

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Review of Related Studies

There are a few studies which provided detail information about hearing-impaired research, especially on writing language. The writer found a research which proposed by Rosenberg (1999). In her research, she analyzed how the deaf people used the writing system language in America in order to represent their thought and what they wanted to say. For deaf people, they tend to use the simple structure of sentence: subject-verb-object. For example: “I help you” not “I will help you”.

Related to the issue that the writer investigated in this study, she found two studies that discuss cohesion in texts; first, Wijayanti (1995) analyzed the use of grammatical cohesion in Graham Greene’s literary work *The Heart of the Matter*. She collected the data from the novel *The Heart of the Matter*. Ana only analyzed the grammatical cohesion that was used in Graham Greene literary work. She concluded that the use of grammatical cohesion made the story in the novel became coherence so the reader could clearly catch what the author wanted to convey. She used descriptive qualitative methodology to analyze the novel based on theory of grammatical cohesion proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976).

Another research conducted by Pusparini (2006) investigated cohesive devices made by elementary students at the fourth and the fifth grades of SDN

Kertajaya XIII/219 in their Indonesian narrative compositions. She found that ten students used all types of cohesive devices: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and reiteration. It also showed types of cohesive devices which mostly occurred in their narrative compositions. However, the use of cohesive devices sometimes is not accurate. Though, some cohesive devices were used inaccurately such personal substitution and conjunction, however, the narrative remains coherent.

Nevertheless, the research conducted by the writer is different with the previous studies since the participants of this research are junior high school hearing-impaired students at the second grades. Beside that, the aims of this research are different with the previous studies that are: first, to find out the grammatical cohesion devices which are used by the participants on their Indonesian descriptive compositions. Second, after finding the grammatical cohesion devices in the participants' Indonesian descriptive compositions, it will be known easily which type of grammatical cohesion devices mostly occurred in their Indonesian descriptive compositions.

2.2 Review of Related Theories

2.2.1 The Language Development of Hearing-Impaired Children

As children who have language delay, they certainly have a different language development with normal children. The terms to cover this condition are specific language impairment (SLI) or language Impairment (LI) are most commonly used to refer to problems in the acquisition and use of language

(Cohen, 2001). A major issue of hearing-impaired language acquisition stands for the extent to which prelinguistic deafness affects language acquisition. Because of their slower acquisition, it causes language acquisition to be delayed. The problem of child with hearing-impaired is in acquiring and using the syntactic and semantic aspects of the language and in using such skills to develop writing and reading ability (Bernstein, 1985). Moreover, hearing loss is classified into several classifications. The following is an audiometric classification system suggested by G. H. Shames and E. H. Wiig (1986).

Hearing Threshold Level	Classification
0-15 dB	Normal range
15-25 dB	Slight hearing loss
25-40 dB	Mild hearing loss
40-65 dB	Moderate hearing loss
69-95 dB	Severe hearing loss
95 dB or above	Profound hearing loss

Table 2.1 Hearing Threshold Classification

The semantic or lexical aspect of language concerns the meaning of words or vocabulary. Children with LI may have poor expressive and receptive vocabularies and difficulty learning new word. With a limited vocabulary, children are likely to have problems expressing themselves and understanding the language of others. Children with LI also commonly have word finding problems. These are reflected in difficulties finding words in the first place, choosing an alternative word when misunderstood, or injecting variety in expression. Beside that, the syntax and morphology refer to the grammatical aspects of language,

which provide the rules for organizing meaningful units into words and words into sentences. Children with LI use shorter sentences and have difficulties producing and understanding syntactically complex sentences with elaborated verb, phrases, pronouns, adjectives, and auxiliaries (Leonard, 1997).

Writing on deaf individuals has been compared to the normally hearing controls in numerous studies, which have consistently revealed differences in performance indicative of deaf subjects English language deficiencies. Sentence written by deaf children and adolescents tend to be shorter (i.e., contain fewer words) than those written by normally-hearing controls of the same age and contain fewer conjoined and subordinate clauses (Kyle, 1994). Deaf individuals also tend to reiterate words and phrases within a discourse. On the other hand, Simmons (1962); Myklebust (1964) as cited in Kyle (1994) stated that deaf children use more articles and nouns and fewer adverbs and conjunction than normally-hearing children matched for age. It is supported by Stuckles and Mark (1966) as cited in Kyle (1994) argued that with increasing age, the length of deaf children sentences and composition tends to increase, as does the diversity of their own usage.

2.2.2 Cohesion and Coherence

In Layman's terms cited in Renkema (1993), a discourse, and especially a text, is a sequence of connected sentences or utterances (the form) by which a sender communicates a message to a receiver (the function). In Halliday and

Hasan (1976) point of view, the primary determinant of whether a set of sentences do or do not constitute a text depends on cohesive relationships within and between the sentences, which create “*texture*”. On the other hand, cohesion is a potential for relating one element in the text to another, wherever they are and without any implication that everything in the text has some part in it (1976). According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), cohesion is expressed partly through the grammar and partly through the vocabulary. Thus, they divided into grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. Grammatical cohesion falls into reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. Reference is a potentially cohesive relation because the thing that serves as the source of the interpretation may itself be an element of text. A reference item can relate anaphorically to any element whether specific or not (1976). Substitution is a relation between linguistic items, such as words or phrases. On the other hand, substitution is a relation within the text. A substitution is a sort of counter which is used in place of the repetition of a particular item (1976). Ellipsis can be defined as substitution by zero. It means that ellipsis can be interpreted as that form of substitutions in which the item is replaced by nothing (1976). The final type of cohesive relation that we find in the grammar is that of conjunction. Conjunction expresses certain meanings which assume the presence of other components in the discourse.

The types of grammatical cohesion may be various among different languages (Chaer, 2006). In order to identify the use of grammatical cohesion devices in Indonesian descriptive compositions used by junior high school hearing-impaired students at the second grades, the writer used Alwi, et. al (2003)

about Indonesian types of grammatical cohesion. Further explanation about the theory used will be explained in theoretical framework in this chapter.

In addition, Widdowsan (1973) states that sentences combined to form texts and the relation between sentences are aspect of grammatical cohesion; utterance combine to form discourse and the relation between them are aspects of discourse coherence. Therefore, cohesion is only a guide to coherence and coherence is something created by the readers in the act of reading the text. Coherence is the feeling that a text hangs together, that it makes sense, and it is not just a jumble of sentences (McCarthy, 1991). Others (van Dijk and Kintsch, 1983) regard cohesion as an instance of coherence. According to Brown and Yule (1983), text is understood in terms of abstract unit that realize discourse relations. The unit is also known as “coherence relations and discourse coherence relation. Furthermore, it is neither too necessary nor sufficient to use cohesion in the identification of text and create coherence because cohesion cannot guarantee it (1983).

De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) stated that cohesion and coherence are different. Cohesion is an element of text explicable in terms similar to those of formal linguistics, and coherence as a result of the interaction of text and receiver. That most coherent texts are also cohesive, however, does not imply that coherence is created by cohesion. Coherence is the quality of being meaningful and unified that is necessary for communication and it cannot be explained by concentrating on the internal grammar (Cook, 1989). Nevertheless, it can be explained through how the meanings of sentences in a text hang together (van

Dijk, 1997). However, the writer only used the grammatical cohesion devices as the limitation on this study in order to gain the hearing-impaired children's ability in making descriptive composition. For hearing-impaired children, their writing skill tends to be delayed since they acquire writing after they acquire the sign language. Hence, automatically, they have limited vocabulary which results in them using grammatical cohesion instead of lexical cohesion since grammatical cohesion is easier to use in their composition. Specifically, grammatical cohesion emphasizes on word or phrases usage; while lexical cohesion emphasizes on meaning.

2.2.3 Descriptive Composition

According to Keraf (2003), composition can be divided into five types such as descriptive, narrative, argumentative, persuasive, and expository. In this case, the written text that is used to be analyzed is descriptive composition. Descriptive is one of the writing compositions which accounts how the writer writes a story to attract the reader based on his or her imagination about certain objects (Keraf, 1982). The word descriptive derives from the Latin word "*describere*" which means to create the reader's imagination about something. So, they will feel as if they see the object physically just like the writer's did.

The writer decides to use descriptive composition on this research, because descriptive composition is easier to write by the hearing-impaired children than any other composition.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), cohesion is expressed partly through the grammar and partly through the vocabulary. Thus, we can refer to grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. Grammatical cohesion consists of substitution, ellipsis, reference, and conjunction.

As stated previously, grammatical cohesion may vary across languages (Chaer 2006). In this study, the writer used Indonesian category of grammatical cohesion based on Alwi, et. al (2003) to identify grammatical cohesion devices used by junior high school hearing-impaired students at the second grades in their Indonesian descriptive composition. In Alwi, et. al (2003), cohesion expresses the form correlation. Cohesion is the compatible relation between an element with others within discourse to create a good meaning or coherent. For example, *Ratna dan kawannya pergi karena ia harus mendaftar*, this sentence is not cohesively since the pronoun *ia* is not clearly part to whom it refers to, whether it refers to Ratna or her friend. In order to make the sentence cohesively, the word *Ratna* or *kawannya* can be used twice to replace the word *ia*.

Before going further into the explanation of cohesive relation, it is better to know about two relations in the discussion of discourse. The first is endophoric and the second is exophoric. Endophoric relations are the relations between sentences within text. Therefore, to interpret the meaning of the text, we do not have to look outside the text. There are two kinds of endophoric relations: anaphoric and cataphoric. Relation that looks back in the text for their interpretation is called anaphoric relation, (e.g. Look at the sun. Its going down

quickly, *It* refers back to *the sun*), and relation that looks forward in the text for their interpretation is called cathaporic relation, (e.g. Its going down quickly, the sun. *It* refers forward to *the sun*) Endophoric relation plays part in textual cohesion. In contrast, exophoric relation has no role in textual cohesion because their interpretation lies outside the text. In this study, the writer explained only about endophoric relation since it is considered as textual cohesion.

2.3.1 Grammatical Cohesion

In Alwi, et. al (2003), grammatical cohesion can be determined on the relation of sentences components in which they are connected to reference, ellipsis and conjunction.

2.3.1.1 Reference

Reference is the act of referring to a preceding or following element, deals with semantics relationship (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). Reference in Indonesian is divided into two types; personal reference and demonstrative reference (Alwi, et. al, 2003). Meanwhile, personal reference falls into three types; the personal reference of the first person, the personal reference of the second person, and the personal reference of the third person, whereas demonstrative reference falls into two types; reference *itu* and reference *ini*.

2.3.1.1.1 Personal Reference

Personal reference is a reference that is used to denote person. The first person is *saya*, *aku*, *daku*, *kami*, dan *kita*; the second person is *kamu*, *engkau*, *anda*, *dikau* and *kalian* including the enclitics *ku*, *kau*, and *mu*. In addition, the personal reference of third person such as *ia*, *dia*, *beliau*, *mereka*. Nevertheless, the enclitics forms of *-nya* can be also categorized as personal reference in textual cohesion. The enclitics form *-nya* can be referred to animate and inanimate things. Below are some examples:

- a. Adik bertanya kepada paman, “Paman, bolehkah *saya* ikut ke rumah paman?”
- b. Kata ayah kepada *saya*, “Mari *kita* bersihkan ruangan ini”.
- c. Ayam jagoku dipotong ibu kemarin. *Dagingnya* dibuat gulai.

It is clearly seen that all the examples refer anaphorically. In sentence (a) we can found the co-reference occurs between the word *adik* and the personal reference of the first person *saya*. The personal reference *saya* explain to the word *adik* which is the antecedent. The example of the personal reference of the first person *kita* in sentence (b) explain to the word *ayah* and *saya*. The enclitics form *-nya* in sentence (c) refer to animate thing, which is *Ayam jago*.

2.3.1.1.1 Demonstrative Reference

There are two types' general reference words in Indonesian those are: *itu* and *ini*.

1. Demonstrative Reference *itu*

In endophoric relation, the word *itu* always refers back in the text for its interpretation. The word *itu* refers to the past or the information that has been conveyed. For example:

“Langit mendung dan berawan tebal. *Itu* tandanya hujan lebat akan segera turun.”

The word *itu* refers back to the word *langit mendung dan berawan tebal*.

2. Demonstrative Reference *ini*

The word *ini* in endophoric relation can be used to look forward or backward in the text for its interpretation. The word *ini* refers to the present or the information that will be conveyed. For example:

“Kami menyampaikan usul kepada Pak Camat agar lebar jalan yang akan dibuat itu ditambah satu meter lagi. Usul *ini* didasarkan pada perkiraan jika terjadi kebakaran maka mobil pemadam kebakaran dapat masuk”.

The word *ini* is considered anaphoric reference, since it refers backward to the phrase *ditambah satu meter lagi*.

2.3.1.2 Ellipsis

In ellipsis, there is an element that is not mentioned literally in the next sentence. It is the absence of word, phrase, or clause, which is still understandable. For examples:

- a. X : Jam berapa kamu datang?
Y : *Enam*.

b. X : Kalau kau bukan orang Maluku, maka sebenarnya kau dilahirkan

dimana?

Y : *Flores!*

In the first and second conversation, the speaker answers the question incompletely. In the first conversation, the word *saya datang jam* is omitted. For the second conversation, the phrase *saya lahir di* is omitted.

2.3.1.3 Conjunction

Conjunction is a relationship which indicates how the subsequent sentence or clause should be linked to the preceding or the following (parts of the) sentence. Conjunction is divided into four types. Those are coordinative conjunction, subordinative conjunction, correlative conjunction, and clausal conjunction.

2.3.1.3.1 Coordinative Conjunction

1. Additive conjunction

The words that are included in additive conjunction are *dan*, *dengan*, and *serta*. For examples:

- a. “Kami memerlukan kertas, lem, gunting, *dan* benang”.
- b. “Ibu *dengan* ayah pergi ke Bogor”.

2. Selective conjunction

Selective conjunction is used to choose two nouns, two verbs, and adjective with different meaning (antonym-synonym). That is *atau*. For examples:

- a. “Mahal *atau* murah akan kubeli rumah itu”.
- b. “Jangan menegur *atau* mengajak bicara anak nakal itu”.

3. Contrastive conjunction

Contrastive conjunction is used to compare two conditions between sentences or within sentence in the contrary way. The words that are included in contrastive conjunction such as *sebaliknya, namun, padahal, walaupun begitu, tetapi, meskipun begitu*. For example:

“Di kantor dia sangat galak terhadap bawahannya. *Sebaliknya*, di rumah sangat takut pada istrinya”.

4. Sequential conjunction

Sequential conjunction is used to describe the sequence of events. The words that are used are *lalu, kemudian, selanjutnya*. For example:

- a. “Dipetiknya bunga itu, *lalu* diberikannya kepadaku”.

2.3.1.3.2 Subordinative conjunctions

1. Occasional conjunction

Occasional conjunction is used to describe time. The words that are included in occasional conjunction are *ketika, sewaktu,*

sebelum, sesudah, tatkala. For examples:

- a. “Dia datang *ketika* kami sedang makan”.

- b. “Saya segera tidur sesudah mengerjakan pekerjaan rumah”.

2. Conditional conjunction

This conjunction describes that what is stated in one sentence

becomes the requirements of another event. The words that are

included in conditional conjunction are *kalau, jikalau, jika, bila, apabila, and asal*. For examples:

- a. “*Kalau* saya punya uang, tentu kamu akan saya bantu”.
- b. “Kamu akan lulus ujian dengan baik *asal* kamu belajar sungguh-sungguh sejak sekarang”.

3. Causal conjunction

Causal conjunction is used to describe the cause-effect relation

or reason-result relation in a sentence or between sentences.

Causal conjunction such as *sebab, karena, sampai, hingga, and*

sehingga. For example:

“Dia tidak masuk kerja *karena* hujan”.

4. Intentional conjunction

Intentional conjunction is used to describe a purpose within sentence. Intentional conjunction such as *agar, supaya, agar*

supaya, and *untuk*. For example:

“Kami berangkat pagi-pagi *supaya* kami tidak terlambat tiba di sekolah”.

5. Comparison conjunction

Comparison conjunction is used to compare between two clauses. The words which are included in comparison conjunction are *seperti*, *sebagai*, *laksana*. For example:

“Kedua anak itu selalu saja bertengkar *seperti* kucing dengan anjing”.

6. Explanatory conjunction

Explanatory conjunction is used to unite and give explanation

between sentences and other as explanation of those sentences.

Explanatory conjunction are *yaitu*, *yakni*, *bahwa*, *adalah*, and

ialah. For examples:

- a. “Tugas mereka, *yakni* mencuci dan memasak, telah mereka kerjakan dengan baik”.
- b. “Yang kami butuhkan *adalah* kertas, gunting, perekat, dan cat”.

2.3.1.3.3 Correlative conjunction

Correlative conjunction is a conjunction that is used to connect two words, phrase, or clause which fits on the same syntactical position in a

sentence. Correlative conjunction such as *baik....maupun...., tidak hanya....,tetapi juga...., demikian.....sehingga....*, etc. For examples:

- a. *Baik* Pak Anwar *maupun* istrinya tidak suka merokok.
- b. Kita *tidak hanya* harus setuju, *tetapi juga* harus patuh.
- c. Mobil itu larinya *demikian* cepatnya *sehingga* sangat sukar untuk di potret.

2.3.1.3.4 Clausal conjunction

Clausal conjunction is used to connect one clause with another clause, or one sentence with another sentence. The words which are included in clausal conjunction are *biarpun demikian/begitu, akan tetapi, bahkan*, etc.

For examples:

- a. Kami tidak sependapat dengan dia. *Biarpun begitu*, kami tidak akan menghalanginya.
- b. Keadaan memang sudah mulai aman. *Akan tetapi*, kita harus tetap waspada.
- c. Pak Amir sudah tahu tentang soal itu. *Bahkan* dia sudah mulai menanganinya.