

Examining Text Coherence in Graduate Students of English Argumentative Writing: Case Study

Sri Wuli Fitriati

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

Fadhila Yonata

English Language Education, Graduate Program
Universitas Negeri Semarang (UNNES)
Semarang, Indonesia

Abstract

This study aims at examining the writing skills of a group of Indonesian graduate students of English. A particular attention has been focused on the coherence of their production of argumentative texts. Employing a discourse analytical case study, three texts written by three Master's degree students of the English language education at a local university in Central Java, Indonesia, were analyzed. Coherence and cohesion is inextricable in which both are crucial in academic writing as to achieve a makes-sense text. Therefore, it is an urgent need to look at the writing competency of students as they are at graduate level, majoring in the English language education. The texts produced by the students were scrutinized through the lens of micro- and macro-level coherence (Thornburry, 2005). From this theory, cohesion is involved in micro level coherence. The findings indicate that the students show a bit weakness on achieving coherent texts due to lack of optimization of cohesive devices especially conjunctions to create interconnectedness of the whole sentences in the texts.

Keywords: argumentative text, coherence, cohesion, graduate students,
written discourse analysis

Cite as: Fitriati, S. W., & Yonata, F. (2017). Examining Text Coherence in Graduate Students of English Argumentative Writing: Case Study. *Arab World English Journal*, 8 (3).

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no3.17>

Introduction

It is common that writing skills positioned as the last skill to acquire by foreign language learners, including in the teaching and learning of English language. This is probably because of the complexity of writing process. Without disregarding the three other skills, writing may always be the most difficult for learners of English as a foreign language (EFL). This may be so because in this skill the student writers need to verbalize their abstract ideas in their brain into a written form by paying attention to many things (idea, concept, vocabulary, and grammar) (Khunaifi, 2015). Due to its complexity and high-conscious-language-knowledge-needed, writing can be used as the parameter of a result of students' linguistic knowledge longitudinal development. The ability in writing then is seen in writing product; that is a text.

Creating a text is not simply about expressing ideas by writing them in a bundle of words. Theoretically, a text has to be built from adequate structural and grammatical resources for written form. Beyond its form and structure, in writing a text it is further about contemplating the purpose of the text as a way of communication between the writer and the reader. Therefore, the reader's side also needs to be considered. The relationship between text and communication has been asserted by Widdowson (2007) who explains that a text, in general, may be defined as a piece of language as distinct from a sentence and it has a communicative purpose.

To make sure the readers easily grasp writers' intended meaning, the texts have to meet requirements of a meaningful text. Thornbury (2005) states that a good text has elements within bounded together and need to make sense to readers. These elements of writing are also known as cohesion and coherence of the text. He further explains that the cohesion is how a text hangs together to make a 'text' and the coherence is about the sense-making quality of a text.

Cohesion and coherence are inextricable, in which both of these features were examined in the present study. The cohesion of a text may be derived from cohesive devices or cohesive ties. These devices are prominent linguistic markers in which the function is to relate each idea into a core principle of the text. The connective properties stick the elements of the text or the whole sentences in order to make the interpretation of the text easier (Shirazi and Nadoushani, 2017). Therefore, the text is not only composed of a bundle of sentences just hanging together but also it has to be semantically united in the whole sentences through cohesive devices.

Cohesion itself is the prerequisite of coherence. This idea is based on Hasan (1976) as cited in Li and Wu (2017) who state that "cohesion is the foundation on which the edifice of coherence is built", and "the basis for textual coherence lies in cohesion" (p. 210). In this study, the main focus is on coherence and the analysis of cohesion is included directly as it is one of the requirements to make a coherent text. The presence of cohesion is then assumed to construct internal coherence of text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Eggins, 2004; Widdowson, 2007).

Coherence, moreover, is an attempt to make the entire text understandable. As stated before that a written text is aimed to be a medium of communication, not only interconnectedness among sentences has to be linked with cohesive devices, but it needs coherence of the whole text as a means of sense-making sentences (Rahman, 2013). In making sense of a text, the writers need to build the context of the text in order to build schema for

readers understanding the whole text (Thornburry, 2005). It means that in discussing a certain topic, for instance the scope of the topic is new for the readers, the writers are responsible for describing the situation explicitly. By doing this, it will lead the readers to connect information from the text to their mental background knowledge. This is also supported by Fitriati (2016) who argues that contextualizing the text is one of the ways to accomplish the communicative purpose. Thus, a coherent text is one of the requirements in creating communicative written text.

However, a text which is cohesive does not necessarily mean it is coherent. The text may be well connected with cohesive devices but the reader also may not be able to understand what the text is about (Yule, 2009). Widdowson (2007) states that a text can be cohesive but a lack of coherence in that it does not bring the reader into any familiar schema of an interpersonal kind. Therefore, in reaching coherence, it depends on how far the readers can relate the text contextually with their particular socio-cultural knowledge they have. In academic perspective, understanding a text is also affected by the readers' level of knowledge.

Several studies related to text coherence analysis have been carried out, particularly in the context of English language teaching. Karadeniz (2017) carried out a study of the analysis of cohesion and coherence of students' written texts in Turkey. By employing qualitative research design, specifically, document review technique, he revealed that the ability to optimize cohesive devices is in relation to coherent text-making. In the other words, cohesion and coherence influence students writing quality. Suwandi (2015) conducted a research about cohesion and coherence in four final project abstracts of undergraduate English language department students. The result of this research shows that the abstracts are still lack of coherence though some cohesive ties are used to link each sentence. Further, a fundamental mistake such grammatical errors is also found.

Triggered by these previous studies, especially research done by Suwandi (2015) about the situation in the Indonesian EFL learner context, a concern comes up on the ability of EFL learners in producing a coherent text. The ability to create a text coherently is highly demanded from EFL learners, especially graduate (or, Master's degree) students majoring in English. Students of the graduate program in this present study are teachers of English at a primary school and a junior high school, and the other one runs his own English language course in a town. Therefore, as teachers themselves, their ability in creating good quality text is needed. They are expected not only able to write coherent texts to provide a good model for their students, but also to teach them how to write a coherent text by making use of cohesive devices.

The students' texts which were examined in this current study belong to an argumentative text or analytical exposition text. In this article, the two terms 'argumentative text' and 'analytical exposition text' are used interchangeably. This type of text demands the writers to express their arguments to persuade the readers that something is the case. The generic structure of this text type consists of thesis which introduces the topic and indicates writer's position, arguments which are developed to support each point of arguments, and reiteration which restates writer's position (Gerot & Wignell, 1995, p. 197). Writers are required to state not only their opinions on a certain case, but also support their focused propositions by giving supporting evidence, examples, or illustration to make the readers convinced with the writers' arguments, as

Khunaifi (2015) suggests that argumentative text requires students to get empirical data in order to understand what position they will be regarding the topic being discussed.

The current study is aimed to reveal the text coherence of argumentative texts written by students of English Education Graduate School. The main reason of choosing this level of students is that, as advanced EFL students, they are expected to have adequate writing skills since they have already obtained a Bachelor's degree on English language education. As English learners as well as English teachers in the same time, this analysis is needed in order to reveal the current condition of their ability in communicating their arguments in written form meaningfully. As English language learners, they need to be able to express their ideas coherently in written form in terms of articles or academic papers. As supported by Boardman and Frydenberg (2008) that cohesion and coherence aspects must be considered as pivotal characteristics while writing an academic text. In another role, as professional English teachers, they need to prepare their students to be able to communicate through written text meaningfully. Moreover, as in the four-level of literacy taxonomy proposed by Wells (1987), graduate students are in the level of epistemic literacy in which they are expected to be able to act upon and transform knowledge and experience to whom who has never learned it before.

The novelty of the current study then is in involving graduate students as the subject of the study. As far as we have concerned, little is known about the writing ability of Master's degree students in terms of their skills in making a coherent text. One of the current studies was conducted by Bakaa (2014) who investigated the ability of non-native speakers Iraqi and native speakers Australian Postgraduate students in writing argumentative text. The result showed a failure of non-native-speaker students in constructing voice and authority appropriately through the thematic organization. Inspiring from this study, the current study is going to explore not only thematic progression but also the influence of cohesive devices in organization of the texts produced by Indonesian students of English at graduate level.

Thornbury (2005) suggests an approach to the analysis of cohesiveness and coherence of a text. He suggests that the cohesiveness of a text may be measured through lexical cohesion, grammatical cohesion, and rhetorical cohesion. In lexical cohesion, the cohesiveness may be made through directly repeated words, word families, synonyms, and antonyms; words from the same semantic field, lexical chains and list; substitution with one/ones. In terms of grammatical cohesion, the cohesiveness may be made from reference (pronouns and articles); substitution of clause elements using *so*, *not*, *do/does/did*; ellipsis of clause elements; conjuncts (also linkers); and tense. The last element is rhetorical cohesion that can be made from question-answer form and parallelism.

In regards to coherency, Thornburry (2005) explains two perspectives, namely the micro-level and the macro level of coherence. In micro level, coherence is achieved when the entire text answers readers' expectation. It can be achieved through theme-rheme pattern and logical relation in each sentence within the text. In macro-level coherence, the text is obviously about something since the topic is identifiable and delivered in a certain known genre. The readers then interact with the text and get complete the communication purpose of the text through schemas and scripts that have already built in readers' mind. The schema is the mental representation of

knowledge based on readers' experience of the world and it will be used to interpret the text. The script can be defined as readers' expectation about things to happen in the text; it is sometimes realized through the generic structure and register (Thornburry, 2005; Wang & Guo, 2014).

The present study focuses on the analysis of coherence, by employing Thornburry's micro and macro level of coherence (2005), to reveal to what extent the graduate students in a local university achieve coherence in their argumentative texts, especially analytical exposition texts. Therefore, the objectives of this study can be formulated as follows: (1) what are the cohesive devices used in the students' argumentative texts, and how do these cohesive devices contribute to the organizational pattern or thematic development of the texts? (2) How is the quality of the graduate students' argumentative texts in terms of text coherence?

Method

This is a qualitative case study seeking an answer as to how, and to what extent Indonesian graduate students majoring in the English language education achieve coherence in their argumentative texts, employing written discourse analysis. Specifically, this study analyzed naturally occurring written data as the students, in this case, the writers of the texts, in the beginning, were not told that their writings would be used as the object of the research.

The source of the data was taken from argumentative texts written by graduate students at a local university in a city in the Central Java Province, Indonesia. The texts were written in about one and a half hours in one session of Academic Writing class. The students were given a piece of paper containing a mind mapping image of a certain topic, that is, saving energy for climate change.

As this is a case study, the researchers took three texts purposively. After choosing the texts, the researchers asked a permission from the three students – the writers of the three texts whether or not they allowed their texts to be used as the object of this study. Although the findings of this study can not be generalized in other settings or research site, it is hoped that the present study will shed some light on the issue of coherence.

The analysis of the data started with identifying clauses and clause complexes. Then, each clause complex was investigated in terms of their cohesive devices and in the whole text. The findings of the use of cohesive devices were presented in tables which then were interpreted. In analyzing the text coherence, the texts were analyzed in terms of thematic pattern and logical relationship across the sentences. Further, the analysis was done in terms of schema established within the texts by identifying lexical chains and generic structure. In short, the task of data analysis required elaborative complex processing by the researchers following the theoretical framework of cohesion and coherence suggested by Thornburry (2005).

Findings

The findings reveal a bundle of linguistic evidence related to cohesion and coherence of the texts. This section will start with the findings on cohesive devices mostly found in each text. Then, it will be followed by the findings on the text coherence with regard to micro- and macro-level analysis of coherence.

Cohesion

Lexical cohesion

Lexical cohesion is achieved through the choice of lexical items. It is realized in terms of “word repetition and lexical chaining of words that share similar meaning” (Thornbury, 2005). Based on the analysis, the frequent words appeared in the texts were identified and ordered from the most to the less. The findings show that several words come up as the most repeated words. In text 1, the frequent word is *energy* (9x), followed by *saving* (5x) and *school* (5x). The words or set of words mostly appeared in text 2 are *school* (14x), *global warming* (8x), and *stop* (7x). Meanwhile, in the text 3, the frequent words are *energy* (12x), *school* (11), and *action* (8x). Moreover, in accordance with lexical cohesion, the use of words from same semantic field and words sharing common roots is found in the texts. For example in a sentence *It is actually caused by climate change, this condition is a result of global warming*, the term *climate change* and *global warming* are words from same semantic field which talks about natural phenomenon.

Unfortunately, there were less lexical variations in terms of using synonym, antonym, hyponym, and meronym. Only in text 2 contains six synonymous words and text 3 has 4 synonymous words. Moreover, only one Antonym word is found in each text. Then, one pair of hyponym words is found in text 1 and text 3 and two pairs in text 2. In regards to meronym, no word is identified in all texts. From these findings, it may describe that the writers produce limited lexical variations in the texts.

Grammatical cohesion

The second type of analysis is grammatical cohesion. Grammatical cohesion is simply related to pronouns, linkers, and tense (Thornbury, 2005). The first part of grammatical cohesion is the presence of reference. The first kind is the **anaphoric** reference which occurs when the writer refers back to someone or something that has been previously identified, to avoid repetition. The second one is the **cataphoric** reference which is the opposite of anaphora: a reference forward as opposed to backward in the discourse. The last one is the **exophoric** reference which is used to describe generics or abstracts found within the text or in the context of the situation. There is an additional reference called as the homophoric reference. It is used to refer to something known in the context of culture. Based on the analysis, it is found the great number of anaphoric references used in the texts. The number of references found in text 1 is eleven anaphoric, one cataphoric, and two homophoric while Text 2 has eight anaphoric, two cataphoric, and one homophoric references. Further, in text 3, there are 14 anaphoric with no cataphoric and two homophoric references. The pronoun *it* in the sentence below is denoted from *getting hotter from day to day* which is stated in the previous sentence. The piece of evidence can be seen as follow: *It is actually caused by climate change; this condition is a result of global warming*.

The second part is to find substitution of clause elements using *so*, *not*, *do/does/did*. However, there is no one evidence found in all the texts about substitution. Another part related to clause elements is ellipsis. This such grammatical form is found once in text 1 and text 2 whereas it is absence in text 3 as can be seen in the following sample:

*You can also set the temperature for your heater into normal degree (18°C - 20°C in winter and 26°C in summer), even students can do it themselves. **By doing this**,*

lesson still can continue comfortably without wasting unnecessary energy (Paragraph 2).

In this finding, *doing this* substitute *set the temperature for your heater into normal degree*. This occurred to avoid repetition of phrase from the previous sentence in the next sentence. The use of substitution further is to facilitate connection from one sentence to others in readers' cognition. In short, the reason to apply this such aspect of grammatical cohesion is to prevent from repetition of phrases and further to get out of reader's boredom.

Further, another part related to grammar issue of cohesion is conjuncts and linkers. Text 1 employs *after* and *at the end* as temporal conjunction; *if*, *because*, and *because of* as causal conjunction; *as well as* and *however* as adversative conjunction; and *or* and *and* as additive conjunction. In text 2, temporal conjuncts are *the first*, *the second*, *the last* and *finally*; causal conjunct is *or*; adversative conjuncts are *however* and *at least*; and additive conjunct are *and* and *so*. Meanwhile, in text 3, conjunctions used are *the first*, *meanwhile*, *the second*, *in lunch time*, *finally*, and *the next* related to temporal relation; *because*, *since*, *so*, *so that* and *because* related to causal relation; *and*, *therefore*, *at least*, *then*, *or*, and *beside* related to additive relation. There is no adversative conjunction used in this text.

The last part of cohesion regarding grammar is Tense used in the text. All of the texts were written in varied present forms. As in text 1, the identified Tenses are Present Tense as in: *One way to solve this problem is by doing environmentally friendly activities*; Present Future as in: *Doing this regularly will help your environment a lot*; Present Continuous as in: *If more people (are) doing this together, climate change can be solved in the near future*. Meanwhile, Present Tense and Present Future were the only kind of Tenses used in text 2 and 3.

Rhetorical cohesion

Rhetorical cohesion is related to the discourse of the text. Thornburry (2005) argues that this is realized through question-answer form and parallelism (p.23). In a case of parallelism, there is no evidence found in all texts. There is only one evidence embedded in text 1 of question-answer form as can be seen in the following sentence: *Do you feel that it is getting hotter from day to day? It is actually caused by climate change; this condition is a result of global warming.*

Coherence

Coherence analysis involved the analysis of thematic progression along with its logical relations within the text. In term of thematic pattern, as Eggins (2004) argues there are three main patterns of thematic development can be observed namely Theme reiteration, zig-zag pattern, and multiple-Rheme pattern. According to the analysis of text 1, it was only found Theme reiteration and zig-zag pattern fold within the text. It can be seen as an example of reiteration in the table below. In the column of Theme slot, two Themes represents same information. The referent 'there' in the clause 21 is referred to the previous Theme 'canteen'. Though the two Themes are related, the new information brought in Rheme slots are different each other.

Table 1
The example of Theme reiteration

	Theme	Rheme
Clause 20	Going to canteen	is also a good choice for your recess.
Clause 21	There	you can also <u>do energy saving</u> .

Further, zig-zag pattern is also employed in the text as it can be seen in the table below. This pattern is called as so because the Theme in a clause is carried from Rheme in the preceding clause. From the table, Theme 'this condition' in clause 4 is used to refer to Rheme 'climate change' in the previous clause. The noun phrase 'global warming' is also restated in next clause as Theme.

Table 2
The example of Zig-zag pattern

	Theme	Rheme
Clause 3	It	is actually caused by <u>climate change</u> ,
Clause 4	this condition	is a result of <u>global warming</u> .
Clause 5	Global warming	happens because of human activities

These such kind of Thematic patterns also occurs in text 2 and text 3. Moreover, in those texts are also identified multiple-Rheme, as a couple of the evidence can be seen as follow:

Table 3
The example of multiple-Rheme in text 2

	Theme	Rheme
Clause 12	There	are at least <u>three ways</u> to stop the global warming from school canteen.
Clause 13	<u>The first one</u>	is to use only locally grown product.
Clause 14	Locally grown products	do not need to travel very far from the farm to the school
Clause 15	that it	will not consume a great amount of fuel.
Clause 16	<u>The second one</u>	is to have a day in a week that all the students and teacher only eat vegetables.
Clause 17	Vegetables	take less time to cook,
Clause 18	so it	will not need to use much fuel.
Clause 19	<u>The last one</u>	is to use low energy fridge to decrease the use of the electric energy.

Table 4
The example of multiple-Rheme in text 3

	Theme	Rheme
Clause 10	There are several things	that we can do as the tips of energy saving climate change for our school, such as things related to <u>transportation, waste, and electricity.</u>
Clause 11	<u>The first way</u>	is by taking consideration is the use of models of transportation.
Clause 18	Then, <u>the second way</u> to save energy for our	is by paying attention to the waste organization.
Clause 28	<u>The next</u> tips that we can do in saving energy	is by using office equipment properly.

Another aspect in micro-level coherence is the logical relationship. However, not all of sentences arranged answered reader's expectation. The ideas seemed to come from elsewhere and had no relation with information in preceding sentences or it is called as a rogue sentence. In text 1, it was found two rogue sentences. One of the evidence is as in sentence 26 *If you cannot avoid vehicle, try to use public transportation* in which even vehicle was introduced in the previous sentence but reader's expectation is this sentence would provide about vehicle. Further, two rogue sentences were also found in text 2, as one of evidence is *There are so many aspects in the school that can be modified to stop the global warming*. This sentence is a rogue sentence by virtue of coming from nowhere since the reader would come to expect relationship *the largest community in society* with climate change issue as introduced in previous sentence but the writer carried forward new information (*aspect in the school*). It can be seen as in the table 5:

Table 5
The example of rogue sentence

No	Sentence
25	At the end when you go home, use environmentally friendly vehicle.
26	If you cannot avoid vehicle, try to use public transportation.
27	It can still decrease the pollution.

In sentence 25, the theme (*at the end*) indicates the last sequence that has been stated in previous sentences. The comment (*environmentally friendly vehicle*) demands example in the next sentence to give an illustration to the readers. Unfortunately, sentence 26 does not give example as reader's expectation. This sentence is then categorized as a rogue sentence. However, this mistake does not significantly affect the whole text. The sentence actually is not completely composed yet since the string of the sentences needs more elaboration or contextualization and they seem jumping from one issue to others quickly without any adequate explanation left.

Further, in regarding macro-level-coherence, the aspect being analyzed is a clue to show obviously what the text is about. This is more likely to be said as a topic of the text in which it may be also topic of some of individual sentences in the texts. From the texts, each topic has been identified through repeated words in which it signals keywords of the text (Thornburry,

2005). Further, it can be concluded the three texts have similar topic; it is about *saving energy at school*. Moreover, the analysis moved toward internal patterning of the text through thematic pattern analysis. By doing this, it would be revealed whether or not the whole sentences were interrelated. The last aspect regarding macro-level coherence is schema or reader's mind. Prediction of what following sentence is about after preceding sentence leads to acknowledging genre. The obvious characteristics of the text bring to some assumption about kind of genre applied in the texts; the genre is analytical exposition. The supporting information regarding this such judgment is in the last paragraph of these texts providing conclusion or thesis reiteration for the readers. Overall the texts have fulfilled characteristics of analytical exposition texts in terms of its generic structure and language features.

Discussion

This discussion section is started from the answer of the first research question about kinds of cohesive devices used in the graduate students' argumentative texts. The overall results, which are seen from the cohesion analysis which covers lexical, grammatical and rhetorical cohesion, emerges less optimization of cohesive devices used by the writers in their texts.

Started from the variation of lexical items used in the texts, the writers generate repetition and words from semantic field frequently to keep the readers on the track. This conforms the findings of Kafes (2012) in Rahman (2013) who emphasized that repetition was predominantly used by non-native students in their English written essay. As the graduate students, they may be aware of needs to stick the main topic to the whole texts. The repeated words used also indicate the intention of the writer to emphasize what the topic is and they are presented adequately. The expected condition is caused by graduate students' extended knowledge of writing which overuse of similar repeated words leads boredom to the readers. However, sense relation of certain lexical items such as using synonym antonym, hyponym, and meronym are unexpectedly underrepresented. Only a small of number synonym is used in all the texts. These findings actually confirm Rahman's study (2013) that non-native students frequently use repetition and scarcely vary the words with synonyms and antonyms. Since the writers were assigned to create a text only in a limited time, as non-native English students, perhaps optimizing words in vocabulary storage may be difficult.

Moving toward to grammatical cohesion, the analysis showed the massive use of references, specifically tremendous use of anaphoric references. This fact may be good since this indicates the text is accessible for public readers. It is supported by Eggins (2004) says such type of retrieval reference facilitates readers whenever they want to trace the referent in a sentence, it is already stated in the previous sentences. Thus, in the other words, the elements in the text intertwine each other. She also adds anaphoric reference creates the internal texture of the text in which the text will be the context-independent use of language. By this, the texts can be used every when and everywhere since they possibly across space and time. By having no context-dependent the texts then have achieved cohesion aspect.

Regarding conjunctions used in the text, the result shows that the number of conjuncts was still low quantity. This may influence the smoothness of understanding the text to the readers. However, the writers cannot be judged as less competent only due to this situation

because time limitation is one of the factors to be taken account. Longer time duration is needed for them to explore more connective ties. This is also similar to Karahan (2015) who found that limited time may cause foreign language learners not use a large variety of connectives in their essay.

The other aspects of grammatical cohesion are ellipsis and substitution. The previous studies also reveal that these two aspects are underused by the students in writing (Rahman, 2013; Suwandi, 2015). Under-practice of these aspects in writing is usually the reason why the students hardly optimize these in their writing in order to get more text cohesiveness. Moreover, this situation is assumed as normal in written text as stated by de Beaugrande and Dressier (1981) as cited in Karadeniz (2017) that reference, conjunction, and lexical cohesion are common in written expressions, while ellipsis and substitution are used in oral expressions. Regarding rhetorical cohesion, only text 1 employed question-answer form to raise reader's expectation to find an answer within the text after reading the question. The answer is expectedly met, the text then is assigned as cohesive regarding fulfillment of rhetorical cohesion. Moreover, parallelism is absent in all texts which later indicate the texts have not succeeded in exploring readers' willing to act toward the texts curiously. Actually, question-answer and parallelism are two kinds that are not well known by the non-native speaker writers. These two aspects demand high critical thinking and also habit in implementing them in writing. Question-answer form may be assumed as the way to gain readers' interests especially the questions that are controversial.

Overall, the discussion covers about cohesion of the texts made by Graduate students. From the analysis, the frequent aspect of cohesion used is lexical and grammatical cohesion. This may arise the following-up question about the relation of these cohesion findings toward organizational of the text. Therefore, further analysis of the texts is about revealing the quality of Graduate students' argumentative texts in terms of text coherence or to know whether the texts make sense or not. Sense-making quality and text internal cohesion create a coherent text.

The first aspect of sense making quality is micro-level coherence while it is realized through sentence-by-sentence analysis. The beginning issue is about Theme-Rheme pattern or thematic organization of the text which discovers about how the topic of a sentence or the message is placed in a sentence. As stated in findings, there were several patterns may be adopted in sentence flow structure namely reiteration, zig-zag, and multiple patterns (Eggins, 2004). Reiteration means the clauses retain the same Theme or referent and all of the Themes are linked up with each other. Zig-zag means the Theme in the second clause is the Rheme in the first clause. So, the new information in the second sentence is derived from the old information in the previous clause or it can be coded as Rh1-Th2, Rh2-Th3 (Rh denotes Rheme and Th denotes Theme). Multiple pattern, or also called as derived progression by Danes (1974) in Hawes (2015), is the themes connect to an implicit 'hypertheme' of the whole text. Based on the analysis, the most frequent Theme progression is zig-zag pattern and followed by Theme-reiteration. The use of zig-zag pattern is in line with the end-weight principle by placing the newsworthy or new information in Rheme slot (Thornburry, 2005). Ordering the new and old information properly and adequately have shown that in terms of Theme-progression the texts are coherent already. The status as advanced tertiary students may be assumed as the reason why the Graduate students have served information flow to the readers in such a way.

Despite the progression of Theme and Rheme, the analysis goes to the detail information in sentence-by-sentence. It was found that there were some rogue clauses in which the Theme or the topic could not be retrieved from somewhere else in previous clauses. These such clauses may affect the logical relationships between sentences. As evidence in text 1, the noun phrase *friendly vehicle* in the first sentence actually predicts examples in the following sentence, but unexpectedly new topic of sentence is introduced without using conjunctive relation. In this case, reader's expectation is not taken into account. Moreover, though there is no grammar mistake found in the texts, but there are some misspelling of some words.

Moreover, the text should be in reader's schema to make sense of it. The schema or mental construction of a text is the idea of the world outside the text. In constructing the schema about energy saving, it can be seen from introduction paragraph in which in drives readers from general issue to the narrower one. The development of introductory part may vary. One form was is in text 1 is initiated by question-answer form as rhetorical cohesion. The topic is expanded starting from the closest readers' environment about *getting hotter from day to day* to the general shared scientific knowledge about global warming and climate change. Another various way is analyzed in text 3 which declarative sentences used to explain the current situation of *climate change* before coming to the main topic about *climate change action at school*.

From the schema built in introduction paragraph, readers may come to the consensus about genre of the texts. Since it is obviously recognized that the genre of the text is argumentative text, reader's expectation is about how this kind of genre delivered properly in the text. It is taken into account to be a requirement of coherent text as supported by Eggins (2004) who says that a text is considered as generically coherent when the clauses in the text can be recognized as belonging to the same type of genre. The genre itself drives to identify the generic structure of the text in which it is used to distinguish between complete and incomplete text (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). As seen in the text, the genre of the text is argumentative text, specifically analytical exposition. By considering this such genre, the readers will expect the text contains paragraph about thesis, argument, and reiteration. The findings show that the texts already employ the proper generic structure of analytical exposition text should be. They may be seen in the first paragraph that each text introduces the topic from the general issue and come to specific one. In the last sentence of the opening paragraph, there is a topic sentence in which outlines the thesis of the text. The rest paragraphs but last one is about the argument to reason the concerns and lead to the recommendation. Finally, in the last paragraph, it is the recommendation of what should happen; in this case is energy saving at school. In short, overall, despite some rogue sentences in which came from nowhere outside from readers' expectation, the texts are mostly logically interconnected as the whole.

From this text coherence analysis, the assessment can be made that all of the three texts are coherent. The use of cohesive devices contributes to achieve internal coherence or connectedness of inter-sentence. The current results show in regard to lexical cohesion that only a small number of lexical variation employed in the text while repetition is still a favor for non-native speaker writers. Through repetition words, the writers actually have helped the readers to follow the meaning of the text from the beginning to the end of the paragraph. Regarding

grammatical cohesion, the attention needs to be put on conjunctions or conjunctive markers. Though there is no error in applying them, the number of their presence needs to be increased. Overall the grammar applied in the whole texts showed that all the writers are competence in grammar but it does not necessarily means they are automatically able to deal with cohesive devices in written discourse (Aldera, 2016). However, the most important thing is not about using cohesive items massively but appropriate, adequate, and effective use of these devices in the texts is the key to create coherent text.

Conclusion

The prominent finding of the study shows that the Graduate students still have a bit weakness on composing coherent texts. Though cohesive devices may build cohesion in the whole text, but bridging new ideas among sentences is still a problem since there is a gap in connecting a sentence to other sentences which result in rogue sentences in several cases. Such kind of weaknesses may be caused by the less optimization of various conjunctions and passive form sentence to enhance end-weight principle on each sentence.

The implication for English language learners is that they need to know the common weaknesses in composing texts, especially in terms of cohesion and coherence. The study shows less optimization of conjunction as part of grammatical cohesion in students' writing. This situation is expected to be a reminder whenever students are assigned to create a text; that is to use conjunctions appropriately and effectively. The result of this study is also addressed to English teachers. Providing students with related materials to the topic of discussion on current worldwide issues is highly recommended to give them background knowledge for their writing. By this, they can enrich their knowledge and, of course, can posit themselves in what side they will be when they create argumentative texts. Further, time allotment is also crucial in creating high-quality texts. Short-time writing is only one of the factors of students' writing imperfections. Teachers need to be aware that writing is a process and students also need to be taught explicitly about the use of cohesive devices and thematic development of a text. Eventually, this research have shed some lights that though Master degree students of English language education are advanced learners, a wide range of writing practices is always needed to improve their text coherence.

About the Authors

Sri Wuli Fitriati, Ph.D. is a lecturer in the English Language and Literature Department at Universitas Negeri Semarang (UNNES). She teaches Discourse Studies at the Graduate Program of UNNES. Her research interests include written and spoken discourse analysis and its pedagogical implication on English language teaching.

Fadhila Yonata is a Master degree student in English Language Education at Universitas Negeri Semarang. He got his Bachelor's degree from Universitas Negeri Padang. His research interests include English textbook analysis, discourse analysis and issues related to teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL).

References

Aldera, A.S. (2016). Cohesion in Written Discourse: A Case Study of Arab EFL Students. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 7 (2), 328-341.

- Bakaa, A. J. A. (2014). Investigating the Manifestation of Textual Themes in Argumentative English Assignments Written by Iraqi and Australian Postgraduate Students. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 3 (6), 205-211. Retrieved April 24th, 2017 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.3n.6p.205>.
- Boardman, C. & Frydenberg, J. (2008). *Writing to Communicate 2: Paragraphs and Essays*. 3rd Edition. New York: Pearson Education.
- Eggs, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Continuum.
- Fitriati, S. W. (2016). *Logical Continuity: Manifestation of Students' Discourse Competence in Final Project Writing*. Paper presented at the Fifth International Conference on English Language Teaching, Literature and Translation, Semarang, Indonesia. Retrieved from <http://elilt.org/proceedings/>.
- Gerot, L. & Wignell, P. (1995). *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Sydney: Antipodean Educational Enterprises.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hawes, T. (2015). Thematic Progression in the Writing of Students and Professionals. *Ampersand*, 2, 93-100. Retrieved April 24th 2017 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2015.06.002>;
- Karadeniz, A. (2017). Cohesion and Coherence in Written Texts of Students of Faculty of Education. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 5(2), 93-99. Retrieved April 18th 2017 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.11114/jets.v5i2.1998>.
- Karahan, P. (2015). A Diagnostic Analysis of ELT Students' Use of Connectives. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 199, 325 – 333. Retrieved May 9th 2017 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.555>.
- Khunaifi, A. R. (2015). The Effects of Teaching Critical Thinking on Students' Argumentative Essay. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 5 (1), 45-56.
- Li, X. & Wu, C. (2017). Coherence in Hong Lou Meng and its English Translations: An Exploratory Investigation. *Functional Linguistics*, 4(1), 1-14. Retrieved April 18th 2017 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s40554-016-0035-z>.
- Rahman, Z.A.A.A. (2013). The Use of Cohesive Devices in Descriptive Writing by Omani Student-Teachers. *SAGE Open*, 1-10. Retrieved April 18th 2017 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2158244013506715>.
- Shirazi, M. A. & Nadoushani, S. M. M. (2017). The Locus of Adversative Conjunctions in the Research Articles: Have They Nixed or Vanished?. *SAGE Open* 1-6 . Retrieved April 18th 2017 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2158244017700946>.
- Suwandi. (2015). 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. Retrieved June 25th 2016 from [http:// dx.doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v5i2.1349](http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v5i2.1349).
- Thornbury, S. (2005). *Beyond the Sentence: Introducing Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Macmillan Publisher Limited.
- Wang, Y. & Guo, M. (2014). A Short Analysis of Discourse Coherence. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(2), 460-465. Retrieved April 18th 2017 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.2.460-465>.
- Wells, G. (1987). Apprenticeship in Literacy. *Interchange*, 8(1/2), 109-123.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2007). *Discourse Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G. (2009). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University