CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1   Theoretical Framework

In this part the writer will describe the theories that are used to analyse the data in this study. For the main theory, the writer applies the lexical cohesion devices theory that is posited by Halliday and Hasan (1976). Furthermore, for the supporting theories, the other linguists' theories will also be used to support the lexical cohesion theory. The supporting theories are Bahasa Indonesia theories from Kushartanti et al (2005), Aritonang et al (2009), and Muslich (2010). Aritonang et al (2009) conducted their research by applying the cohesion devices theory by Halliday-Hasan as their main theory. They also analysed their study further by applying some theories from other linguists in their analysis such as Firth (1957), in this study it is stated in the collocation description, and Suryawinata and Haryanto (2003), it is stated in the synonymy description.

The writer applies Kushartanti et al theory (2005) to develop her explanation about the lexical cohesion devices and reiteration in Bahasa Indonesia standardisation. Even though Kushartanti et al also applied Halliday-Hasan in their explanation about discourse especially in lexical cohesion devices, actually they include metonymy after repetition, synonymy, antonymy, and hyponymy which in Halliday-Hasan there is no metonymy; the writer also uses their theory to explain the

7

metonym further. Furthermore, Muslich's theory (Muslich, 2010) is applied by the writer to explain further about repetition and antonym.

Then the writer also uses other references to discover the supporting theories which are related to the topic of this study, language development of mental retardation and narrative speech theory. In language development of mental retardation theory the writer applies Santrock (2000), McCauley (2001), French and Suen (2003), Hoeksema-Susan (2004), Walker et al. (2006), Rahardja and Sujarwanto (2010), and Bernstein (1989) as addition. All of those language development references actually discussed about disorders in general but there is further explanation about mental retardation. Lastly, the writer uses a narrative speech theory by Sellnow et al. (2010).

2.1.1   Lexical Cohesion Devices

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), cohesion is a relation between the meaning of the text and the text itself semantically. There are two types of cohesion devices: grammatical and lexical cohesion devices. The grammatical cohesion includes: reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. Then, the lexical cohesion is the semantic relation which is realised in a lexical system (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). There are two forms of the lexical cohesion devices: reiteration and collocation. The reiteration form has five types: repetition, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, and metonymy. Further explanation will be discussed in these following discussions.

2.1.1.1 Reiteration

Reiteration is a lexical cohesion form that involves the repetition of a lexical item or the use of a word that refers to a lexical item (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, p. 278).

2.1.1.1.1 Repetition

Repetition means replicating the same lexical which has been stated before. The two forms of repetition are:

a. Identical repetition is replicating the same word without changing the word. For example:

> ***Menulis*** *merupakan kegiatan yang menyenangkan. Saat ini **menulis** menjadi hal yang sangat digemari khususnya para remaja.*

In the example above, the word **menulis is** replicated and repeated in the same function as a subject which means that word is important in the text.

b. Partial repetition is duplicating the word shortly than before. For example:

> ***Gadis Cantik*** *si kembang desa dari desa seberang membuat kagum banyak orang.* ***Gadis*** *itu merupakan anak Kepala Desa tersebut.*

By looking at the example above, gadis cantik is replicated by gadis that has the same reference in short replication form.

2.1.1.1.2 Synonymy

Synonymy is the lexical item that has similar or almost similar meaning with the previous related word. For example:

> ***Indah****nya tari Remo semalam menginspirasi adikku yang ingin menampilkan tarian yang **bagus** dalam pementasan nanti.*

In the example above, the word **indah** and **bagus** have a similar meaning.

2.1.1.1.3   Antonymy

Antonymy is the relation between one lexical item to another lexical item which has a semantically contrast meaning. For example:

*Walaupun sampul buku ini **jelek**, namun isi yang terkandung sangat **baik**.*

Based on the example, **jelek** and **baik** absolutely have contrast meaning.

2.1.1.1.4   Hyponymy

Hyponymy is about the relation between a specific word (as the subordinate) with the general word (as the superordinate), for example:

*Taman di belakang rumahku ditumbuhi banyak **bunga**. Ada **mawar**, **melati**,*

__matahari__, dan banyak lagi.

It is inefficient if the word **bunga** is applied before each hyponymy word, such as: **bunga mawar**, **bunga melati**, and **bunga matahari** whereas **bunga** is the subordinate of **mawar**, **melati**, and **matahari**.

2.1.1.1.5   Metonymy

Metonymy is the relation between a name or/and term that is associated to another thing that is related to the meaning of that word or become its quality (Kushartanti, 2005, p. 99). For example:

*__Maskapai penerbangan Garuda__ memperbarui armada penerbangannya dengan pesawat – pesawat baru. **Garuda** menggunakan pesawat Boeing terbaru dari Jerman yang telah diuji coba langsung oleh pilot – pilot professional.*

Based on the example, the word *Garuda* means the airline company and not a species of bird. However, it is also associated with an eagle as a bird that can fly.

2.1.1.2 Collocation

Collocation is the relation between one word to another word that are mixed up or belonging to each other as one unity. For example:

> *Ajang Miss Universe merupakan impian banyak gadis yang ingin menjadi* **ratu** *sejagad. Dalam penobatan,seorang Miss Universe akan dikenakan* **mahkota** *cantik yang berlapis emas murnia dan berlian.*

From the example above, the word **ratu** is associated with with **mahkota**. It is due to that **ratu** and **mahkota** are belonging each other as one unity.

2.1.2 Language Development of Mentally Retarded

Mental retardation is also defined as reduced intelligence (ability to a function in everyday situations and developmentally appropriate) accompanied with reduced adaptive functioning (McCauley, 2001, p. 147); moreover, the sufferers have an intelligent range below 70. Nakata (2003, in Rahardja&Sujarwanto, 2010, p. 45) uses intellectual disability as a mental retardation term which indicates that the sufferers are delayed in intellectual development. In daily life, they need helps and special education in academic area (Direktorat PLB, 2004, in Rahardja&Sujarwanto, 2010, p. 45). They can receive special education in special schools such as school for special need people or an inclusive school; it is to properly develop their motor skills and knowledge and also to teach them to be confident when facing other people.

Nolen-Hoeksema (2004, p. 461) also clarifies that in the language development each category has different characteristics. In the mild mental retardation children, they have average motor skill in learning, talk and write; thus**,** they have the ability to communicate with other people such as their family or other people around their environment and they also can reach a high school education. Children with moderate mental retardation significantly have delayed period. In this case, at age 3 they only use 4 to 10 words and are capable of learning simple vocational skill by studying in special education. Then children with severe mental retardation have very less development in motor skill and language; regarding to those reasons, they only speak in two or three word sentences. And the last children with profound mental retardation can only reach 300 – 200 word vocabularies and are inclined to not interact with others.

Individuals with mental retardation were identified by a lack of age-appropriate skills in carrying themselves and learning (Santrock, 2000, p. 405). In the early year, the mentally retarded children have lower development than normal children (Walker et al, 2006). That is why when facing or communicating with the mentally retarded children, giving a detail explanation and repeating the direction are really needed as stimulation for them. For example in telling a story based on a picture it is needed to give detail explanation first before they start to speech such as they have to look at the picture as a whole and pay attention for everything in the picture. In order to tell the story loudly they have to be reminded often because they have short-term memory.

Rahardja and Sujarwanto (2010) also explained that learning abstract words is difficult for them; thus, it really helps to make the words become more concrete. For example, when learning the word *democracy*, normal students usually write an article about the same subject but mentally retarded students will show their comprehension by showing pictures that is related to the word. Bernstein (1989, in Setyawati, 2011, p. 11) adds, therefore it is highly recommended for every person around mentally retarded people, such as parents and teachers, at every opportunity to slip some material related skills that they wanted to learn.

Because of the delay in intelligence development, mentally retarded students have been placed in their academic grade based on their mental age. It means, it is totally different with non-retarded students who have been placed in the grade based on their chronological age in general; in addition, the assessment test for them usually uses Binet test. Binet's mental result is originally to be used to determine how well children achieve in school (French and Suen, in Kamphaus and Reynolds, 2003, p. 7). The Binet test is used to find their mental age by calculating their IQ x chronological age, after that the preliminary result is divided by 100, then it is found the result of their mental age.

2.1.3 Narrative Speech

In this study, the writer focuses on narrative speech. The selection of narrative speech as the topic of this study because the participants are very familiar with narrative speech, it is due to that narrative speech is a part of the participants'

material in their school. Narrative speech is telling a story that consoles the audiences, and it is a good way to try out the speech-planning that have been learnt (Sellnow et al, 2010, p. 50). Moreover, most narrative speech is used to entertain or to melt down a situation between two or more people. Narrative speech is including telling a story about fictions, facts, or their experiences. The list below gives the characteristics of a narrative that is used in a speech (p. 50):

1. When delivering a narrative speech, the speaker must notice about the sequences: beginning, middle, and end. The climax part is the most interesting part where the speaker must give details on this part.

2. The speaker needs to make the story beautiful and give details in the background.

3. Add drama in the story; it is better to put dialogue (a dialogue between two or more people) to make the audiences feel involved in the story. Improve the speech with expressions, gestures, oddy moves or voice changes when mimicking another character.

4. There are various emotions in a narrative. Make a connection to the audiences' emotional.

5. In a narrative speech, the speaker does not need to put visual aids. But to show the event picture could be done in a narrative speech. It is effective for the speaker to use expressions, colourful languages, and non-verbal gestures related to the picture.

However, in narrative speech for mentally retarded students, according to Kernan&Sabsy (1993, in Syukri, 2011) showed that mentally retarded students have capability in telling story with the same structure as same as normal students. Then, Syukri (2011) added that while they were given the exact direction and context, they have capability to deliver a narration which shows that they obviously creative and sensitive. It is related to their academic activity where in exercising their storytelling skill, the participants usually talk about their holiday or daily activities. They have more capability in telling story about those aspects as a narrative text.

2.2   Review of Related Studies

The writer found that the studies about mental retardation in Indonesia were mostly conducted in written text production. In this study, the writer has found several studies dealing with mental retardation and lexical cohesion devices. Pruthi (2007) wrote about language development in children with mental retardation. In describing and comparing the language development between mental retardation and normal children she identified the language systems such as phonology, syntax, morphology, semantics and pragmatics using the frameworks by some theorists in each language system. The result of her study is that generally in early language development children with retardation are delayed compared to normal children but even so, both of those groups do not only have differences but also similarities. The retarded children follow the same set of universal principles in the word meaning acquisition. There are other similarities such as phonological errors, acquiring the

syntactic and morphological knowledge (in the early stages). In pragmatic skills, retarded children are less commonly displayed than normal children.

Moreover, Syukri (2009) conducted study about cohesion and coherence in the descriptive and narrative writing of hearing-impaired students. She described and categorised the cohesion devices in 100 students' writing texts by applying the theory of cohesion devices by Halliday and Hasan (1976) which is added with Renkema's (1993) and Carter's (1997). Then, she counted the frequency of the use of cohesive devices and also analysed the logical order of idea expression to depict the coherence. As the result, the hearing-impaired students used very limited cohesive devices in their descriptive and narrative writing production. Even though cohesive devices are used very rarely, the writing was coherent.

Another Syukri's study is about morpho-syntactic construction in mentally retarded children with a mild category. Syukri (2011) recorded the mentally retarded speech that was produced based on the five genre texts: narrative, descriptive, exposition, argumentative, and persuasive. She identified the turn taking role, the completeness constituent of a sentence, the word construction, and the verb construction that were produced by the mentally retarded children in their speech. The result shows that based on the five genre texts the mentally retarded children are more reactive. Then, the morpho-syntactic form occurred is verb inflection that is related to the sentence voice, those are active and passive voices. Meanwhile, she concluded that the mentally retarded children only have delaying not deviation in constructing and passive voice.

Additionally, Solichin (2010) studied the lexical cohesion devices in hearing impaired students. He identified the lexical cohesion in the students' writing by combining the frameworks of lexical cohesion analysis which are summarised by Yuwono in Kushartanti et al (2004) and Rani et al (2006) to view the accuracy in the students' writing. He also classified the lexical cohesion devices that is used in a student according to the type of the lexical cohesion devices and counted the percentage. The result shows that reiteration is mostly used than collocation in the text about 94.85%, where repetition is the biggest use about 84.55%.

Furthermore, Setyawati (2011) studied the grammatical cohesion devices in mentally retarded student with mild category. In analysing the data she used a similar way with Solichin's study (Solichin, 2010) but she analysed the grammatical cohesion. She used the cohesion theory from Hasan and Halliday (1976). She classified the cohesion devices that appeared in the mentally retarded students' writing then put them into the table based on each type. After that she counted the total number of each type of the grammatical cohesion devices that is used by the mentally retarded students in their writing and then analysed it. In her study she found that the grammatical cohesion that is used by the mildly mentally retarded students in their writing are nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis, nominal substitution, verbal substitution, temporal conjunction, additive conjunction, and personal reference.

Briefly, it can be seen there are some differences between those previous studies above and this study. The writer prefers mental retardation as the subject than other

subjects such as normal children like Pruthi done and hearing-impaired students like Syukri and Solichin done**.** The writer found there are only a few researches about mental retardation in speech. Mostly, those studies are about the writing text production. Then, different from Syukri's study, this study only focuses on lexical cohesion devices as one of the cohesion devices type and also only focuses on the narrative text. The writer prefers to analyse the lexical cohesion devices than other linguistics aspects such as phonology, syntax, morphology, semantics, and pragmatics in Pruthi's study, coherence text in Syukri's study, or grammatical cohesion in Setyawati's study. And due to other limitation factors such as research that concerns in adolescent, the writer chooses to focus only on teenagers in this study because mostly those related studies were conducted by focusing on children.