



Grammatical Cohesion Devices in The Hortatory Exposition Texts of The Grafindo Bahasa Inggris Textbook Used at SMA N 1 Medan

Sofyan Dikha Rahman¹, Ariatna²

^{1,2}English and Literature Department, Universitas Negeri Medan, Indonesia

Correspondence E-mail:

mrsofian301@gmail.com, ariatna@unimed.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate the types and frequency of grammatical cohesion devices realized in the hortatory exposition texts of the Grafindo Bahasa Inggris textbook for Grade XII used at SMAN 1 Medan, and to analyze the reason behind their usage. The data consist of clauses containing grammatical cohesion devices (reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction) drawn from eight hortatory exposition texts. The source of data is Chapter 4 of the Grafindo Bahasa Inggris textbook, 2024 edition for Grade XII. This study employed a qualitative descriptive research design. The technique of data collection is documentary analysis following Bowen (2009), in which the texts were systematically selected, appraised, and reviewed clause by clause. The instruments of data collection are a Table Checklist adapted from Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) for RQ1 and a Functional Context Matrix for RQ2. Two complementary techniques of data analysis were applied: Miles, Huberman,

and Saldaña's (2014) Interactive Model for RQ1 and Bingham's (2023) Five-Phase Process for RQ2. The results show that 274 total instances of grammatical cohesion devices were identified. Reference is the most dominant device with 149 instances (54.4%), followed by conjunction with 124 instances (45.2%), substitution with 1 instance (0.4%), and ellipsis with 0 instances (0%). Functionally, The Reason behind reference dominance is motivated by participant tracking, conjunction by logical scaffolding, substitution by grammatical economy, and ellipsis absence by the written monologic mode of the texts.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received

Revised

Accepted

Keywords:

grammatical cohesion; hortatory exposition; systemic functional linguistics; textbook evaluation.

INTRODUCTION

Textbooks remain one of the most influential sources of language input in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, particularly in resource-limited settings such as Indonesia. Most students in Indonesia meet English mostly through their textbook. There is not much English around them outside class, so whatever the book gives them is largely what they get (Cunningsworth, 1995). This makes the quality of a textbook's texts matter a lot, not just for vocabulary and grammar but for how ideas are tied together across sentences. A text that jumps from point to point without clear links is hard to follow, even if every single sentence is grammatically correct on its own.

One genre that depends heavily on this kind of linking is hortatory exposition. Unlike an analytical exposition, which just argues that something is true, a hortatory text goes a step further and tells the reader what to do about it (Gerot & Wignell, 1994). To pull that off, a writer needs more than good vocabulary. They need reference words that keep the reader tracking who or what is being discussed, and conjunctions that show how one idea leads to, contrasts with, or follows from another (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). Halliday and Hasan (1976) grouped these linking tools under four types: reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. Together these are called grammatical cohesion, and they are what stop a paragraph from reading like a list of unconnected facts.

A number of studies have already found that Indonesian EFL learners struggle exactly here, not with vocabulary, but with tying their arguments together using cause, contrast, and concession rather than just piling on more information with *and* (Liu & Braine, 2005; Yang & Sun, 2012). If students keep writing this way, it is worth asking where that habit comes from. One likely place is the textbook itself. If a textbook mostly shows students how to add ideas but rarely shows them how to argue with reason or answer an opposing view, students will simply repeat that pattern in their own writing (Ellis, 2008; Nation & Macalister, 2010).

Even so, not much research has actually checked this for hortatory exposition texts specifically, at least not in an Indonesian senior high school textbook. Earlier textbook studies mostly looked at narrative or news texts (Nurwahidah et al., 2022), and studies of hortatory writing mostly looked at what students produced, not what the textbook gave them to learn from (Wijayanti et al., 2023). Since Kurikulum Merdeka asks Grade XII students

to write hortatory exposition, this gap matters. This study investigates the hortatory exposition texts in the Grafindo Bahasa Inggris textbook used at SMAN 1 Medan to find out, first, what types and how many grammatical cohesion devices appear in these texts, and second, why some devices used and showed up far more than others.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative descriptive design, since the goal was to describe patterns in real texts rather than test a hypothesis (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The data came from eight hortatory exposition texts in Chapter 4 of the 2024 edition of the Grafindo Bahasa Inggris textbook for Grade XII, the book used at SMAN 1 Medan. Exercise questions and non-hortatory texts were left out so the analysis stayed focused on the reading texts students are meant to learn from.

Each clause in the seven texts was read and checked against a coding checklist adapted from Halliday and Matthiessen's (2014) categories of reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. A second tool, a functional context matrix, recorded where in the text (Thesis, Arguments, or Recommendation) each device appeared, which helped later when working out why a device was used there. Data collection followed Bowen's (2009) steps for document analysis: finding and picking the right texts, checking they genuinely fit the hortatory structure, then reading them closely to pull out every cohesive tie.

Two analysis methods were used side by side. Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña's (2014) interactive model handled the frequency question, narrowing down the raw data, laying it out in tables, and drawing conclusions from the counts. Bingham's (2023) five-phase process handled the harder question of why one device dominates, working from the raw counts through to an explanation grounded in Eggins's (2004) idea that a text type's cohesion pattern is not random but exists because it is the best way to do that text's job.

RESULTS

Types and Frequency of Grammatical Cohesion Devices

The eight texts together contained 274 cohesive ties. Table 1 breaks this down by text and by device.

Table 1. Frequency of Grammatical Cohesion Devices

Text	Reference	Substitution	Ellipsis	Conjunction	Total
HT1	22	1	0	10	33
HT2	27	0	0	16	43
HT3	14	0	0	14	28

Text	Reference	Substitution	Ellipsis	Conjunction	Total
HT4	22	0	0	17	39
HT5	25	0	0	18	43
HT6	20	0	0	19	39
HT7	7	0	0	14	21
HT8	12	0	0	16	28
Total	149	1	0	124	274
%	54.4	0.4	0	45.2	100

Reference was the most common device, mostly through inclusive pronouns like we, our, and us. Conjunction came second, but it was not spread evenly across its four subtypes. Substitution appeared just once, a single case of do so in HT1. Ellipsis did not appear in any of the eight texts.

Reasons Behind the Dominant Devices

Reference stayed on top because of what it does for the reader: it keeps track of who is being talked about across the whole text. Words like our in the opening sentence pull the reader in as part of the problem right away, and that same we gets picked up again later when the text tells the reader what to do. This matches what Martin and Rose (2007) call participant tracking, and it is the main reason hortatory texts lean so heavily on personal reference.

Conjunction tells a less complete story. Nearly half of all conjunctions were additive, and, also, another, just stacking one point next to the last without saying how they connect. Causal conjunction, the kind that shows real reasoning with because or therefore, made up less than a quarter. Adversative conjunction, the kind needed to raise an opposing view and answer it, showed up only seven times out of 124, and almost all of those were in a single text. Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) describe ellipsis as "the omission of an element which is presupposed from the environment," which usually happens in spoken dialogue, not in a printed, one-way textbook passage, which explains why it never showed up here. The one case of substitution turned up right at the end of a text, once everything it stood in for had already been said in full, which is exactly where that kind of shortcut is safe to use.

DISCUSSIONS

The pattern found here, reference first, conjunction second, substitution and ellipsis almost absent, is not unique to this textbook. Nurwahidah et al. (2022) found the same order in a different Grade XII textbook, and Sari et al. (2022) and Khoyrotul Aini (2023) found it again in other Indonesian EFL reading materials. Wijayanti et al. (2023), looking at hortatory texts written by

students themselves, found the exact same imbalance, which suggests students are simply writing the way their textbooks taught them to.

The additive-heavy conjunction pattern is the part worth worrying about. Liu and Braine (2005) linked the same pattern to weak, list-like arguments in student writing, and Yang and Sun (2012) found that lower-proficiency writers lean on additive conjunctions while stronger writers use more causal and adversative ones. That puts this textbook's conjunction pattern closer to a beginner writer's output than to a model a Grade XII student should be learning from. A hortatory text is supposed to teach students how to argue and how to answer a counterpoint, and this textbook barely shows the second half of that skill.

None of this means substitution and ellipsis are missing by mistake. A textbook passage is written, not spoken, so there is no question-and-answer exchange for ellipsis to fit into (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). Their absence here is simply the right choice for this kind of writing, not a gap that needs fixing.

CONCLUSIONS

This study examined grammatical cohesion in the hortatory exposition texts of the *Grafindo Bahasa Inggris* textbook and found that of 274 total instances, reference was dominant at 54.4 percent, conjunction followed at 45.2 percent with a pronounced skew toward additive over causal and adversative subtypes, substitution occurred once, and ellipsis did not occur.

Reference's dominance is functionally motivated by participant tracking, which binds the reader to the argument from Thesis through Recommendation, The Reasons for conjunction's imbalance reflects a textbook that models information accumulation considerably more than logical reasoning or counterargument engagement, and the near-total absence of substitution and ellipsis is a register-appropriate feature of written, monologic, pedagogical texts rather than a deficiency.

These findings carry a direct implication for textbook revision and classroom practice: future editions of the *Grafindo Bahasa Inggris* textbook, and comparable EFL materials, would better serve Kurikulum Merdeka's writing objectives by rebalancing conjunction toward causal and adversative subtypes. Teachers using this textbook can supplement it by explicitly drawing students' attention to counterargument moves and students should be encouraged to notice how professional persuasive writing outside the textbook handles concession and rebuttal. Future research could extend this analysis to the *Grafindo* textbook's Grade X and XI volumes, or compare grammatical cohesion modeling across competing textbook series, to establish whether the pattern found here is specific to this textbook or characteristic of Indonesian EFL hortatory materials more broadly.

REFERENCES

- Ariatna, & Ellis, R. (2024). Mentoring task-based language teaching as an innovation in an Indonesian secondary school. *Language Teaching for Young Learners*, 7(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ltyl.00062.ari>
- Bahaziq, A. (2016). Cohesive devices in written discourse: A discourse analysis of a student's essay writing. *English Language Teaching*, 9(7), 112–119. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n7p112>
- Bingham, A. J. (2023). From data management to actionable findings: A five-phase process of qualitative data analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231183620>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Heinemann.
- Eggs, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd ed.). Continuum.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Gerot, L., & Wignell, P. (1994). *Making sense of functional grammar: An introductory workbook*. Gerd Stabler.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Khoyrotul Aini, L. (2023). Analyzing grammatical cohesion in Indonesian EFL textbook. *Linguapedia*, 7(1), 44–50.
- Liu, M., & Braine, G. (2005). Cohesive features in argumentative writing produced by Chinese undergraduates. *System*, 33(4), 623–636. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.02.002>
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause* (2nd ed.). Continuum.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. Routledge.
- Nurwahidah, N., Hidayat, D. N., Husna, N., & Alek, A. (2022). A discourse analysis of grammatical cohesion in news item text of "Symphony 3" XII grade English textbook. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 7(1), 171–183. <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v7i1.764>
- Sari, A. J. C., Mujiyanto, J., & Rukmini, D. (2022). Assessing the use of cohesive devices in reading texts of English textbook. *English Education Journal*, 12(2), 264–273. <https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v12i2.56996>
- Wijayanti, H., Suwandi, S., & Fitriati, S. W. (2023). Assessing the students' use of cohesive devices in writing hortatory exposition text. *English Education Journal*, 13(3), 363–369. <https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v13i3.72805>
- Yang, W., & Sun, Y. (2012). The use of cohesive devices in argumentative writing by Chinese EFL learners at different proficiency levels. *Linguistics and Education*, 23(1), 31–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2011.09.004>