

**AN INQUIRY OF THEME CHOICE AND THEMATIC PROGRESSION
IN EFL STUDENTS' EXPLANATION TEXTS**

AN UNDERGRADUATE THESIS

Submitted to the English Language Education Program as a Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for *Sarjana Pendidikan* Degree



SHANIA AFINA BARKAH

1902691

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION PROGRAM
FACULTY OF LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE EDUCATION
UNIVERSITAS PENDIDIKAN INDONESIA**

2023

PAGE OF APPROVAL

**AN INQUIRY OF THEME CHOICE AND THEMATIC PROGRESSION
IN EFL STUDENTS' EXPLANATION TEXTS**

**An Undergraduate Thesis by
Shania Afina Barkah
1902691**

Approved by:

Main Supervisor

Co-Supervisor



Gin Gin Gustine, M.Pd., Ph.D.

NIP. 197608102001122001



Dr. Iyen Nurlaelawati, M.Pd.

NIP. 197709062009122002

**Head of English Language Education Study Program
Faculty of Language and Literature Education
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia**



Prof. Emi Emilia, M.Ed., Ph.D.

NIP. 196609161990012001

STATEMENT OF AUTHORIZATION

I, Shania Afina Barkah, as the researcher of the undergraduate thesis entitled “An Inquiry of Theme Choice and Thematic Progression in EFL Students' Explanation Texts” hereby declare that this study is my own work. I am keenly aware that I have quoted propositions and discoveries of others. Those external sources taken from other researchers or institutions have been properly cited aligned to the existing ethics in the studies of applied linguistics.

Bandung, July 2023

Shania Afina Barkah

PREFACE

This undergraduate thesis aspires to make contributions to the study of SFL in the classroom context. In order to accomplish that, theoretical frameworks taken from Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) and Eggins (2004) were utilized in this study to analyze six explanation texts made by Indonesian high school students from all academic achievements. These theoretical frameworks are used to discover the realizations of theme choice and thematic progression in creating a cohesive and coherent explanation text. What drives the researcher to set that aim is because EFL students were seen to struggle with previously mentioned aspects: (1) Making cohesion and coherence appear in their text, and (2) Constructing explanation texts which are complex in nature.

I hope this undergraduate thesis can make great contributions to English Language Teaching (ELT) and the study of SFL in the classroom context. Putting my hope aside, I understand this study is far from perfection, therefore any given input from the readers is very welcome and appreciated.

Bandung, July 2023

Shania Afina Barkah

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Constructing this undergraduate thesis has become one of the big journeys of my life where I could obtain many valuable experiences, but I also encountered some issues along the way. Those issues made things a bit difficult, but they helped me grow as a person and as a researcher. Needless to say, I did not overcome them alone as there were so many people who supported and helped me in the process. So, I would like to use this opportunity to express my deepest gratitude to them.

First and foremost, I would like to thank Allah the Almighty. As the source of all affection, He constantly gave me His blessings and opportunity to learn. When things get rough, I always manage to find solutions largely thanks to His promise: “For indeed, with hardship comes ease. Surely, with hardship comes ease (94:5-6).” Not only that, but I have also been blessed by Him with many lovely people who constantly helped me to stand back on my feet again.

Some of those people are my family: my parents, my brother, and my sister-in-law. Thank you for all the love, patience, trust, and assistance you all have given me throughout making this undergraduate thesis.

I also want to express my gratitude to my research supervisors: Ibu Gin Gin Gustine, M.Pd., Ph.D. and ibu Dr. Iyen Nurlaelawati, M.Pd. As I stated in the beginning, I constantly struggle with some issues as I am still inexperienced in doing research. However, I managed to overcome these problems with all the constant feedback, support, and patience given by my research supervisors.

I also owe my gratitude to my friends. I wanted to thank my beloved best friends Mei, Ariq, and Wapa who constantly cheered me up with their silly ways. I also feel grateful toward the friends I met in college that felt like my own sisters who encouraged each other even on their hardest days: Karina, Roja, Dinda, and Sifa. Lastly, to all friends from Pendidikan A batch 2019, thank you for always being ready to help each other.

AN INQUIRY OF THEME CHOICE AND THEMATIC PROGRESSION IN EFL STUDENTS' EXPLANATION TEXTS

Shania Afina Barkah

Main Supervisor: Gin Gin Gustine, M.Pd., Ph.D.

Co-Supervisor: Dr. Iyen Nurlaelawati, M.Pd.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to investigate the realizations of theme choice and thematic progression in students' explanation texts and how they may influence the texts' cohesion and coherence. To achieve this aim, six explanation texts taken from low, middle, and high achiever categories were analyzed for this study using qualitative content analysis. By analyzing the texts with the theoretical frameworks taken from Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) and Eggins (2004), the frequencies of theme choice and thematic progression were obtained and interpreted to find the meanings held by them. The study found that the most employed theme type in the students' texts was topical theme, which was followed by the textual theme. However, there was no occurrence of interpersonal theme found in the students' texts. This phenomenon found in the realization of theme choice may indicate that students were trying to follow the nature of explanation texts and impersonal academic style. The most frequently used thematic progression were the zig-zag and reiteration patterns, but the least used one was the multiple-rheme pattern. This indicates that the students' texts have contained local coherence, but still lack global coherence. This study is expected to enrich the study of SFL in the classroom context and provide practical input for teachers.

Keywords: Explanation texts; Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL); Thematic Progression; Theme choice; Theme System.

INVESTIGASI PILIHAN TEMA DAN PENGEMBANGAN TEMATIK DALAM TEKS EKSPLANASI SISWA EFL

Shania Afina Barkah

Dosen Pembimbing Utama: Gin Gin Gustine, M.Pd., Ph.D.

Dosen Pembimbing Pendamping: Dr. Iyen Nurlaelawati, M.Pd.

ABSTRAK

Studi ini bertujuan untuk menyelidiki realisasi dari pilihan tema dan pengembangan tematik di teks eksplanasi siswa dan bagaimana mereka dapat mempengaruhi kohesi dan koherensi teks. Untuk mencapai tujuan ini, enam teks ekplanasi yang diambil dari kategori berprestasi rendah, menengah, dan tinggi dianalisis dalam studi ini menggunakan analisis isi kualitatif. Dengan menganalisis teks-teks menggunakan kerangka teori yang diambil dari Halliday dan Matthiessen (2014) dan Eggins (2004), frekuensi pemilihan tema dan pengembangan tematik diperoleh dan diinterpretasikan untuk menemukan arti yang terkandung di dalamnya. Studi ini menemukan bahwa jenis tema yang paling banyak digunakan dalam teks siswa adalah tema topikal, yang diikuti oleh tema tekstual. Namun, tidak ada kemunculan tema interpersonal yang dapat ditemukan dalam teks siswa. Fenomena yang ditemukan dalam realisasi pilihan tema ini dapat mengindikasikan bahwa siswa berusaha mengikuti sifat teks eksplanasi dan gaya akademik impersonal. Perkembangan tematik yang paling sering digunakan adalah pola *zig-zag* dan *reiteration*, tetapi yang paling jarang digunakan adalah pola *multiple-rheme*. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa teks siswa telah mengandung koherensi lokal, namun masih belum memiliki koherensi global. Kajian ini diharapkan dapat memperkaya kajian LSF dalam konteks kelas dan memberikan masukan bermanfaat bagi para guru.

Keywords: Linguistik Sistemik Fungsional (LSF); Pengembangan Tematik; pilihan Tema; Sistem Tema; teks eksplanasi.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE OF APPROVAL	i
STATEMENT OF AUTHORIZATION	ii
PREFACE	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF APPENDICES	x
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Research Question	5
1.3 Aim of the Study	5
1.4 Scope of the Study	5
1.5 Significance of the Study	5
1.6 Clarification of Terms	6
1.7 Organization of the Study	7
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1 Cohesion and Coherence in Writing	8
2.2 Systemic Functional Linguistics	9
2.2.1 The Notion of Context and Text in SFL.....	9
2.2.2 The Notion of Metafunctions in SFL	11
2.2.3 Functional Grammar.....	12
2.3 Theme System	13
2.3.1 Types of Theme	13
2.3.2 Thematic Progression	17
2.4 Explanation Texts.....	19
2.4.1 Social Purpose and Generic Structures of Explanation Texts	19
2.4.2 Language Features of Explanation Texts	21
2.4.3 Examples of Explanation Texts Analyzed with the Theme System.....	22

2.5 Previous Studies on Theme System Analysis in Academic Texts	24
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	29
3.1 Research Design	29
3.2 Context of the Study	29
3.3 Data Collection.....	30
3.4 Data Analysis	32
CHAPTER IV FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS	35
4.1 The Realization of Theme Choice in Students' Explanation Texts	35
4.1.1 The Markedness of Topical Theme	36
4.1.2 The Realization of Textual Theme	46
4.1.3 The Realization of Interpersonal Theme	50
4.2 The Realization of Thematic Progression in Students' Explanation Texts	51
4.2.1 The Realization of Reiteration and Zig-zag Pattern	52
4.2.2 The Realization of Multiple-Rheme Pattern.....	55
4.3 Concluding Remark.....	57
CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	59
5.1 Conclusion.....	59
5.2 Pedagogical Implication	60
5.3 Limitations of the Study	61
5.4 Recommendation for Future Studies	61
REFERENCES.....	63
APPENDICES	69

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Unmarked Topical Theme Taken from Halliday and Matthiessen (2014, p. 104) and Its Examples	14
Table 2.2 Examples of Marked Theme Taken from Halliday and Matthiessen (2014, p. 100)	15
Table 2.3 The Example of Theme Choice Analysis Taken from Halliday and Matthiessen (2014, p. 107).....	17
Table 2.4 The Types of Explanation Texts According to Rose and Martin (2012) and Derewianka and Jones (2016)	20

Table 2.5 The Example of An Explanation Texts Analyzed with the Theme System Taken from Christie and Derewianka (2008, p. 203).....	22
Table 3.1 An Overview of the Collected Data.....	31
Table 3.2 The Example of Coding Process in Analyzing Theme Choice of Text C	33
Table 3.3 The Example of Coding Process in Analyzing Thematic Progression of Text E.....	34
Table 4.1 Overall Students' Theme Choice Frequency.....	35
Table 4.2 The Frequency of Unmarked Topical Theme Usage	38
Table 4.3 The Example of Unmarked Topical Theme in Text A	39
Table 4.4 The Example of Unmarked Topical Theme in Text B.....	39
Table 4.5 The Example of Unmarked Topical Theme in Text B.....	40
Table 4.6 The Example of Unmarked Topical Theme in Text B.....	40
Table 4.7 The Example of Unmarked Topical Theme in Text C.....	41
Table 4.8 The Example of Unmarked Topical Theme in Text C.....	42
Table 4.9 The Example of Unmarked Topical Theme in Text C.....	42
Table 4.10 The Example of Unmarked Topical Theme in Text D	42
Table 4.11 The Example of Unmarked Topical Theme in Text E.....	43
Table 4.12 The Example of Marked Topical Theme in Text C.....	44
Table 4.13 The Example of Marked Topical Theme in Text A.....	44
Table 4.14 The Example of Marked Topical Theme in Text A.....	45
Table 4.15 The Example of Marked Topical Theme in Text E	45
Table 4.16 The Frequency of Textual Theme Usage.....	47
Table 4.17 The Frequency of Thematic Progression	51

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 The Zig-zag Pattern According to Eggins (2004).....	18
Figure 2.2 The Reiteration Pattern According to Eggins (2004)	18
Figure 2.3 The Multiple-Rheme Pattern According to Eggins (2004).....	18
Figure 3.1 Thematic Choice According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2014).....	33
Figure 3.2 Thematic Progression According to Eggins (2004).....	34
Figure 4.1 The Word Cloud of Conjunctions Used by the Students	50

Figure 4.2 The Example of the Zig-zag Pattern Usage in Text D.....	53
Figure 4.3 The Example of the Zig-zag Pattern Usage in Text F	54
Figure 4.4 The Example of the Multiple-Rheme Pattern Usage in Text A.....	56
Figure 4.5 The Example of the Multiple-Rheme Pattern Usage in Text E.....	56
Figure 4.6 The Example of the Multiple-Rheme Pattern Usage in Text C.....	57

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 Writing Assessment Rubrics	70
APPENDIX 2 Students' Explanation Texts	74
APPENDIX 3 The Sample of Theme Choice Analysis.....	80
APPENDIX 4 The Sample of Thematic Progression Analysis	86

REFERENCES

- Ariyanti, A., & Fitriana, R. (2017). EFL students' difficulties and needs in essay writing. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*, 158, 111–121. <https://doi.org/10.2991/iccte-17.2017.4>.
- Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, genre, and style*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bloor, T., & Bloor, M. (2004). *The functional analysis of English: A Hallidayan approach* (2nd ed.). London: Arnold.
- Bloor, T., & Bloor, M. (2013). *The functional analysis of English: A Hallidayan approach* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Bui, H. P. (2022). Vietnamese EFL students' use and misconceptions of cohesive devices in writing. *SAGE Open*, 12(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221126993>.
- Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (2006). *Cambridge grammar of English: A comprehensive guide. Spoken and written English grammar and usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chang, P. (2021). Reading research genre: The impact of thematic progression. *RELC Journal*, 54(1), 129-148. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882211013613>.
- Chang, P., & Lee, M. (2019). Exploring textual and interpersonal themes in the expository essays of college students of different linguistic backgrounds. *English for Specific Purposes*, 54, 75-90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2019.01.002>.
- Chen, Q. (2019). Theme-Rheme structure in Chinese doctoral students' research writing — From the first draft to the published paper. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 37, 154-167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.12.004>.
- Christie, F., & Derewianka, B. (2008). *School discourse: Learning to write across the years of schooling*. London: Continuum.
- Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (6th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson.

- Dascalu, M., Crossley, S. A., McNamara, D. S., Dessus, P., & Trausan-Matu, S. (2018). Please readerBench this text: A multi-dimensional textual complexity assessment framework. In S. D. Craig (Ed.), *Tutoring and intelligent tutoring systems* (pp. 251-271). Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Derewianka, B., & Jones, P. (2016). *Teaching language in context* (2nd ed.). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Dontcheva-Navratilova, O., Jančaříková, R., Hůlková, I., & Schmied, J. (2020). Theme choices in Czech university students' English-medium master's theses. *Lingua*, 243, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2020.102892>.
- Eggins, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd ed.). London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Emilia, E. (2011). *Pendekatan genre-based dalam pengajaran bahasa Inggris: Petunjuk untuk guru*. Bandung: RIZQI press.
- Emilia, E. (2014). *Introducing Functional Grammar*. Bandung: PT. Dunia Pustaka Jaya.
- Emilia, E., Habibi, N., & Bangga, L. A. (2018). An analysis of cohesion of exposition texts: An Indonesian context. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(3), 515-523. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i3.9791>.
- Feri, Z. O., Ashadi, A., Triyono, S., & Pranowo, D. D. (2023). Thematic structure in students' writings: Implications on their ideas organization and development. *Register Journal*, 16(1), 49-72. <https://doi.org/10.18326/register.v16i1.49-72>.
- Firth, J. R. (1950). Personality and language in society. *The Sociological Review*, a42(1), 37-52. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.1950.tb02460.x>.
- Fontaine, L. (2012). *Analysing English grammar: A systemic functional introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hadiani, D., & Permata, N. N. (2019). An analysis of students' writing skills: Focus on grammatical and discourse competence. *A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 22(2), 198-208. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.2019.220206>.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2002). *On grammar*. London: Continuum.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *An introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Hart, C. (2014). *Discourse, grammar and ideology: Functional and cognitive practices*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Hernandez, H. P. (2020). Comparative analysis of the textual resources in academic texts in Philippine and American Englishes from systemic functional linguistic perspective. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 15(1), 17-43.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342178214_Comparative_Analysis_of_the_Textual_Resources_in_Academic_Texts_in_Philippine_and_American_Englishes_from_Systemic_Functional_Linguistic_Perspective_Journal_of_English_as_an_International_Language.
- Hidayati, K. H. (2018). Teaching writing to EFL learners: An investigation of challenges confronted by Indonesian teachers. *LANGKAWI: Journal of the Association for Arabic and English*, 4(1), 21-31.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v4i1.772>.
- Hood, S. (2010). *Appraising research: Evaluation in academic writing*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Humphrey, S., Droga, L., & Feez, S. (2012). *Grammar and meaning*. Newton: PETAA.
- Hymes, D. (1967). Models of the interaction of language and social setting. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23(2), 8-28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1967.tb00572.x>.
- JDIH Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (n.d.). *Peraturan menteri pendidikan dan kebudayaan Indonesia nomor 37 tahun 2018*.
<https://jdih.kemdikbud.go.id/sjdih/siperpu/dokumen/salinan/Permendikbud%20Nomor%2037%20Tahun%202018.pdf>.

- Knapp, P., & Watkins, M. (2005). *Genre, text, grammar: Technologies for teaching and assessing writing*. Randwick: University of New South Wales Press Ltd.
- Krippendorff, K. (2019). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4th ed.). California: SAGE Publications.
- Malinowski, B. (1923). The problem of meaning in primitive languages. in C. K. Ogden & I. A. Richards (eds.), *The Meaning of Meaning*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Mamac, M. H., & Bangga, L. A. (2022). Using linguistic-informed analysis to assess model texts for teaching EFL reading. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 421-433. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i2.45868>.
- Martin, J. R., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., & Painter, C. (2010). *Deploying functional grammar*. Beijing: The Commercial Press.
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause*. London: Continuum.
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2008). *Genre relations: Mapping culture*. London: Equinox Publishing Ltd.
- McNamara, D. S. (2013). The epistemic stance between the author and reader: A driving force in the cohesion of text and writing. *Discourse Studies*, 15(5), 579-595. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24442029>.
- McNamara, D. S., Graesser, A. C., McCarthy, P. M., & Cai, Z. (2014). *Automated evaluation of text and discourse with Coh-Metrix* (1st ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Morley, G. D. (2000). *Syntax in functional grammar*. London: Continuum.
- Nafisah, N., & Kurniawan, E. (2007). *Writing: English for general communication*. Bandung: UPI Press.
- Noprianto, E. (2017). Student's descriptive text writing in SFL perspectives. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 2(1), 66-81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v2i1.53>.
- Nurlatifah, L., & Yusuf, F. N. (2022). Students' problems in writing analytical exposition text in EFL classroom context. *ENGLISH REVIEW: Journal of*

English Education, 10(3), 801-810.
<http://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v10i3.6633>.

- Pavavijarn, S. (2022). Influences of thematic progression on quality of EFL Argumentative Writing. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 15(1), 282-319. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/256725>.
- Prasetyaningrum, A., Asrobi, M., Husnu, M., & Royahin, S. (2022). EFL students' ability and barriers in report text. *English Language in Focus*, 4(2), 149-162. <https://doi.org/10.24853/elif.4.2.162>.
- Priyatmojo, A. S. (2021). Cohesion and coherence of students' recount texts in Indonesia. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 15(2), 361-374. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v15i2.29003>.
- Pun, J. K. H. (2019). Salient language features in explanation texts that students encounter in secondary school chemistry textbooks. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 42, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.100781>.
- Rizki, M., Hidayat, D. N., Husna, N., & Alek. (2022). Discourse analysis of grammatical cohesion devices in student explanation texts. *Journal of English Education and Development*, 6(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.31605/eduvelop.v6i1.1545>.
- Rose, D., & Martin, J. R. (2012). *Learning to write, reading to learn: Genre, knowledge and pedagogy in the Sydney school*. Sheffield: Equinox Publishing Ltd.
- Sayukti, N. K. H., & Kurniawan, E. (2018). An analysis of student's recount text in systemic functional linguistic perspectives. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 4(1), 53-59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22225/jr.4.1.466.53-59>.
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Sofyan, R., & Tarigan, B. (2018). Theme markedness in the translation of student translators. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 235-243. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i1.11463>.
- Supriani, R., Rama, E. N., Sulhaida., & Aswani, A. (2018). The realization of markedness in grade XI students' recount texts in Binjai: Systemic

- functional perspective. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature*, 3(2), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v3i2.5998>.
- Thompson, G. (2014). *Introducing functional grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- To, V., Lê, Q., & Lê, T. (2015). Applying Halliday's linguistic theory in qualitative data analysis. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 15(2), 135-146. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-11-2014-0059>.
- Toba, R. Noor, W. N., & Sanu, L. O. (2019). The current issues of Indonesian EFL students' writing skills: Ability, problem, and reason in writing comparison and contrast essay. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 19(1), 57-73. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v19i1.1506>.
- Webster, J. J. (2015). *The Bloomsbury companion to M. A. K. Halliday*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Yunita, S. (2018). Theme and thematic progression in students' recount texts. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(3), 524-530. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i3.9797>.
- Zahra, G. M., Emilia, E., & Nurlaelawati, I. (2020). An analysis of cohesion and coherence of descriptive texts written by junior high school students. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 546, 195-202. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210427.030>.
- Zen, T. T., Sinar, T. S., Nurlala, N., & Yusuf, M. (2019). Process types of transitivity system in English department students' narrative texts. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 276, 149-155. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icoelt-18.2019.21>.