

The Lexical Cohesive Devices in the Conceptual Meaning of ‘Hero’: A Pragmatic Discourse Analysis

Elsa Maulita Siahaan¹, Rosaria Mita Amalia², Eko Wahyu Koeshandoyo¹, Elvi Citraesmana¹, Lia Maulia Indrayani¹, Ypsi Soeria Soemantri², Sutiono Mahdi²

¹Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Padjadjaran, Jatinangor, Jawa Barat, Indonesia

²Department of English Linguistics, Jatinangor, Jawa Barat, Indonesia,

Keywords: lexical cohesive devices, concept of ‘hero’, Cahaya Bangsa Classical School, descriptive writing, pragmatic discourse analysis

Abstract: Writing as one of language abilities involving multi-learning skills, experiences, and also cognitive processes can be obtained in descriptive writing. The aim in this research is to investigate the concept of “hero” in The English Second Language learners’ descriptive writing by third grade students observed using one of Halliday and Hassan’s five categories of cohesive devices, lexical cohesive devices, to enhance their overall texts’ communicability as devices are prominent to textual cohesion. The data of the features generally come from texts, oral and written, in any documents or transcripts. This paper focuses on (1) the type of lexical cohesion features occur in the third grade descriptive writing, (2) the difference concept of ‘hero’ obtained through the lexical cohesion features occurred in the third grades’ descriptive writing based on the student’s perspectival system. The method of this study is a descriptive qualitative research by first collecting, classifying, and then analysing the data, finalized in drawing conclusion. The data analysed are taken from the descriptive writing produced by Indonesian third grade students of Cahaya Bangsa Classical School (CBCS) obtained in January 2019. This is a case study constructed based on four previous researches in which specifies to the twelve (12) Indonesian third grade students. In result, both types of lexical cohesion features appear in the students’ descriptive writing which mostly are simple repetition, substitution, and equivalence, whereas only the first type collocation, ordered-set, that mostly appears one time. In conclusion, it is understood that the child processes their ‘hero’ concept by describing the characteristics of those whom they acknowledge as their heroes from the last clause in each of their descriptive writing.

1 INTRODUCTION

Everyone learns language started by learning the mother language before others even if there will be mistakes occurred. The meaning of language is to communicate among individuals known as a signalling system that fulfils the purpose of communication by having vocal sound operated within (Suhono in Puspita&Hasyim, 2017). In addition, one of the sciences that must be learned by all people is English language which has four different skills such as speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Writing skill is however recognized as the most difficult one, especially the academic one is hard which takes study and a lot of practice to

master this skill (Hoshima and Hogue in Siburian, 2013). The writer has different perspective about writing not being a product but the process or review and revise since through writing there will be the result. The result of writing is a final product of writing.

There is narrative, expository, persuasive, and descriptivetype of writings (Jeffrey, 2016). Stated accordingly, descriptive writing can be found in mostly fiction although it can also be found in nonfiction in such as memoirs or travel guides. He added that when a person writes a descriptive style, this author paints a picture of a person, place, or things in words for the reader or listener. They might also employ metaphors or any literary devices in describing the author’s impression using their five

senses (see, hear, smell, taste or touch) without trying to convince the reader or listener of anything being explained in the scenes – the author only describes things as they are. More specifically, the generic structure of descriptive writing is enhanced such as identification in which describing the identified phenomenon and description in which parts, qualities or characteristics of something or someone is described (Gerot & Wignell in Masitoh and Surpijadi, 2015). Along with that statement, it is also broadened that descriptive writing applies linguistics feature such as (1) specific participant or the main character, (2) the use of present tense, (3) the use of linking verb, (4) the existence of action verb, mental verb, and mental process, (4) the nominal groups, (5) adjective, and (6) adverb and adverbial phrase. Thus being stated, it is clear that descriptive writing has the purpose to give a certain information about particular place, person, and place, and the use of linguistic features are definitely required in this writing.

Related to the process of writing itself, it is then specified that children age 7-9 develop improved handwriting, group sentences about one idea joined together to make a paragraph, start adding not only spaces between words, but also capital letters in the beginning of a sentence and punctuation at the end (Morin, 2014). In addition, they also learn to write contraction in their sentences, make compound sentences, and insert the adjective and adverb in their writing to be more descriptive. Related to that, the process of writing is then more functionally developed in the age of 8-9-year-old child which is in third grade level (Anderson, 2011). In addition, two out twenty-one (21) common characteristics a third grader is good at caring about process and product; being eager for approval of their friends and adults, and also are increasingly interested in logic, classification, and the way things work. Therefore, the third grade students' descriptive writing is interesting to be analysed. Therefore, to investigate about the conceptual meaning of 'hero' in the students' writing, according to the children's perspective, the lexical cohesive devices tools are used to comprehend the third graders conceptual meaning of "hero" in their descriptive writing.

There have been some previous researches conducted associated to this current research such as first entitled *Lexical Cohesion In Student Academic Writing* (Susan Lousie Van Tonder, 1999) which focuses the study on examining the lexical cohesion occurred in the random writing of undergraduate students studying the course regarding to the

question required the students to write an answer of an expository nature based on the discussion of a literary text, in this case *Animal Farm* by George Orwell. Another one is entitled *A Cognitive Approach to Cohesion and Coherence in Dholuo Narrative* (Okoth Bellah Queen, 2015) focuses in determining the cohesion features to be analysed using frames and profiles theories. Moreover, the other article entitled *Use of Cohesive Devices in Children and Regular Literature: Conjunction and Lexical Cohesion* (Mohammad Raouf Moini, 2016) focuses the potential similarities and differences between literature for children and adult level (regular) with respect to the frequency of lexical cohesive markers and conjunctions. Furthermore, another article entitled *Discourse Analysis on the Cohesion of Descriptive Writing Produced by Students of UIN RIL Lampung* (Nurul Puspita and Umar Al faruq A Hasyim, 2017) which focuses in both cohesion features in university students in Lampung. Finally, the most recent research conducted is entitled *The Use of Lexical Cohesion Elements In Writing of ESL learners* (Kadiri, Igbowke, Okebalama, and Egbe, 2016) focuses the study investigating the use of lexical cohesion elements in the students of English as Second Language in the University of Nigeria.

This research is different from the previous ones for this research analyses the occurrence of lexical cohesive devices used by the third grade Indonesian students applying the devices on their descriptive writing that can convey their conceptual meaning of a hero in their life. It is important to be conducted in order to give comprehension towards the usage of having lexical cohesive devices on the written text to students and more of exposure for the English teacher in order to improve the text coherence for different level to have mutual understanding between the author and the reader or listener. For other researchers, this research can also be beneficial as the alternative way to see the important usage of the discourse features namely cohesion on the written text. In short, this research hopefully gives benefit to the students, teacher, and the others researcher in order to obtain recent information on the cohesion and its weight to written text.

2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

A text recognizes the process of instantiation; and possible to be characterized by reference to the

system as the selection of systemic options clarifying over time (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014). The text is considered good when the cohesion features exist in the text. Cohesion can be defined as the set of resources for building relations in discourse that exceeds grammatical structure where meaning is focused into a useable present of discourse (Martin in Tannen, 2015). Cohesion is one of the aspects in the study of coherence in which the reading position is established by texts for listener or readers involving understanding and expectations about the social context a text dynamically interprets. In SFL, social context is modelled through register and genre theory, conjunction, and lexical cohesion.

The account of cohesive devices which Halliday refers as the ‘textual meta-function’ is subdivided into five (5) categories, such as (1) *Reference* is the resources for referring to a participant or circumstantial element that has a recoverable identity including demonstratives, the definite article, pronouns, comparatives, and the phoric adverbs *here, there, now, and then*; (2) *Ellipsis* that is useful to omit a clause, or some part of a clause or group within the contexts having the content assumed, such as English conversation, rejoinders which are often made dependent through omissions of this kind, for example: *Did they win? –Yes, they did*; (3) *Substitution* is a set of place holders used to signal the omission including *so* and *not* for clauses, *do* for verbal groups, and *one* for nominal groups in English conversation; (4) *Conjunction* is known as much larger register of connectors that bond clauses in discourse. Halliday and Mattiessen involve linkers that connect sentences to each other but excluding paratactic and hypotactic (coordinating and subordinating) linkers within sentences, in which considered structural, whereas Gutwinski (2007) includes all connectors, whether or not they link clauses within or between sentences. This difference reflects in part a territorial disagreement over how much work the grammar is expected to do in discourse analysis. . Therefore, even there are differences, Gutwinski (1971) and Halliday and Hassan (1976) do play important role in contributing the fundamental perspective in understanding cohesion; (5) *Lexical Cohesion* is known as the complement of grammatical cohesion involving open system items (open class words) such as synonymy, or near synonymy (including hyponymy and collocation)) for expectancy relations between lexical items (e.g., the mutual predictability of *strong* and *tea*, but not *powerful* and *tea*).

Given specific detail regarding to lexical cohesion, Tanskanen asserted in more detailed description and classification of the lexical cohesion based on previous theory by Halliday and Hasan model (Tanskanen, 2006). She is concerned by how cohesion is used to achieve coherence in different text types, which one of them is the academic writing. In addition, her interesting work model in the perspective of discourse because can be applied to analyse cohesion in different text types by borrowing some categories from the previous models such as from Halliday and Hassan, Morris and Hirst (1991), and Hoey (1991). It is considered that her model “provided a good basis for understanding the work done by lexical cohesion in discourse (Tanskanen, 2006, p.49). To Tanskanen, once the author of a discourse produce texts and use the cohesive devices to be the signals for the reader or listener to interpret the signals and decode information from the texts, both of them are considered to be collaborating toward coherence.

In the proposed model, she grouped lexical cohesion into two main categories such as reiteration and collocation. After that, she describes eight (8) subcategories for reiteration including Simple repetition, Complex repetition, Substitution, Equivalence, Generalization, Specification, Co-specification, and Contrast. Moreover, she discovers collocation are also used to achieve cohesion which subdivided into three subcategories such as Ordered –set, activity related and elaborative relations are three kinds of collocation in her model of lexical cohesion. Yet she also concludes that through collocation, the cohesion is rarely achieved.

Table 1: Lexical Cohesion Features

Reiteration	Collocation
1. Simple repetition (a cat – cats)	1. Ordered- set collocation
2. Complex repetition (a help – helping)	{1,2,3; Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday}
3. Substitution (a drug – it)	2. Activity-related collocation
4. Equivalence (to buy – to purchase)	3. Elaborative collocation
5. Generalization (political party- labor)	
6. Specification (health, education – social service)	
7. Co-specification (RP Speakers – Standard English Speaker)	
8. Contrast (full- empty)	

The first main category of lexical cohesion is repetition. Repetition is subdivided into two, the simple and complex ones (Tanskanen, 2006). Simple repetition, the first category, occurs when something is repeated either in an identical form or with others that only changes simple grammatical portion such as singular-plural, present tense –past tense.

Complex repetition as the second category rather includes a more significant change in which the item(s) may be identical but perform different grammatical functions, or they may not be identical but share a lexical morpheme. The third category is substitution which most usual form occurs is a pronoun substituting a noun. She agrees to Hoey (1991) stating that even though pronouns are usual part of grammatical cohesion, they can still have similar function to full repetitions which is the reason she includes substitution as part of reiteration. The Equivalence is the fourth. After McCarthy (1998), the notion equivalence is used to refer to the relation more commonly referred to synonymy, specific approach which then being implemented to analyse the lexical relation in discourse. As Tanskanen specifies that the significance issue for this kind of approach to lexical relations is to take an item for instance in equivalence with another item, although they may not be semantically absolutely synonymous. Generalization, the fifth, refers to the relationship between an item and a more general item, in which commonly known as superordinate or hyponymic relation. As the sixth, Specification refers to an item and a more specific item called meronymy, and McCarthy referred to it as inclusion: general-specific (Tanskanen, 2006). The seventh category is Co-specification which refers to the relation between two items that have a common general item. In the earlier studies, it is called as co-hyponymy and comeronymy. Finally, the last category is the contrast, in which referring to the relation between an item and the other that has an opposite meaning. This relation has other notion such as antonymy, opposition, or complex repetition or paraphrase (Tanskanen, 2006 pg.59).

The second main category of lexical cohesion is collocation. This category is often controversial in the kind relation between words which most of the times has been excluded from analysis. Despite of the difficulties, it is still the member of lexical cohesion features that is able to be analyzed. Collocation is subdivided into three parts. The first one is Ordered-set collocation involves members of ordered set of lexical items such as colours, numbers, months, and the days of the week and the like. It is the easiest one to recognize compared to the other two. Since this set is commonly clearer, these relations are easy enough to find in texts, however it could seem to be uncommon in the present study. In example, *today-tomorrow-yesterday, or Monday – the Saturday night*. The second one is Activity-related collocation relating

words to each other based on an activity. For example (1) cyphers – decode (You can decode cyphers), (2) meals – eat, (3) driving- the same car. In classifying such examples, it may be helpful to think of the word' association as the result from the relation (Tanskanen, 2016 pg.62). The last one is Elaborative collocation referring to the association that neither can be considered as an ordered- set nor as an activity-related collocation. It is defined based on frame theory. Frames are knowledge structures which are evoked by lexical items. For example, if a text starts with *arraignment*, it arouses the arraignment frame, and such words *asmagistrate* and *charges* are interpreted according to this frame resulting in the creation of coherence in the text (Fillmore 1985; Fillmore & Baker 2001:3 in Tanskanen 2006 pg.63).

Evans (2007: 85) explained that a frame is a schematization of experience or a knowledge structure which is represented at the conceptual level and understood in long time memory and which relates elements and entities associated with a particular culturally embedded scene, situation, or event from human experience. The essential idea to understand the frames is that one thing cannot understand the meaning of a single word without having the access to all the essential knowledge that is related to that word. For example, to understand the word *sell*, we understand that there should be an obligatory seller, buyer, and also goods to sell in particular for the word '*buying*' to take place. This statement explains how a word activates a frame of semantic knowledge relating to the specific concept it refers to or highlights.

3 METHODOLOGY

The data of this study is taken from the descriptive writings written by the Indonesian Third Grade students of Cahaya Bangsa Classical School. This school is located in Kota Baru Parahyangan, West Java. This data is interesting because the writer sees the different concept of hero the third graders

This study uses qualitative research with case study. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) described that a qualitative research as involving "... an interpretive naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of or interpret

phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them.” (p. 3).

[Qualitative research is] research using methods such as participant observation or case studies which result in a narrative, descriptive account of a setting or practice. (Parkinson & Drislane, 2011). Therefore, qualitative researchers are interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed, that is, how people make sense of their world and the experiences they have in the world. (Merriam, 2009, p. 13)

4 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Table 2: Categories Conceptual Meaning

Data	Type of reiteration	Type of collocation	Concept of 'hero'
1	Simple repetition (6) equivalence (1)	Ordered -set (2)	Mom and dad → always help and give solution
2	Simple repetition (13), substitution (3), equivalence (2), specification (1)	Ordered -set (2)	Dad and mom → told me to be brave, cook good food, and give me courage
3	Simple repetition (13), substitution (2), equivalence (3), co-specification (1)	Ordered -set (2)	Parents and God → loves me which made me & be kind, teach me and make me laugh
4	Simple repetition (6), substitution (2), equivalence (3)	Ordered -set (2)	Dad, mom, shepherd dog → teaches me to protect each other
5	Simple repetition (7), substitution (3), equivalence (1)	Ordered -set (1)	Lord and parents → teach about the Lord and my mom gave me healthy food have equivalent value of giving
6	Simple repetition (8), substitution (1), equivalence (2)	Ordered -set (1)	God and mom → help me in my life, in my hard times and when I need more energy.
7	Simple repetition (5), substitution (2), equivalence (5)	Ordered -set (1)	Jesus Christ and parents → He save me and die for me and they keep giving food and House has the equivalent value of love and kindness
8	Simple repetition (8), substitution (2), equivalence (5)	Ordered -set (1)	My God and dad → cares for me and loves me has the equivalent value of protection
9	Simple repetition (9), substitution (1), equivalence (2)	Ordered -set (1)	God and my friend, Derrick → God is my creator and my friend Derrick is very kind to me have the equivalent value of making him feel special
10	Simple repetition (5), substitution (3), equivalence (2)	Ordered -set (1)	mom and grandma → help me Do my homework and tell me to do my homework; Grandma always cook the best have the equivalent value that hero gives something to him.
11	Simple repetition (8), substitution (2), equivalence (1)	Ordered -set (1)	Grandpa and little brother → every time we went to the mall, he bought me a toy and he entertains me when i was sick have the equivalent values that heroes are entertaining
12	Simple repetition (8), substitution (2), equivalence (1)	Ordered -set (1)	Mother and Jesus → My heroes can help me live with happiness and peace.

Based on the twelve data obtained, there are twelve different categories conceptual meaning of 'hero' given below. Each student's category of 'hero' concept obtained here is taken from the original thoughts of each in the descriptive writing, therefore, there must be seen grammatical and punctuation error above. Based on the model proposed by Tanskanen (2006) for lexical cohesion and that of Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) had previously, it is shown that lexical cohesion features, reiteration and collocation, occur in the twelve data obtained from the third-grade students' descriptive writing.

Based on the occurrence of reiteration, there are nine data that show the occurrence of simple

repetition, substitution, and equivalence. There is one data that shows the occurrence of simple repetition and equivalence. There is one data that shows the occurrence of simple repetition, substitution, equivalence, and specification. There is one data that shows the occurrence of simple repetition, substitution, equivalence, and co-specification.

Based on the occurrence of collocation, only collocation type one, ordered- set collocation that occur in the third grade students' descriptive writing. There are five data that show the two pairs of first type collocation and there are seven data that have one pair of first type collocation.

The concept of 'hero' occur mostly in the last clause each student has in their descriptive writing. The concept or value of hero is obtained based one the utterance written by each student. The concept of hero itself, based on the Anderson' (2011) characteristics list what third graders' can do, two of them stated that the third graders are good at such as they usually care about process and product. One of the processes is the concept of 'hero' that they receive and resulted in the definition of who is the hero for them related to the process. Based on the results, it is understood that the child processes the concept of his/her heroes by describing about the characteristics of those that they believe as heroes for them from the last clause. The amount of simple repetition, substitution, and equivalence do influence the conceptual meaning of 'hero' from each respondent. The more amount they have, the more they establish the understanding each respondent has to describe about their 'hero'.

Based on the twelve data obtained, both type of lexical cohesion features appears in the third graders' descriptive writing with the conceptual meaning of 'hero' do appear in the third graders' descriptive writing. The lexical cohesive devices that appear are simple repetition which appears 13 times in 2 data, substitution which appears 3 times in 3 data, and equivalence which appears 5 times in 2 data, and also co-specification that appears 1 time in 1 data, whereas the collocation that appears is only the first type, ordered-set collocation that mostly appear one time.

In conclusion, it is understood that the child processes the concept of his/her heroes by describing about the characteristics of those that they believe as heroes for them based on their conceptual perspectival system based on personal experience each of them have with them which mostly appear in the last clause of their writing. The more amount of lexical cohesion features appears in each

respondent's writing, the more they know their favorite hero(es) in their life, while if they are only mentioned less, it means that the respondent's do not have detailed description of their favorite 'hero'.

REFERENCES

- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2002). *The Qualitative Inquiry Reader*. doi:10.4135/9781412986267
- Evans, V. (2007). *A Glossary of Cognitive Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd
- Gutwinski, W. (2007). *Cohesion in Literary Texts*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Mathiessen, C. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (4th Edition). London: Edward Arnold.
- Jackson, S.L. (2011) "Research Methods and Statistics: A Critical Approach" 4th edition, Cengage Learning
- Kadiri, G. C., Igbokwe, U. L., Okebalama, U. N., & Egbe, C. I. (2016). The Use of Lexical Cohesion Elements in the Writing of ESL Learners. *Research in Language*, 14(3), 221-234. doi:10.1515/rela-2016-0014
- Langacker, R. W. (1986). *An Introduction to Cognitive Grammar*. *Cognitive Science*, 10(1), 1-40. doi:10.1207/s15516709cog1001_1
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative Case Study Research Qualitative research: a guide to design and implementation* (2nd ed., pp. 39-54). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Nurul Puspita, & Umar Alfaruq A. Hasyim. (2017). Discourse Analysis on the cohesion of descriptive writing produced by students of IAIN lampung. *IQRA' (Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Pendidikan)*, 2(25274449). doi:10.25217/ji.v2i2.166.347-36
- Sibirian, T. A. (2013). Improving Students' Achievement On Writing Descriptive Text Through Think Pair Share. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistic World (IJLLALW)*, 3.
- Tannen, D., Hamilton, H. E., & Schiffrin, D. (2018). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tanskanen, S. K. (2006). *Collaborating Towards Coherence: Lexical Cohesion in English Discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamin.
- Use of Cohesive Devices in Children and Regular Literature: Conjunctions and Lexical Cohesion. (2016). *International Journal of Comparative Literature and Translation Studies*, 4(4). doi:10.7575/aiac.ijclts.v.4n.4p.12