



LEXICAL COHESIVE DEVICES IN NARRATIVE AND EXPOSITION TEXTS

Adnania Nugra Heni¹, Hermawati Syarif², Leni Marlina³

English Department

Faculty of Languages and Arts

Universitas Negeri Padang

email: adananianugraheni@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to find out the types of lexical cohesive devices found and prevailed in two different genres, in this case, narrative and exposition texts. This analysis will be based on theory of discourse connections proposed by Renkema. The objects of this research are six texts, three texts from narrative and three texts from exposition. This study is descriptive comparative with the presence of tables to show the comparison. The result shows that types of lexical cohesive devices which prevailed in both of the genres were reiteration, especially repetition. Repetition is one of the most stable ways of pointing the same referent. It means that repetition tends to be used by the author of texts in creating a cohesive text since it is the type of lexical cohesive devices which mostly found in the texts. However, the type of repetition which prevailed in each genres were different. From that fact, it can be concluded that type of lexical cohesive devices presented in narrative and exposition texts depend on which genre they belong to.

Key words: Lexical Cohesive Devices, Genre, Narrative, Exposition

A. INTRODUCTION

In writing, the ideas which are shared or written have to be related each other. In order to make the ideas achieved by the readers in a written text, the sentences have to be related each other, and this can be done by using cohesive devices. According to Halliday & Hasan (1976:27), cohesion is a relationship between one element with another element in a text or a discourse that is really important in the interpretation of that text. Tanskanen (2006:7) noted that cohesion is one of the ways to signal coherence in a text. It means that cohesion can be used to write coherence and meaningful texts.

¹English ELLSP of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang graduated on December 2018

²Lecturer of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang

³Lecturer of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang



In writing a text, cohesion has an important role. Cohesion in writing functions to relate the meaning of one sentence to another sentence in a text. If the text is not cohesive, the reader will be confused and does not catch the meaning that the writer wants to convey. For example, if the writer does not use any reference and repetition in a text, the reader will be confused about the relationship between the sentences. In order to avoid the misinterpretation of the text, the cohesive devices are needed. According to Halliday & Hasan (1976), cohesive devices are divided into two; grammatical cohesive devices and lexical cohesive devices, however, this article is only focusing on lexical cohesion, especially lexical cohesive devices.

There are some researchers who have conducted the study in cohesion, they are: Syarif (2011), Baleviciene (2014), and Khoirunnisa (2018). The first researcher studied about cohesiveness of students' writing in discussion section of English graduate students. In her study, she found that lexical cohesive devices, especially repetition is used most often. However, the repeating words sometimes failed to make the text cohesive because too many similar words are repeated. She also found that the appropriate and inappropriate use of connectives are found almost the same. The second researcher studied about density and distribution of cohesive devices in literary text and legal genres. His finding shows that genre has important roles in distribution of cohesive devices in two types of text chosen. The third researcher studied about cohesive devices in novel. In her studies, she used chapter 30 of the novel and her finding showed that the two types of cohesive devices exist in chapter 30.

The study which is conducted is similar to the three studies mentioned above in the way of observing cohesive devices in texts. However, there are two differences between this study and the three studies above. The first difference is on the text used. The first researcher used discussion section of students' thesis where this study used different texts from different genre. The second study studied about cohesive devices in two different text types, they are literary text and legal text where this study used narrative texts and exposition texts. The second difference of this study from the three studies above is the researchers studied about both types of cohesive devices, they are grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion where this study is only focusing to one type of cohesive device, that is lexical cohesive devices. This study is only focused on lexical cohesive devices because in the result of the second study, it is stated that the choice of cohesive devices depend on the register. Based on that fact, the writer eager to know how register affected the lexical choices of narrative and exposition texts by observing the lexical cohesive devices since it have not been used by the previous researcher.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

The type of this research was descriptive comparative. The data of this research were sentences which contain lexical cohesive devices presented in narrative and exposition texts. The lexical cohesive devices found would be

analyzed to find out types of lexical cohesive devices. The sources of data were firstly, three short stories written by Brendan Dubois entitled *The Dark Snow*, Nathan Ballingrud entitled *Sunbleached*, and Lauren Groff entitled *Ghost and Empties* as the sample of narrative texts. The other source of data were scientific articles written by Ghasemi&Jahromi entitled *The Differences between Spoken and Written Discourses in English*, Bebir entitled *The Scopes of Word Semantics*, and Shams and Afghari entitled *Effects of Culture and Gender in Comprehension of Speech Acts of Indirect Request*. These six data were compared according to their length.

In order to do the research in operational ways, the writer used four steps in collecting the data. The steps were; searching the short stories and the articles from the internet, downloading and printing the short stories and the articles, reading the short stories and the articles, and identifying the lexical cohesive devices from the stories and articles. After collecting the data, the writer analyzed the six data based on these three steps; First, the writer classified and counted the data based on the types of lexical cohesive devices, then, the writer analyzed them based on the theory. After that, the writer drew conclusion based on the finding.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Research Findings

This part presented the findings of this research. The lexical cohesive devices which were found in the data were shown in the table below.

Table 1. Lexical Cohesive Devices in Narrative Texts

Lexical Cohesive Devices	H.RF. Keating's <i>Do You Believe in Ghost?</i>		Nathan Ballingrud's <i>Sunbleached</i>		Lauren Groff's <i>Ghost and Empties</i>	
	Occurences	Percentage	Occurences	Percentage	Occurences	Percentage
Reiteration						
1. Repetition						
a. Pronoun	336	43.29%	581	40.29%	262	41.65%
b. Noun	164	21.13%	295	20.45%	191	30.36%
c. Verb	58	7.47%	22	1.52%	22	3.50%
d. Adjective	2	0.25%	3	0.20%	-	-
e. Adverb	-	-	10	0.69%	2	0.31%
f. Sentence	8	1.03%	19	1.31%	11	1.74%
s	-	-	3	0.20%	4	0.63%
2. Synonymy	9	1.15%	9	0.62%	9	1.43%
y	1	0.12%	-	-	2	0.43%
3. Hyponymy						

4. Antonymy						
5. Meronymy						
Collocation	8	1.03%	8	0.55%	2	0.31%
Total	776	100%	1442	100%	1134	100%

Based on the table above, it can be seen that repetition of noun had the highest occurrences in the three narrative texts and the occurrences of it was similar in the three texts that is about 40 % where repetition of pronoun and verb followed it. From the table, it was also seen that types of reiteration which was not have high occurrences were meronymy and hyponymy which only found below 5% of the total. To sum up, based on the table above, the types of lexical cohesive devices which prevailed in narrative texts is reiteration, especially repetition of noun where the types of lexical cohesive devices which was not prevailed in narrative texts are meronymy and hyponymy. The second types of lexical cohesive devices, which is collocation was not also prevailed in narrative texts, however the occurrences of collocation was slightly higher than meronymy and hyponymy. Below is the example of the analysis of data found in narrative text:

*As **he** monitored his brother's breathing, waiting for him to fall asleep, **he** found himself wondering about how **he** would feltoward his family once the transformation was complete (98). **He** was worried that **he** would lose all feeling for them (99). Or, worse, that **he'd** thinkof them as prey (100). **He** didn't think that would happen; everything he'd ever read about vampires seemed to indicate that they kept all their memories and emotions from life (101).*

(data 2: Nathan Ballingrud`s *Sunbleached*paragrah 38)

From the data above, *Sunbleached* short story, the pronoun *he* occurred 229 times and mostly refers to the main character of the story and it is the dominant pronoun found in the data. Another data example was shown as follows:

*"We're God's beautiful creatures," the vampire **said**, something like joy leaking into its voice for the first time since it had crawled under this house four days ago (1)... "Invite me in," it **said** (31). "Later," Joshua **said** (32). "Not yet (33). After you finish changing me (34)...That seemed like a funny thing to **say**(218).*

(Data 2: Nathan Ballingrud`s *Sunbleached* paragraph 1, 7-8)

In the story, the verb *said* was repeated 39 times. From the example, it could be seen that the verb *said* were also found in its present form, *say*. According to Halliday&Mattheisen (2014:644), repetition does not need to be in same morphological form. It means that inflectional and derivational forms of one word can be included in repetition. so that the verb *say* and *said* can be

categorized as repetition of the same word. In this story, the verb *said* is mostly found because the story was narrated in third person point of view, so that in order to create conversations between characters, the author used the verb *said*.

Table 2. Lexical Cohesive Devices in Exposition Texts

Lexical Cohesive Devices	Ghasemi&Jahromi `s <i>The Differences between Spoken and Written Discourses in English</i>		Bebir` <i>sThe Scopes of Word Semantics</i>		Shams and Afghari`s <i>Effects of Culture and Gender in Comprehension of Speech Acts of Indirect Request</i>	
	Occurences	Percent age	Occurences	Percent age	Occurences	Percent age
Reiteration						
1. Repetition						
a. Pronoun	26	3.05%	68	5.88 %	6	0.52%
b. Noun	576	69.76 %	674	58.35 %	738	64.28 %
c. Verb	164	19.29 %	269	23.29 %	208	18.11 %
d. Adjective	38	4.47 %	83	7.18 %	141	12.28 %
e. Adverb	5	0.58 %	8	0.69 %	13	1.13 %
f. Sentence	-	-	-	-	-	-
s	7	0.82 %	27	2.33 %	16	1.39 %
2. Synonym	2	0.23 %	3	0.25 %	2	0.17 %
y	16	1.88 %	15	1.29 %	13	1.13 %
3. Hyponymy	6	0.70 %	1	0.08 %	1	0.08 %
4. Antonymy						
5. Meronymy						
Collocation	10	1.17%	7	0.60%	10	0.87%
Total	850	100%	1155	100%	1142	100%

From the table above, it can be seen that the types of lexical cohesive devices which prevailed in exposition texts is reiteration, especially repetition of noun. It can be seen from the table that more than 50% of the total finding were repetition of noun where repetition of verb followed in the second place which had about 20% of the total finding. The other types of lexical cohesive devices were also found in exposition texts, however the occurrences were small. The types of lexical cohesive devices which had the lower occurrences was collocation, meronymy, and hyponymy which had almost similar occurrences. However, the occurrences of collocation was slightly higher than hyponymy and meronymy. The example of the lexical cohesive devices found in exposition text is shown below.

...However, many languages do not have a written form, and many people cannot read or **write**(3). Moreover, while children can acquire spoken language innately, they have to learn written form at schools(4). This fact raises a question that is what makes reading and **writing** difficult to learn?(5) Why children learn to speak fluently, whereas some never master fluency in **writing**?

(Data 4: Ghasemi & Jahromi`s *The Differences between Spoken and Written Discourses in English* paragraph 1)

Repetition of verb *write* occurred 24 times in the data. From the example above, the verb *write* occur with its inflectional form *writing*. Beside the example present above, the other repeating verb which had similar occurrences was the word *speak* and it also often repeated by its inflectional form *speaking*. As stated above, the choice of verbs depended on the scopes of the study. In this article, the author studied about differences between spoken and written discourse, so the verb that related to spoken and written were chosen, in this case, *write* and *speak*. Another data example was shown as follows:

...Other words: `deadpàn, `dead`workvə `dead`wind (Palmer, 1981). L.Bloomfield suggests that words should be considered as minimal **independent** forms (Bloomfield, 1933) (186). They are the smallest forms that can be met **independently** (187). It is possible in that case if we use the word **independently** or separately (188). The words like *the, iss, by* etc. are not used **independently** carrying any grammatical meaning (189).

(Data 5: Bebir`s *The Scopes of Word Semantic* paragraph 54)

In the data, adverb *independently* occurred 4 times. As stated above, the adverb was formed from its adjective. The other example from the other text could be seen below.

Direct requests, or imperatives, **explicitly** state the desired action, whereas indirect requests implicitly state the desired action (53). There are several types of indirect requests: embedded imperatives— an action is **explicitly** stated, question directives implicitly mention the desired action in question format need/want statements—stated in terms of the speaker`s desires hints— and request a desired action in a hidden manner; suggestions— specify that the speaker will join the listener in the desired action; and questions —request a desired action **explicitly** in a questioning manner with questioning intonation which rises at the end (Irawati, 2009) (54).

(Data 6: Shams and Afghari`s *Effects of Culture and Gender in Comprehension of Speech Acts of Indirect Request* paragraph 16)

Table 3. The Summary of Lexical Cohesive Devices Found in Narrative Texts and Exposition Texts

Lexical Cohesive Devices Types	Occurences in Narrative Texts			Occurences in Exposition Texts		
	Text 1	Text 2	Text 3	Text 4	Text 5	Text 6
Reiteration						
1. Repetition						
a. Pronoun		495	122	26	68	6
b. Noun		581	262	576	674	738
c. Verb	190	295	191	164	269	208
d. Adjective		22	22	38	83	141
e. Adverb	336	3	-	5	8	13
f. Sentences		10	2	-	-	-
2. Synonymy	164	19	11	7	27	16
3. Hyponymy		3	4	2	3	2
4. Antonymy	58	9	9	16	15	13
5. Meronymy		-	2	6	1	1
	2					
	-					
	8					
	-					
	9					
	1					
Collocation	8	8	2	10	7	10
Total	776	1442	1134	850	1155	1148

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the types of lexical cohesive devices prevailed in narrative and exposition text was reiteration, especially repetition. However, as seen in the table, the occurrences of repetition were varied in both of the genre. Repetition of pronoun was prevailed in narrative rather than in exposition texts where repetition of noun had higher occurrences in exposition texts rather than in narrative texts. Collocation, the second type of lexical cohesive devices is also found in both genre. However, the occurrences are not high. From the table it can be seen that the occurrences of collocation in narrative and exposition texts are slightly similar. To sum up, types of lexical cohesive devices which prevailed in both of the genre was repetition, especially repetition of noun where the other types of lexical cohesive devices were also found in both of the texts, however the occurrences were small.

2. Discussion

The first focus of this study was to find out types of lexical cohesive devices presented in narrative texts. Based on the finding, the writer found that two types of lexical cohesive devices were found in narrative texts, however, reiteration was the types of lexical cohesive devices which mostly found. Based on the definition of lexical cohesion proposed by Bloor and Meriel (2004 : 99), lexical cohesion is cohesive effect which is caused by the use of lexical items, in which the choice of an item relates to the one in the previous sentences. In narrative texts, it can be said that repetition was one of the most stable ways of pointing the same referent. It can be seen from the finding where nearly 90% of lexical cohesive devices found was repetition. It can also be stated that repetition tend to be used by the author of narrative texts in creating a cohesive text since it was the types of lexical cohesive devices which mostly found in narrative texts.

From six types of repetition, repetition of noun had the highest occurrences. This result was quite different from the study conducted by Astuti (2017) who found that repetition of pronoun had higher occurrences than repetition of noun. From the result of this study and Astuti's study, it can be concluded that despite different types of repetition found, it was still types of cohesive devices which prevailed in narrative texts, especially short stories.

The second focus of this study was to find out types of lexical cohesive devices in exposition texts. Based on the finding, the writer also found two types of lexical cohesive devices. Similar to the narrative texts, reiteration was the types of lexical cohesive devices which mostly found. Based on what Perk states (2015:20), which states that beside the use of a proper syntax, the use of precise, clear, and simple words makes the scientific writing more comprehensible and readable, it can be stated that the author of exposition texts, especially scientific articles in the use of lexical cohesive devices, tend to use reiteration, especially repetition as one way to make the articles comprehensible and readable. It can be seen from the finding where nearly 95% of lexical cohesive devices was repetition. It can be said that using repetition of the same item makes the texts more understandable rather than using other types of lexical cohesive devices.

The third focus of this study was to describe the differences and similarities of types of lexical cohesive devices in narrative and exposition texts. Based on the finding, it could be seen that repetition of pronoun was prevailed in narrative texts rather than in exposition texts. As stated in the background, narrative texts usually use free styles and the data found proved it. In addition, as stated in the Bocek's (2016) thesis result, the high occurrences of pronoun repetition was often found in narratives and this study's finding supported the idea. From the finding, repetition of pronoun was not prevailed in exposition texts because as stated in the background, scientific writing usually written in specific language form and specific register (Sari, 2012:5), it means that it was using formal language so that pronoun was not really used.

To sum up, types of lexical cohesive devices which prevailed in both of the genres were reiteration, especially repetition. However, the types of repetition which prevailed in each genres were different. For instance, repetition of pronoun

was prevailed in narratives rather than in expositions whereas repetition of noun had higher occurrences in exposition texts, which was proved by the higher percentage (more than 50%), rather than in narratives.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the finding, it can be concluded that reiteration is the types of lexical cohesive devices which prevailed in both narrative and exposition texts. From the five types of reiteration, repetition had the highest occurrences in both genre. However, the types of repetition which prevailed in narratives are little bit different with expositions. For instance, repetition of pronoun prevailed in narrative texts rather than in exposition texts. On the other hand, repetition of noun in exposition texts had higher occurrences rather than in the narrative texts.

Based on the data, the repetition of noun had higher occurrences in exposition texts because the nouns that were repeated were often from the same noun, and sometimes in their inflectional form. It is indicated that exposition texts indeed using restricted word choices. In addition, the nouns used were depended on the studies. It is indicated that exposition texts indeed using restricted register. On the other hand, the use of noun in narrative texts were varied. Based on the data, the authors of the stories were using variative nouns, that was why the occurrences were smaller compared to the articles. From the explanation above, it can be concluded that types of lexical cohesive devices present in short stories and articles depend on which genre they belong to.

Note: this article was written based on the writer's thesis with the advisor 1 was Prof. Dr. HermawatiSyarief, M. Hum and advisor 2 was LeniMarlina, S.S.,M. A.

REFERENCES

- Astuti, Ni Putu T.A. (2017). Lexical Cohesion Found in Story The Tell-Tale Heart by Edgar Allan Poe. *Jurnal Humanis*, Vol 18.2 pp.176-183.
- Balevičienė, DainoraLeva. (2014). *Density and Distribution of Cohesive Devices in the Texts of Literary and Legal Genres*. Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences.
- Bebir, AlishovaRamila. (2015). The Scopes of Word Semantics. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, Vol. 5 No. 6, pp. 169-175.
- Bloor, Thomas and Meriel Bloor.(2004). *The Functional Analysis of English Second Edition*. Great Britain: Arnold.
- Boček, Bc. Štěpán.(2016). *Lexical Cohesion in Stephen King`s Short Stories*. Ostrava: Masaryk University Brno.
- Ghasemi, Hamta and Jahromi, Maryam Khoshbouie. (2014). "The Differences between Spoken and Written Discourses in English".*International*

Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistic World, Volume 6, No. 4, pp. 147-155.

- Halliday, M.A.K and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Khoirunnisa, Jufriзал, Leni Marlina. (2018). An Analysis of Cohesive Devices in Hirata's "The Rainbow Troops" Novel. *E-Journal of English Language and Literature*, Volume 7, No. 1, pp. 106-120.
- Penzler, Otto. (2014). *The Best of the Best American Mystery Stories The First Ten Years*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company.
- Perk, Marcel Van der. (2015). *A Guide for Scientific Writing*. Utrecht University.
- Renkema, J. (2004). *Introduction to Discourse Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sari, Stefmi D.W. (2012). *Analysis of Lexical Cohesion in Applied Linguistic Journals*. Padang: Andalas University.
- Shams, Rabe`a, Afghari, Akbar.(2011). Effects of Culture and Gender of Speech Acts of Indirect Request. *English Language Teaching*, Vol 4, No.4, pp. 279-287.
- Syarif, Hermawati. (2011). The Cohesiveness of Students' Writing: An Analysis of Thesis Discussion Section of English Graduate Students. *Paper*. In: Eight Conference on English Studies (Conest 8) in Jakarta, 1-2 December.
- Tanskanen, Sanna-Kaisa.(2006). *Collaborating toward Coherence*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.