragraph of this the thesis.

### Using Appropriate Transition Signals to Link Ideas

#### *Data 14*

*In terms of students' involvement in teaching methods under 2013 curriculum, teachers can apply group learning, which consisted of the students who were in a lower and higher level of abilities. The students in the higher level of capacities should help the students who were in the lower ability directly.*

***On the other hand**, due to train students four competencies in learning related to 2013 curriculum 2013, teachers can use an exciting media that make the students easy to think critically. **In addition**, the teachers also gave more practice in order to build students' 4C skills. (p. 50-51/T3)*

Adversative conjunctions **on the other hand** were used by the writer to convey contradicting or contrasting ideas. As can be seen, in the first paragraph the writer explained the capacity of students in following the 2013 curriculum learning. Furthermore, in the next paragraph, the writer gave a statement that contrasts with the statement in the previous paragraph, which is the writer explained the teacher's capacity in teaching with the 2013 curriculum using conjunctions **on the other hand**. Additionally, the writer also added idea that is still related to the previous sentence using an additive conjunction **in addition** so that the paragraphs written achieve good coherence.

### Arranging Ideas in Logical Order

Based on the logical order described by Oshima and Hogue (2006), it appears that student theses are arranged chronologically. Starting from the background of the problem, several main problems can be formulated which are answered in chapter four. After answering the problems formulated specifically, the main focus of research is to get an answer or solution to the problem. Later, some research results will be found that are in accordance with the formulation of the problem discussed in chapter four, namely the part studied by the researcher. Throughout the researcher's analysis, the researcher found that all the thesis writers explained their findings and discussions logically.

Besides achieving the use of factors that build coherence in paragraphs, the researcher also found several paragraphs that were incoherence due to misuse in using factors or aspects to build coherence. The examples are as follows:



## Misused Repeating Key Nouns

### *Data 15*

#### *4.2.1. Establish Equivalent Technique*

**# [Establish Equivalent Technique]** is the using of a term or expression recognized by the dictionary as an equivalent in the Target Language (Molina & Albir, 2002). **It** is referring to the dictionary as main reference to these utterances however given output would not be too rigid. (p. 33/T4)

The data above is an example of misused repeating key nouns. The thesis writer wrote a sub-chapter entitled establish equivalent technique. However, at the beginning of writing the paragraph, the writer used the pronoun **it** and does not repeat the key noun establish equivalent technique. So, the paragraph above does not become a coherent paragraph.

## Using Inconsistent Pronouns

### *Data 16*

Honestly, online learning is fine. But **I** prefer more offline class because **we** need practice as a teacher to help to teach the student to know specific characteristics, behavior, etc. The teacher preserved active class with existing methods and with each assignment that makes up a portfolio and answer questions. And **I** think it is active, not monotonous so that the material is not only fed by the lecturers. Virtual meetings conducted through Google Meet are already active. So, every student has the opportunity to interact not only with the same person but it is just that virtual meetings are more activated, but because several obstacles that cannot be avoided such as limited quota and network constraints that make it impossible. **We** already get knowledge with assignments made by lecturers. And for less active class, the teacher must prepare the material well. (p. 45/T5)

In data 16, the researcher found inconsistencies in the use of pronouns. In the paragraph, there are two pronouns that make the coherence inconsistent. The pronouns used include **I** and **we**. Actually, if the writer already uses pronoun **I**, then the pronoun **we** should not exist. The use of the pronoun is inappropriate and makes it ambiguous, thus incoherent paragraph occurred. As stated by Oshima and Hogue (2006), what makes writing incoherent is the inconsistent use of pronouns.

## Using Inappropriate Transition Signals to Link Ideas

### *Data 17*

Based on the informal conversation of the participants, the researcher concludes that there are advantages and disadvantages in online learning. The problems that appear will always be there and cannot be avoided. **The first**, network problems that are very disturbing during the online learning process. **The second**, the problem is the limited quota that students have. **And**, the limited time in online learning. **Fortunately**, the teacher not only facilitated synchronous meeting but also asynchronous meeting. **So**, the students can learn easily and discuss. (p. 40/T5)

The data indicates that there is an error in the use of transition signals, causing the paragraph fragments contained in the student's thesis to be incoherent. The transition signals in question are the third and final part. Supposedly if the word is used first, then it is followed by thesecond, third, and so on. However, the transition signal used in the third part is **and**, while



in the fourth part the writer used **fortunately**. It is very clear that the conjunction **and** is not used to connect between sentences but between clauses, and of course, the use of **and** at the beginning of sentence is not justified in scientific reports such as theses. Then, the transition signal in the fourth part is better to use **eventually** or other temporal conjunctions related to steps than to use **fortunately**.

A total of 8 theses by students of English Education were analyzed using cohesion devices referring to the theory of Hasan & Halliday (1976), which are grammatical and lexical cohesion. However, not all theses used cohesion devices correctly and properly. The errors or misuses noticed were inaccuracies in the use of references, conjunctions, and ellipsis. Meanwhile, the error found in lexical cohesion is the inaccuracy in the use of repetition.

Departing from the explanation above, the main error lies in grammatical cohesion. This error occurs because according to Fengjie (2014), English students, especially English as foreign language learners are not proficient enough in English grammar so that they still make a number of grammatical errors. In addition, Sujana (2011) in Anjani (2019) asserts that without an adequate understanding of English grammar, students will not be able to express themselves precisely and accurately.

Dealing with coherence, most of the written documents of students in chapter 4 are categorized as coherence because the thesis writings applied the four indicators of coherence as stated by Oshima and Hogue (2006); repetition of key nouns, consistent use of pronouns, use of transition signals, and logical order. However, the results of this study also displayed that there were a number of errors obtained in the students' writing the errors relied on no key nouns repetition, missing and inappropriate use of pronouns (references), missing and inappropriate use of transition signals (conjunctions). The errors occurred because students do not repeat or use proper key nouns, pronouns they used were not repeated and even incorrect. In addition, the transition signals in each sentence or paragraphs are also written inaccurately and infrequently. Thus, the errors found in the findings lead the coherence in some parts in theses writings were not achieved. In fact, by using the quality of cohesion, the strength of the relationship found between cohesion and coherence becomes an undeniable relationship (Tanawong, 2014). Advantageously, the illogical order was not obtained in the chapter four of the theses because based on the outline of logical sequence created by Oshima and Hogue (2006), the thesis written was developed by chronological order. This is because the writing of chapter four is in accordance with the research questions' formulation scripted. Furthermore, these findings are also in line with the findings of one of the related studies written by Liyana (2014) which identified that there were several problems with inconsistent use of pronouns, misuse of transition signals, and insufficiently repetition of key nouns in students' theses analyzed.

## CONCLUSIONS

The use of cohesion written in the theses to compose and link meaning in sentences was discovered to consist of grammatical cohesion including references, conjunctions, ellipsis, and substitution and lexical cohesion consists of reiteration and collocation. However, four theses did not consist of substitution and two theses did not use collocation. Additionally, misuse in using cohesion devices was also found. Seven theses did not use references correctly, four theses misused conjunctions, two theses misused ellipsis, one thesis misused

repetition and synonym.

Furthermore, the results of coherence analysis on students' theses showed that theses are written coherently based on chronological order. Two theses did not apply repeating key nouns, three theses were not found using consistent pronouns and transition signals did not appear in four theses. Besides, there was one thesis that misused repetition of key nouns, two theses used inappropriate transition signals, and one thesis used inconsistent pronouns.

Apart from the shortcomings contained in this study, the results may provide benefits for students to pay more attention to their writing products so that the writing is cohesive and coherent and to learn more about the use of proper cohesion and coherence devices. In addition, the results of this study can also provide informative input to lecturers to be more concerned in noticing the students' writing results. Then, when doing writing lectures, students are given warnings and in-depth explanations related to the concepts and aspects of writing. The results of this study are also expected to provide inspiration and innovation to other researchers to conduct research related to the use of cohesion and coherence devices in other students' writing products or analyze the use of cohesion and coherence devices in the entire chapters of students' thesis, not only focusing on chapter four.

## REFERENCES

- Anjani, D. A. T. (2019). *An Exploration of Writing Errors Contained in The Students' Descriptive Writing Product: A Study in Laboratory High School of Tarlac Agricultural University, Philippine* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Mataram).
- Bogdan, Charles R, & Biklen, Kopp S. (1982). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Allyn and Bacon, Inc.: Boston London.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1993). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fengjie, L., Xiuying, Y., & Chuanze, Z. (2014). *Analysis of the problems on coherence in college English writing*. *International Journal of Language and linguistics*, 2(6), 387-390.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hasanah, I. N. *A Cohesion and Coherence on Students' Exposition Writing (A Discourse Analysis)* (Bachelor's thesis, FITK UIN JKT). Downloaded in <https://repository.uinjkt.ac.id/dspace/bitstream/123456789/34582/1/Ina%20Nur%20Hasanah-FITK>
- Kementerian Riset, Teknologi, dan Pendidikan Tinggi. (2019). *Edaran Punlikasi Karya Ilmiah Program Sarjana, Magister dan Program Doktor*.  
<https://ldikti8.ristekdikti.go.id/2019/06/13/edaran-publikasi-karya-ilmiah-program-sarjana-program-magister-dan-program-doktor/>
- Liyana, C. I. (2014). *Cohesion and Coherence in English Education Students Thesis*. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 1(2).
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2006). *Writing Academic English* (No. 808.042 O82 2006). Pearson Education.



- Rositasari, D. (2019). *Cohesion and Coherence Analysis on Thesis Abstract of Students' English Letters Department* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas
- Suwandi, S. (2016). *Coherence and Cohesion: An Analysis of the Final Project Abstracts of the Undergraduate Students of PGRI Semarang*. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 5(2), 253-261. Downloaded in <https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/IJAL/article/view/1349>
- Tanawong, P. (2014). *The relationship between cohesion and coherence in writing: The case of Thai EFL students* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Zaim, M., & Ningsih, K. (2019). *Coherence and Unity of Students' Writing on Background of the Study of Research Proposal*. In 1st International Conference on Education Social Sciences and Humanities (ICSSHUM). (pp. 399-404). Atlantis Press. Downloaded in <https://www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/icesshum-19/125914674>