

The Use of Lexical Cohesion among TESL Post Graduate Students in Academic Writing

Siti Nor Fatimah¹ Haris and Melor Md Yunus²

Abstract

This research investigates the use of lexical cohesion among TESL post graduate students in academic writing. 15 TESL post graduate students' essay writing were collected and analyzed by the researchers to identify the types, the most and least usage of the types and also how the TESL post graduate students used lexical cohesion in their writing. The result showed that there were four types of lexical cohesion used commonly by the students such as repetition, synonym, antonym and collocation. The finding also showed that there was overused of certain types of lexical cohesion, which was repetition in the analysis apparently affects the variety of the words chosen by the students. The finding also revealed that those types of lexical cohesion created cohesiveness towards the ideas conveyed by the students in writing. The implication of this research suggested for other types of lexical cohesion to be taught to the students and avoid overused of certain types of it to enhance better flow in writing.

Keyword: writing, lexical cohesion, cohesive, post graduate

1. Introduction

Historically, writing became least important language skill due to the challenge in the audio lingual method of language teaching in the 1960s and 1970s.

However, writing skills continuously rose in the mid-1970s to present due to the benefits of second language learners or SLL in the developments of writing skills and the explanations of its intervening in academic contexts (Leki, 2003 : Matsuda, 1999).

¹ Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia. Phone: 012-6636434, E-mail: fatimahharis@gmail.com

² Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia.

Aligned with Leki' (2003) issue of writing in the historical perspective, Matsuda (1999) claimed that albeit this issue began to attract serious attention in 1960s from the specialist, however the second language or L2 writing instruction did not become a sudden issue during that time based on the historical evidence.

On the other hand, Kroll (2003) stated that writing involved 'process theory' and 'the composing process', where many felt that the focus of the writing course in the writing process was a theoretical development when it was first popularized and introduced. However, a more precise statement was the process insights enhanced the methodological breakthrough in terms of the teaching of writing. Kroll (2003) also believed that every writer either from the beginner until the professional writer, engage in some processes in completing a given writing task. Moreover, most writing teachers probably agree that by lengthening a single piece of writing, it will contribute most towards the expansion of the students' writing skills.

In addition, according to McNamara, Crossley and McCarthy (2010), writing well produces a substantial challenge for students and a crucial importance for achievement in an extensive diversity of circumstances and professions. Aligned with this view, Crowhurst (1990) also stated that in order to communicate convincingly with others at large such as peers, colleagues, coworkers, teachers and community, effective writing is apparently crucial.

In discourse research, text processing always has a noticeable status, and researchers are interested in the textual cohesion's mechanism where they formed hypotheses of the possibility of coherence in the reader's mind (Yeh, 2004). Based on Halliday and Hassan's (1976) ideas reviewed by Tanskanen (2006), a text is a passage of discourse which is coherence in regards to the respect of the context of the situation which is consistent with the register, and also with respect to itself and therefore cohesive.

Hoey (2001) defined texts as the visible proof of a rational independent purposeful communication between writers and readers, where the writers control the communication and produce most of the language.

According to Beaugrande (1997) as cited in Tanskanen (2006), text is regarded as a communicative occurrence instead of just sequences of words in written or utterance where it converges cognitive, linguistic and social action.

However, Beaugrande (1997) admitted that regarding his definition of text, although it is easy to proclaim, but due to the vast richness which it demands, it is actually hard to maintain.

In contrast, in terms of textual coherence, Carrel (1982) claimed that text cohesion is not necessarily a written property manifested by grammatical or lexical connective ties, but cohesion is an outcome of coherence where the readers are able to connect ideas from their schemata. She proposed that in teaching writing and composition in second language, cohesive ties should only act as secondary part to instruction in terms of the organization of the flows of ideas in text. This is due to her view, where she mentioned on how the explicit cohesive ties should not be relied on in unifying the text's idea when the readers have the ability to connect the text's idea without relying to it.

According to Thompson (2001), the audience awareness in writing is affected by the organization of text and the signal of the organization. Based on Thompson's (2001) view, a text can be a record of a dialogue between the writer and the reader. It involves an attempt made by the writer in guessing the expected information by the readers in certain point at unfolding text, and proceeds with their expected questions towards the written text.

Aligned with Thompson's (2001) idea regarding the relationship between the writer and the reader, McNamara, et. al (2010) also have the same view where they believed that the writer's aim in conveying the thesis of composition should be aided by the cohesion which either across or within the text. Based on the previous studies reviewed by them, they found that many assumed that in order for the text to communicate successfully the writer's envisioned message to the reader, the essential condition involved a cohesive text.

In relation to cohesion in writing, Tanskanen (2006) referred it as the grammatical and lexical elements which connect between parts of the text on its surface which has no commonly exclusive than coherence although they are separated.

Tanskanen (2006) referred coherence as an outcome of a dialogue between the reader and the text which does not reside in the text.

Thus, it is concluded that cohesion also contributes to coherence, as it is one of the ways in signaling the coherence in the text.

According to Morris, Beghtol and Hirst (2003), readers' understanding is related with the relationship between words when they read the text. Similarly, McNamara, et. al (2010) also stated that in terms of reading understanding, cohesion is crucial for its ease, but however it depends on the needs of the readers whether the facilitation benefits them. But on the other hand, they also asserted that the relationship between writing and cohesion has just a little understanding.

Hoey (1991) stressed on the significance of text-forming properties of lexis, where he stated that lexical cohesion received less attention although it has multiple relationships if one considers about its importance in texts. There are three main categories of cohesion which are referential cohesion, relational cohesion and lexical cohesion. Although cohesion involves both grammatical and lexical elements as mentioned previously by Tanskanen (2006), however, for the purpose of this present study, the entire focus will be only on lexical element which is lexical cohesion. As stressed by Tanskanen (2006), the greater part of cohesion involves the study of lexis, and the considerable degree of the study of lexis patterns in text is included in the study of cohesion in text.

It is appeared that many studies just restricted to only a part of lexical cohesion, and some others might be excluded for attention. In terms of speech and writing, learning to use cohesion is crucial in language learning, thus there is a need for studies of cohesion in those two aspects (Tanskanen, 2006). In addition, Halliday (1994) also agreed that in order to make a text to be coherent, it should organize the cohesion resources in ways motivated by the instant register. Halliday and Hassan (1976) as cited in Tanskanen (2006) concluded that lexical cohesion is one of the cohesive devices which contribute to the coherence. It is referred as the semantic relation between lexical items in text which distributes information regarding how lexemes are systematized in a discourse (Berzlanovich, 2008).

Lexical cohesion is related to conceptual structures and has the capability to signal the relationship between those structures. Tanskanen (2006) agreed with this view, as cohesive devices prompt the successful interpretation of message to the receiver, whether there is a close link between knowledge structures and cohesion.

Other researchers such as Teich and Fankhauser (2005) also reviewed the work of Halliday and Hassan (1976), where lexical cohesion is defined as the essential device in hanging the text together where there are about 40 to 50 percent of cohesive devices in a text is lexical.

This research focused on academic writing as Hyland (2004) asserted that the rhetorical character and interactive in academic writing has a growing interest in current years. Academic writing is an organized research written by academics to other academics, which also defined as scientific writing in English (Finnish Institutions Research Paper, 2014). Hyland (2004) defined academic writing as the representation of self and not just imparting the ideational content.

Thus, the purpose of this research is to analyze the use of lexical cohesion among TESL post-graduate students in academic writing. Henceforth, the objectives of this research are to discover what are the types of lexical cohesion that the students used in their writing. The most frequent and the least frequent of types are also being identified throughout the essay writings. In addition, this research is also made to identify how the students use the lexical cohesion in their academic writing.

2. Literature Review

2.1. The Rhetorical Structure Theory

This research follows the Rhetorical Structure Theory or RST as according to Berzánovich (2008), it has been empirically proven as useful in coherence studies in a variety of language and genre. It is perceived as a theory that analyzes the hierarchic construction of a text which is insensitive towards the text size as it has been used in a wide variety of text size. Besides that, RST also defines the relation of the part of text in terms of functional, as well as sorting the associations between the transition point and the item related extension. RST also delivers a common way to outline the relationship among clauses in text, whether they are grammatically or lexically signed (Mann & Thompson, 1988).

Meanwhile in terms of other theories, RST has theoretical and pragmatic advantages over others. It also enables the computational analysis easier to be developed as it defines the relationship of coherence properly and elaborately.

RST indicates that the possible occurrence of all rhetorical relations can be grouped into a finite set of relation categories. It is also a primary method in analyzing the text (Bosma, 2005).

Taboada and Mann (2006) perceived RST as a way to illustrate text and textual relations of text generations. It is used to explain and understand the text's structure as well as to link it with other phenomena such as in anaphora or cohesion. They concluded that RST provides a better understanding for text, contributes to a conceptual structure relationship and coherence, and contributes to a great variety of works where RST is used as a conceptual initial point.

2.2 Cohesion, Coherence and Texture

Cohesion involves the connection between ideas that readers made in a text which denotes to the existence or nonexistence of explicit signs in a text. On the other hand, coherence involves the readers' understanding of a text, which may be less or more coherent in regards to several factors such as preceding knowledge or reading skills (O' Reilly & McNamara, 2007).

Cohesion is a part of study of the texture which engages the communication between the cohesion and other aspects of text association (Martin, 2003). It is referred as the existence or nonexistence of signals in a text (McNamara, et. al, 2010). Based on the views taken from Halliday (1994), it is believed that cohesion is the set of resources in building discourse relations which surpasses grammatical construction. It is also can be explained as the process of a guidance meaning into a consumable existing of discourse. Halliday (1994) defined cohesion as set of resources in creating the relationships in discourse which go beyond grammatical structure. In addition, Halliday and Hassan (1976) claimed that cohesion exists when the interpretation of certain features in discourse being dependent with one another.

In relation to texture, texture is a part of the study of coherence which engages the social setting of texture into concern, as well as a process which relates the comprehensions and beliefs regarding the social setting a text dynamically interprets (Martin, 2003).

On the other hand, texture is defined as the property of being a text which functions with unity based on its surrounding (Halliday & Hassan, 2013).

Based on Halliday and Hassan's (1976) view which was reviewed by Taboada (2004), she concluded that texture separates between text and non-text, and which also progresses from the unity of a text's function in regards to the surrounding. On the other hand, she also mentioned that cohesion also provides texture as it is a non-structural text-forming relations which works together with the structural relations.

2.3 Lexical Cohesion

According to Flowerdew and Mahlberg (2009), lexical cohesion is related to the meaning in a text which the lexical items connect to each other and other cohesive device to build the continuity of the text. Lexical cohesion, is also referred as the texture builds by words with related meanings were supplied by the readers' schemata or background knowledge (Klebanov & Shamir, 2008). Lexical cohesion is one of the dominant factors in coherence of text structure which involves association relation of mutual knowledge based on the dependency relationship between words. It is a relationship between words which indicates the alike or semantically associated concepts of common knowledge (Kozima, 1994).

In relation to texture, according to Morley (2009), lexical cohesion contributes not only to the text's texture, but it also specifies the rhetorical growth of the discourse. Lexical cohesion is also referred as two features shared a lexical field or collocation where it is apparently attained by the vocabulary selection. Lexical cohesion is the central device which hanging the text together which contributes to the most substantive to texture (Halliday & Hassan, 1976).

2.4 The Variety Types of Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion is one part of the cohesive resources which include synonymy, collocation or repetition of lexical items. Some of the types of lexical cohesion are such as repetition, semantic relationship, and antonymic relationship.

Repetition involves either sequence repetition, or repetition caused by the source and modification variants of words contracting a cohesive tie and also the occurrences of the same words. Semantic relationship involves meronymy, synonymy, antonymy and hyponymy (Halliday & Hassan, 1976).

According to Osisanwo (2005), lexical cohesion is divided into two parts which are reiteration and collocation. As asserted by Akindele (2011), reiteration involves doing or saying something numerous times while collocation involves the connotation of lexical items that frequently appears which involves pairs of words from the same order series. Reiteration consists of repetition, superordinate or hyponym and synonym or near synonym. Meanwhile collocation consists of complimentary, converse, antony, part or whole, part or part, co-hyponyms and links (Osisanwo, 2005).

2.5 Related Studies

One past study done by Morris and Hirst (2006) investigated the readers' perceptions and interpretations of lexical cohesion in text for individual differences. Five participants were instructed to read 'Reader Digest' article and marked the word groups using different colour for every group. All of the word groups were transferred into a data sheet, where they stated which pair or words as related, what was the relationship and its meaning. The data was analyzed to examine the degree of individual differences in the response. The finding showed that for both theory and as a practical tool to decide on the commonly agreed on and the subjective aspects, the lexical cohesion was useful in text understanding.

Another past study was done by Wu (2010) in exploring the relationship between lexical cohesion and oral English quality. Wu (2010) compared between High Quality Discourses (HQD) and Low Quality Discourses (LQD) based on the lexical cohesion. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used to differentiate the distribution and failures of the group of discourses. A working taxonomy of lexical cohesion was used such as repetition, antonymy, synonymy, superordinate, collocation and general noun. In this research, 10 samples in Qingdao University of Science and Technology from 118 pieces sound recording of final oral examination of second year English-major students were divided into two groups consists of HQD and LQD.

The samples were given five minutes for their oral discourse and their speaking activity was done in an examination situation without help from any references.

The result showed that lexical cohesion was related with oral English quality, where HQD differed than LOD in both qualitatively and quantitatively in the usage of lexical cohesion. Wu (2010) concluded that there was an overuse of repetition and general noun as common in the oral English, while the other types were in satisfactory usage.

One past study was done by Akindele (2011) in analyzing cohesive devices in two academic papers which examined both grammatical and lexical devices. All of the cohesive devices were highlighted and identified thoroughly. Akindele (2011) adapted the taxonomy of cohesive relationship based on Halliday and Hassan to create the relationship inside the text. The result showed that a cohesive text must held together some grammatical or lexical linguistic devices. It also stressed on the importance of a meaningful discourse or text which can only be achieved when it involved variety of segments in developing a unified form. The variety of cohesive devices found in this research was grammatically and lexically attached to discourse because of the cohesion provided by the linguistic means which a text operated as a single unit.

3. Methodology

The respondents involved in this research were 15 third semester TESL post graduate students in Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia or UKM. In this research, the researchers used purposive sampling because all of the respondents were taken from TESL course and they were purposively chosen by the researchers since they are considered as skillful English learners. All of them also shared similar characteristics; second language learners and similar proficiency levels.

The research design was a qualitative type research design which concentrated more on essay writing. The purpose of using essay writing was because it enabled the researchers to analyze more about the usage of lexical cohesion as essay writing was lengthier and consisted of combination of sentences. In this procedure, the researchers collected the respondents' essay writing entitled "How to Avoid Plagiarism" which consisted of 1000 words per each paper. This particular essay was one of the assignments that the respondents had done in their Academic Writing subject during their post graduate year.

Hence by using this type of design, it generated deeper analysis from the respondents' essay which later contributed more to the findings for the current study.

First, the researchers asked the permission from the respondents to collect their essay writing entitled "How to Avoid Plagiarism" by asking them to upload it via Google Mail or Gmail within one week. The essays were analyzed manually by hand where first the softcopy of the essays were highlighted in red colour to estimate it by 1000 words. Then, all of the essays were printed out and read thoroughly by the researchers. All of the type of lexical cohesions were crossed out and marked by using different symbols. R represented repetition, S represented synonym, A for antonym and C for collocation. Later, the researchers analyzed the use of lexical cohesion in each paper and stated the usage of using lexical cohesion by using the table to count the type and frequency of lexical cohesion. At least two weeks were spent to analyze those essays. The types, the frequencies, the functions and the examples of it were analyzed for further clarification. All of the data obtained were elaborated and analyzed under their own theme.

4. Results and Findings

This section discussed about the three research questions analyzed by the researchers. The respondents' essay writing were labeled as '*Sample 1, Sample 2, Sample 3,..*' and so on. This section involved the analysis of demographic background, the types of lexical cohesion, the most and least frequent of types and also the usage of those types in the essay writings.

4.1 Demographic Background

All of the 15 respondents consisted of two males and thirteen females which was around 20-40 years old. Six of them were in service teachers while the rest were full time students.

4.2 Types of Lexical Cohesion (Research Question 1)

Based on the analysis and the result obtained from the data, there was a big difference in the types of lexical cohesion used among the TESL post graduate students in their essay writing.

The researchers revealed that there were about four types of lexical cohesion which were commonly occurred in the essay writings. This included repetition, collocation, synonym and antonym. For repetition, the words were calculated one by one. However, for collocation, synonym and antonym, the words were grouped according to their semantic meaning throughout the entire essay writings. The types were separated in a table as below:

Table 1. Numbers of Lexical Cohesion

| Sample | Types of Lexical Cohesion | | | |
|--------|---------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|
| | Repetition | Collocation | Synonym | Antonym |
| 1 | 64 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| 2 | 77 | 3 | 9 | 4 |
| 3 | 81 | 2 | 9 | 4 |
| 4 | 92 | 2 | 6 | 2 |
| 5 | 84 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| 6 | 90 | 4 | 7 | 5 |
| 7 | 87 | 2 | 7 | 3 |
| 8 | 114 | 3 | 7 | 3 |
| 9 | 109 | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| 10 | 86 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| 11 | 124 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| 12 | 97 | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| 13 | 111 | 3 | 9 | 3 |
| 14 | 88 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 15 | 94 | 3 | 6 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 1398 | 38 | 90 | 50 |

4.3 The Frequent Types of Lexical Cohesion (Research Question 2)

4.3.1 Repetition

Under this type of lexical cohesion, repetition was the most dominant one contained in the respondents' essay writing. It can be said that most of the respondents used repetition the most thoroughly in their essay, where the difference between the other types of lexical cohesion was quite significant. The number of repetition used by the respondents was approximately 88.7 %, where there was about 1398 words been repeated in those 15,000 words contained in the entire essay. The most repeated words were such as '*plagiarism*', '*student*', '*idea*', '*source*', '*word*' and '*writer*'.

4.3.2 Collocation

In the respondents' essay writing, the number of collocation used was the least. Based on the analysis, the overall groups of collocation were calculated separately for each respondent, which the total was 38 groups of collocation. All of these collocations can be found almost in every respondent's essay writing, where they shared the same context thus the relationship of the collocation that they used was also almost similar with each other.

- i. Cite/quote
- ii. Copy/paste
- iii. Scholars/writers
- iv. Cutting/ pasting
- v. Theft/cheat/steal
- vi. WWW/ retrieved
- vii. Plagiarism/ plagiarist
- viii. Crime/fraud/unethical/immoral/illegal
- ix. Teacher/ lecturer/ educator/ administrator/ academic/ supervisor/instructor
- x. Research/thesis/book/jornal/title/author/resource/quote/summarize/paraphrase/citation/attribute/reference/bibliography/page number/publisher/date of publish/accessed date

4.3.3 Synonym

Under this type of lexical cohesion, synonym was the second highest lexical that can be found in the total 15 essay writings. As it was grouped and calculated based on the groups obtained, the total of synonym was around 90 groups or around 5.71 %. These were the overall types of synonym which was discovered by the researchers in the respondents' essay writings.

- i. Other people/ someone else/ others/ another person
- ii. Preventing/ avoiding
- iii. Cite/ quote
- iv. Duplicate/ copy/replicate
- v. Writer/ author
- vi. Unethical/ immoral/ dishonest
- vii. Cheating/dishonest
- viii. Collected/ gathered
- ix. Ours/ our own

- x. Accountable/ responsible
- xi. Educator/ teacher/ lecturer
- xii. Illegal/ wrong
- xiii. Knowledge/ consent
- xiv. Same/ identical
- xv. Credit/ attribute/acknowledge
- xvi. Alteration/ change
- xvii. Stating/ implying/ indicating
- xviii. Pilfer/ steal
- xix. Both method/ two methods
- xx. Shunning/ avoiding
- xxi. Search/ access
- xxii. Important/ crucial
- xxiii. Replacing/ substituting
- xxiv. Accidental/ unintentional
- xxv. Inappropriate/ incorrect
- xxvi. Base/ surface
- xxvii. Well organized/ systematically
- xxviii. Misconduct/ mishandling
- xxix. Declare/ acknowledge
- xxx. Rearranging/ replacing
- xxxi. Correct/ righteous
- xxxii. Other/ another
- xxxiii. Inadvertent/ intentional
- xxxiv. Restatement/ paraphrase
- xxxv. Misconception/ confusion
- xxxvi. Copy/ borrow
- xxxvii. Rise/ increase

4.3.4 Antonym

In this current research, antonym was the third highest frequent type of lexical cohesion used by all of the respondents. Antonym was calculated with approximately 50 groups of words or almost 3.17 % which made it as the least type of all.

These were some examples of antonym used which can be found in the whole essay writings.

- i. Bad/ good
- ii. Right/ wrong
- iii. Acceptable/ unacceptable
- iv. Intentionally/ unintentionally
- v. Hard/ soft
- vi. Serious/ lightly
- vii. Experienced/ beginner
- viii. Specific/ generic
- ix. With/ without
- x. Solution/ problem
- xi. Ethical/ unethical
- xii. Whole/ part
- xiii. Do/don't
- xiv. Commit/ avoid
- xv. Claim/ deny
- xvi. Honest/ dishonest
- xvii. Advanced/ traditional
- xviii. Necessary/ unnecessary
- xix. Need/ unneeded
- xx. Longer/ shorter
- xxi. Proper/ improper
- xxii. Take/ pass
- xxiii. Ethical/ unethical
- xxiv. Specific/ common
- xxv. Original source/ secondary source
- xxvi. Delete/ add
- xxvii. Plagiarized/ non- plagiarized
- xxviii. Solution/ trouble
- xxix. Legitimate/ original

4.4. The Usage of Lexical Cohesion (Research Question 3)

4.4.1. Repetition

Based on the researchers' observation, the usage of repetition used in most of the essay writings was quite redundant as the respondents repeatedly used the same word over and over again within the same paragraph which made their writing quite boring and lack of quality within it. In the analysis of this data, the researchers selected the three highest usage of repetition among entire samples of the essay for justification.

For example in sample 11, there were almost 124 repetitions of word made by this respondent. There was lack of versatility or substitution of words used by this respondent to make her writing more lively and interesting to read. In this respondent's essay, she kept repeatedly used the word "*source*", "*text*" and "*paraphrase*" eight times approximately without replacing the words by using synonym which made her essay quite bored to read.

'.....copying from a lot of source.. different method for acknowledging source.. list the source by number...students should also paraphrase all the information... to paraphrase, students must read the text... three consecutive words in paraphrase can be identical... identify the source in the introduction.. the rules when copying directly from a text.. does not represent a large proportion of text.. from the rest of the text and make it clear...'

Another example as in sample 8, where this respondent repeated the word '*student*', '*plagiarism*', and '*idea*' the most in her essay writing about 27, 18 and 14 times within the 1000 words. This respondent repeatedly used the same word around 114 times within her essay writing. This was some of the examples taken from sample 8, where the respondent overused the word too much without substitute it with other word to create variety in her essay writing.

'.....Students know that plagiarism is a sin.....perhaps the students are lacked of ideas.. students have to think and motivate themselves... sometimes ideas will not come.. motivate students to get ideas.. students choose plagiarism... common scenario among students in universities.. due to the deadline, students will feel that...'

Next was in sample 13, where the respondent repeated almost 111 words in her entire essay where 'cite' and 'writer' constituted quite a higher number of repetition. '.....technique that we can use to cite another writer.... Between the ideas cited and our own so that... academician community which does not need to be cited.. if we are uncertain to cite or not.. and cite the original author.. writer would tend to fall... a mixture of the writer's own word..'

In these sentences, the researchers think that the repeated word can be replaced by other words as well. For example, the word '*source*' can be replaced with '*information*', or '*basis*' while '*text*' can be substituted with the word '*handbook*'. Meanwhile the word '*paraphrase*' can also be replaced with '*rephrasing*', '*restating*', or '*rewording*'. Next, for example, by using synonym, the '*student's* words can be replaced with '*learners*', or even substitute it by using '*them*', '*they*' or '*their*'. For the word '*plagiarism*', the respondent can replace it with word such as '*copy*' while the word '*idea*' can be replaced with word such as '*clue*' or '*outline*'. In addition the word '*cite*' can also be replaced with '*quote*', while the word '*writer*' can also be substituted with the word '*author*'.

4.4.2. Collocation

The researchers discovered that in this current research, collocation had certain relationship with the topic itself. This was because, the collocation found in this research mostly related with the topic areas where the meaning was interrelated. These are some of the examples of the three highest usage of collocation found within the essay writings:

For example in sample 6, there was just four frequency of collocation found in his essay writing, which were such as:

'...Since the establishment of World Wide Web.. the information is retrieved.. cutting and pasting from another author.. lecturers or instructors need to explain thoroughly..'

Another example as in sample 14, which also only contained with four occurrence of collocation such as:

'...is a common term among scholars, academicians...but also resulted in contemptible copy and paste culture... paraphrasing refers to the act of rewriting in your own...'

Another example as in sample 15, which consisted just three occurrence of collocation throughout the 1000 words:

'....both stealing someone else's work...is an act of fraud...record bibliography information.. each source listed in reference section...'

4.4.3. Synonym

These were the examples of the three highest usage of synonym in those essay writings.

For example as sample 2:

'.....that any writer or author should keep in mind.. to avoid being accused of duplicating and replicating someone's else... can be considered as cheating or being dishonest...something that is unethical, immoral and illegal...'

Another example as in sample 3:

'... with or without that student's knowledge.... held accountable and responsible...'

Next, as in sample 13:

'.....resulting in a big mess and chaos...which are to properly quote and cite...the correct and righteous ways to do so....'

In sample 2, 3 and 13, the usage of synonym in the essay writings were used together in pair where the usage can be seen more synchronously. It appeared as a good cohesive device to link those words in similar meaning which made the essays more coherent and organized. For the usage of synonym, it was true indeed that synonym gave a sense of good quality writing.

When the researcher analyzed its usage which contained in the essay, the researchers found that synonym was also a part of cohesive ties which brought and lead the readers to the ideas being discussed which at the same time, interrelated with each other.

4.4.4 Antonym

These were the samples taken from the three highest usage of antonym in those essay writings.

For example as in sample 6:

'...only quote necessary information...it is unnecessary to quote the entire paragraph... advanced technology compared to the traditional technology...to abridge the meaning of longer text into a shorter text..'

Another example as in sample 11:

'.. compare and contrast the view from different authors...delete most details and examples.. add their own comments regarding the views.. take another person's idea.. and pass them off as your own...'

Next, as in sample 15:

'... the only solution is may be to revise the academic climate.. a lot of trouble to researchers.. plagiarism is on the rise in recent years.. resulting to the decrease of fundamental value..'

Unlike synonym, the used of antonym in those essay writings did not appear side by side or together. The respondents rarely placed them together, as the antonym to a certain pair of word can only be found in some other sentences. But, it thus still created cohesiveness as the meaning of those words created a link to its pair which engaged the readers towards the outline contained in the paragraph. It created a tie, which link a bridge to the ideas put forward by the respondents.

Hence, the overall result concluded that repetition was the most frequently used in the respondents' essay writing while synonym was the second highest, antonym was the third highest and collocation was used the least frequent. However, repetition was overused by the respondents which quite redundant in the essay writings. This is also adhere with the finding obtained by Rahman (2013) and Wu (2010), as they also found that repetition was one of the types which overused in their research. However, although repetition was used more extensively in compared to the other lexical cohesions, but it was noticeable that this type of lexical cohesion may create boredom or less quality of writing if it was overused thoroughly.

There are also some other types of lexical cohesion which might not be familiar for the learners such as meronymy or hyponymy which are not being used or neglected in this current research. Aligned with this, Tanskanen (2006) also proclaimed that many studies just controlled to only a part of lexical cohesion, and some others might be excluded for attention.

5. Conclusion and Implication

The usage of these lexical cohesions in terms of cohesiveness are also depends on the context where the writer put themselves in. For example, the researchers discovered that the context which engaged the respondents determined the types of lexical cohesion used in their essay writings. In this current research, repetition, collocation, synonym and antonym are easily to be analyzed in compared to other types such as meronymy or hyponymy.

In terms of textual coherence, the researchers identified that lexical cohesion also relates with textual as the types of lexical cohesion used engaged with the surrounding which the writers operated in. The chosen words used by the respondents related with the surrounding of their topic thus it creates a sense of texture. This view is similar with the view interpreted by Halliday and Hassan (2013), where they previously mentioned that textual engages with the unity based on its operational surrounding.

As asserted by Yunus and Haris (2014), the difference between the writer's clarification and the reader's understanding depends on how they understood it.

Writing is quite a difficult skill to be learned among SLL as second language is an official or societally main language used by minority group participants or immigrant who speaks other language natively. It is normally used for education, occupation or other basic resolve. (Saville-Troike, 2012).

Hence, it is beneficial for the learners to be introduced more about the usage of these lexical cohesions in producing more quality writing. As lexical cohesion provides the variety or diversity in creating better sentences, it will also help the learners to lead their readers without losing track of the ideas transmit by the writers. However, the teachers should also create awareness to the learners about the overused of certain types of lexical cohesion which might distract the readers to continue reading their writing.

Last but not least, both teachers and students should concentrate on how to apply the lexical cohesion in producing a better writing. It should be stressed more during the lesson and the focus should not be on just one type, but the variety types of it. Thus, it is recommended that other researchers in the future should focus more on this area as well as it is also a part of lexical cohesion and it might produce different result if it is analyzed in some other prospect.

This study is hoped to benefit the students, teachers, and other researches. For students, it will make them realize the importance of using lexical cohesion in their writing. Then, it will also enable them to reduce the communication gap within the writing with their readers by producing more coherence writing product. For teachers, it will aware them about their students' difficulties in writing and the importance of lexical cohesion to reduce the difficulty. Moreover, teachers can also give further attention towards its usage in relation to writing context. For other researchers, those who are interested within the same area of research can use this current study as a guide for their future knowledge. They will also have the opportunity to discover more about lexical cohesion in writing, which will also eventually contribute to the world of knowledge.

Acknowledgement

This research is dedicated to every person who has contributed and shared their ideas throughout the process. It is hoped that this work can be beneficial and contribute to the world of knowledge within the same area.

Reference

- Akindele, J. (2011). Cohesive Devices in Selected ESL Academic Papers. *African Nebula*, 1(3). Retrieved May 23, 2014, from http://nobleworld.biz/images/Akindele_AN3.pdf
- Berzlánovich, I., (2008). Lexical cohesion and the organization of discourse. Center for Language and Cognition Groningen University of Groningen. Retrieved May 20, 2014, from <http://www.rug.nl/research/clcg/education/berzlanovich.pdf>
- Bosma, W. E. (2005). Query-based summarization using rhetorical structure theory. Retrieved April 10, 2014, from <http://eprints.eemcs.utwente.nl/1870/01/clin04.pdf>
- Carrell, P.L. (1982). Cohesion is not coherence. *TESOL Quarterly*. 16 (4), 479-488. Retrieved April 3, 2014, from <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/3586466?uid=3738672&uid=2&uid=4&sid=21104227258703>
- Crowhurst, M. (1990). Reading/writing relationships: An intervention study. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 15, pp. 155-172. Retrieved March 31, 2014, from <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/1495373?uid=3738672&uid=2&uid=4&sid=21104227258703>.
- Finnish Institutions Research Paper. (2014). What is an Academic Writing? Retrieved April 10, 2014, from <http://www15.uta.fi/FAST/FIN/RESEARCH/acadwrit.html>
- Flowerdew, J., & Mahlberg, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Lexical Cohesion and Corpus Linguistics*. 17. Netherlands : John Benjamin
- Halliday, M. A. K. and R. Hasan. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. (2nd Ed.). London: Edward Arnold
- Halliday & Hassan. (2013). *Cohesion in English*. USA: Routledge. Retrieved May 3, 2014, from <http://books.google.com.my/books?id=dSusAgAAQBAJ&pg=PT16&dq=cohesion+and+texture&hl=en&sa=X&ei=vZlJU6NGsjrQfAsoAg&ved=0CEoOQ6AEwBQ#v=onepage&q=cohesion%20and%20texture&f=false>
- Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hoey, M. (2001). *Textual Interaction: An Introduction to Written Discourse Analysis*. Psychology Press. USA: Routledge.
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Patterns of Engagement : Dialogue Features and L2 Undergraduate Writing*. London: Continuum.
- Kozima, H. (1994). *Computing lexical cohesion as a tool for text analysis* (Doctoral dissertation, Ph. D. thesis, University of Electro Communications) Retrieved May 11, 2014, from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.48.1713&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Klebanov, B. B. & Shamir, E. (2008). *Lexical cohesion in texts: Extraction methods and applications*. Retrieved May 3, 2014, from <http://www.cs.bgu.ac.il/~frankel/HonoraryDay09/Slides/EliShamir.pdf>
- Kroll, B. (Ed.). (2003). *Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing*. Retrieved April 3, 2014, from <http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/samples/cam034/2002074049.pdf>

- Leki, I. (2003). A challenge to second language writing professionals: Is writing overrated. In Kroll, B. (Ed). *Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing*, 315. USA: Cambridge University Press
- Mann, W. C. and Thompson, S. A. (1988). Rhetorical structure theory: Toward a functional theory of text organization. *Text*, 8(3). pp. 243-281. Retrieved April 3, 2014, from <http://www.cis.upenn.edu/~nenkova/Courses/cis700-2/rst.pdf>
- Martin, J. R. (2003). Cohesion and Texture. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 35. Blackwell Publishers Ltd : Oxford. Retrieved April 3, 2014, from http://occupytampa.org/files/wcom/tannen/The%20Handbook%20of%20Discourse%20Analysis_nodrm.pdf#page=57
- Matsuda, P.K. (1999). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective. In Kroll, B. (Ed). *Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing*, 315. USA: Cambridge University Press
- McNamara, D. S., Crossley, S. A., & McCarthy, P. M. (2010). Linguistic Features of Writing Quality. *Written Communication*, 27(57), 24. Retrieved March 24, 2014, from http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwwesl/Files/ALSL/cross_Linguistic_Features.pdf
- Morley, J. (2009). Lexical cohesion and rhetorical structure. *Lexical Cohesion and Corpus Linguistics*, 17, 5. In John Flowerdew & Michaela Mahlberg (Eds). John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam
- Morris, J., Beghtol, C., & Hirst, G. (2003). Term relationships and their contribution to text semantics and information literacy through lexical cohesion. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual Conference of the Canadian Association for Information Science*. pp. 153-168. Retrieved March 3, 2014, from ftp://ftp.cs.toronto.edu/public_html/pub/gh/Morris-etal-2003.pdf
- Morris, J., & Hirst, G. (2006). The subjectivity of lexical cohesion in text. In *Computing Attitude and Affect in Text: Theory and Applications*. pp. 41-47. Springer Netherlands. Retrieved April 6, 2014, from <ftp://ftp.sys.utoronto.ca/cs/ftp/dist/gh/Morris+Hirst-2004-EAAT.pdf>
- O'Reilly, T., & McNamara, D. S. (2007). Reversing the reverse cohesion effect: Good texts can be better for strategic, high-knowledge readers. *Discourse Processes*, 43, pp. 121–152.
- Osanwo, W. (2005). *Introduction to Discourse Analysis and pragmatics*. Lagos: Femulus Fetop Publishers.
- Rahman, Z. A. A. (2013). The use of cohesive devices in descriptive writing by Omani student-teachers. *Saga Open*. Retrieved May 3, 2014, from </content/3/4/2158244013506715>
- Saville-Troike, M. (2012). *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Taboada, M. T. (2004). *Building Coherence and Cohesion*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Taboada, M., & Mann, W. C. (2006). Rhetorical structure theory: Looking back and moving ahead. *Discourse Studies*, 8(3), pp. 423-459. Retrieved April 3, 2014, from http://www.sfu.ca/~mtaboada/docs/Taboada_Mann_RST_Part2.pdf
- Tanskanen, S. K. (Ed.). (2006). *Collaborating towards Coherence: Lexical Cohesion in English Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

- Teich, E. & Fankhauser, P. (2005). Exploring lexical patterns in text: Lexical cohesion analysis with WordNet. *Interdisciplinary studies on information structure*, pp. 129-145. Retrieved March 20, 2014, from http://www.linguistics.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/~dipper/papers/isis05_webVersion.pdf#page=135
- Thompson, G. (2001). Interaction in academic writing: Learning to argue with the reader. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), pp. 58-78. Retrieved March 3, 2014, from <http://corpuslg.org/inpla/2011/programacao/geoff.pdf>
- Wu, S. (2010). Lexical cohesion in oral English. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(1), pp. 97-101. Retrieved May 3, 2014, from <http://ojs.academypublisher.com/index.php/jltr/article/viewFile/010197101/1516>
- Yeh, C. (2004). The relationship of cohesion and coherence: a contrastive study of English and Chinese. *Journal of language and linguistics*, 3(2), pp. 243-260. Retrieved April 24, 2014, from http://webspaces.buckingham.ac.uk/kbernhardt/journal/3_2/yeh3_2.pdf
- Yunus, M. M., & Haris, S. N. F. (2014). The use of discourse markers among Form Four SLL students in essay writing. *International Education Studies*, 7(2), p54.