LEXICAL COHESION IN ZOOTOPIA

Harry Setiawan[1]
Universitas Widyatama

Ervina C.M. Simatupang[2]
Universitas Widyatama

harry.setiawan@widyatama.ac.id[1]

ABSTRACT
This research delves into the intricate examination of lexical cohesion within the dialogues of the main characters, Hoops and Nick, in the animated movies Zootopia (2016) by Byron Howard and Rich Moore. Grounded in the qualitative research methodology, the study aims to determine the various types of lexical cohesion present and to analyze the functions of each cohesion device employed, drawing upon Halliday and Hasan's theory (1976, p. 282). Through meticulous analysis, the research identifies 168 instances of lexical cohesion, including 76 repetitions (45.8%), two synonyms (1.2%), one antonym (0.6%), two hyponyms (1.2%), one meronym (0.6%), and 86 collocations (51.8%). The prevalence of collocations underscores their significant role in reinforcing themes, character dynamics, and plot advancement within the narrative framework. By shedding light on these linguistic mechanisms, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of storytelling and character development in animated movies, advancing the current state of knowledge in the field of linguistics studies.
Keywords: Animation Movies, Cohesion, Discourse analysis, Lexical Cohesion

INTRODUCTION

Discourse analysis is a branch of linguistics that studies discourse. The term discourse is used to cover not only conversation or dialogue but also public speaking, writing, as well as formal endeavours such as scientific reports and plays or plays. Discourse has four purposes for using language, namely self-expression, exposition, literature, and persuasion. (Landsteen, 1976). Stubbs (1983) reveals discourse as a language organization above clauses and sentences or linguistic subjects that are larger than sentences or clauses—for example, dialogue or written text.

A text is best regarded as a semantic unit; it is not a unit of form but a unit of meaning (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 2). A text is a unit of language use; it is not a grammatical unit, like a clause or a sentence, as it is not defined by its size (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 1). In addition, text is a unit of discourse (cohesion) and a unit of semantics (meaning), so text is a cohesive unit and a semantic unit

(Eggins, 1994, p. 112). Meanwhile, a texture is entirely appropriate to express the property of being a text, functioning as a unity with respect to its environment. The texture is provided by the cohesive relation that exists between two elements, which are the referring item and the item that it refers to (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 2).

Cohesion and coherence are two special factors that must be present during the writing process, including the organization of sentences into paragraphs and how sentences are combined into one. Hidayat (2016) states that cohesion and coherence are intangible adhesives that hold paragraphs together. This narrative is supported by Harmer (2007, p. 29), who states that cohesion and coherence are complementary phenomena, and the elements in a text must be cohesive and coherent.

Regarding cohesion analysis, this study tries to analyze the types of cohesion found in the film *Zootopia*. Researchers are interested in using *Zootopia* as a research medium because *Zootopia* is a 2016 American 3D animated film directed by Byron Howard and Rich Moore while this film was written by Byron Howard, Rich Moore, Jared Bush, Josie Trinidad, Jim Reardon, Phil Johnston and Jennifer Lee. This film tells the story of animal tales (fables) with adventure, action, and comedy plots. The objectives of this study were to find the type of lexical cohesion structure used in the dialogues of the main characters in the film Zootopia by Byron Howard and Rich Moore and to investigate the functions of each lexical cohesion device utilized in the dialogues of the main characters in the film Zootopia by Byron Howard and Rich Moore.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis stands as a pivotal branch within linguistics, delving into the multifaceted nature of discourse across various forms of communication, including conversation, writing, public speaking, and formal presentations. Landsteen (1976) encapsulates discourse as encompassing self-expression, exposition, literature, and persuasion, portraying it as a versatile tool for language utilization. Stubbs (1983) emphasizes discourse as an organizational construct transcending mere clauses and sentences, highlighting its role in shaping linguistic subjects, such as dialogue and written text.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) underscore the semantic unity of the text, portraying it as a cohesive and meaningful entity rather than merely a grammatical construct. They stress the interconnectedness of discourse and semantics, portraying text as a cohesive and semantic unit. Additionally, they introduce the concept of texture, which refers to the cohesive relation between elements within a text, further emphasizing the importance of cohesion in discourse.

Hidayat (2016) and Harmer (2007, p. 29) underscore the significance of cohesion and coherence in textual organization, depicting them as intangible adhesives that bind paragraphs together and ensure textual unity. This notion is echoed by Eggins (1994), who emphasizes cohesion as a crucial aspect of discourse, facilitating semantic unity and coherence.

In conclusion, discourse analysis provides a robust framework for examining the intricate patterns of cohesion within textual discourse. By understanding the principles of cohesion and coherence, researchers can unravel the underlying structures that govern language use in various communicative contexts. This theoretical foundation enriches our understanding of discourse as a cohesive and meaningful construct, shedding light on the complexities of linguistic communication.

Cohesion

Cohesion is generally defined as the grammatical and lexical connections that bind a text together, contributing to its meaning (i.e., coherence). Cohesion is the relationship between propositions, which is stated explicitly by the grammatical and semantic elements in the sentences that make up the discourse. Cohesion refers to the relationship between sentences in discourse, both at the grammatical level and at the lexical level, so as to create coherence. According to Halliday & Hasan (1976, p. 27), "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."

Cohesion is expressed partly through grammar and vocabulary. Halliday and Hasan (1976, p. 6) divide cohesion into grammatical and lexical cohesion. Grammatical cohesion includes devices such as reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction, while lexical cohesion is divided into reiteration (repetition, synonymy, etc.) and collocation (co-occurrence of lexical items). Furthermore, Halliday and Hasan (1976, p. 31–33) emphasize that "grammatical and lexical elements are interpreted through their relation to other elements in the text, a cohesive tie is formed.

Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion refers to a cluster of words that maintain semantic unity by addressing the same subject matter (Abass, 2021). It serves two primary purposes, the first being to establish connections between individual words or phrases within a given text. Morley also argues that (2009, p. 5) lexical cohesion pertains to the semantic connections within a text, focusing on how words interact with each other and with other cohesive elements to establish textual coherence. Historically, scholars have primarily examined lexical cohesion alongside other cohesive elements within individual texts.

Meanwhile, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976, p. 282), lexical cohesion is achieved through the selection of vocabulary and encompasses instances where the use of a lexical item evokes the sense of an earlier one. There are two primary categories of lexical cohesion: reiteration and collocation. Reiteration involves the repetition of lexical items, while collocation refers to the tendency of certain words to occur together in a text.

Lexical cohesion establishes semantic relationships between elements within discourse, contributing to its overall coherence and integrity alongside grammatical cohesion. The tools of lexical cohesion include various linguistic devices such as:

Repetitions

Repetitions, characterized by the recurrence of lexical items within discourse, serve various communicative functions, including emphasis, reinforcement, and clarification. These reiterated elements amplify the salience of particular ideas or concepts, fostering coherence within language use. In the statement, "Education is the key to success. Without education, success is unattainable," the repetition of "education" underscores its pivotal role in achieving success, reinforcing the message through reiterated emphasis.

Synonyms

Synonyms, characterized by their similarity in meaning, serve an essential function in bolstering or elucidating the desired communication within a conversation. These linguistic alternatives offer adaptability and subtlety to linguistic expression by presenting alternate phrasings to convey identical concepts. Employing synonyms amplifies the intricacy and breadth of communication, empowering speakers and writers to customize their message to particular circumstances or recipients. For instance, in the phrase "The cat is sleeping on the couch," replacing "sleeping" with its equivalent "resting" preserves the fundamental meaning while injecting diversity in language usage.

Antonyms

Antonyms, representing words with contrasting meanings, serve to emphasize disparities or highlight different facets of discourse. These linguistic opposites create a dynamic interplay within language, allowing for the delineation of contrasts and the amplification of semantic nuances. In the sentence "The room was bright and cheerful, not dark and gloomy," the juxtaposition of "bright" and "dark" accentuates the stark disparity between the two environments, underscoring the contrast in mood or atmosphere.

Hyponyms

Hyponyms, as subordinate terms to more general categories, offer further specificity and granularity in language use. These hierarchical relationships enrich discourse by providing detailed categorization and classification of concepts. In the phrase "fruit includes apples, oranges, and bananas," "apples," "oranges," and

"bananas" serve as hyponyms of the overarching category "fruit," delineating specific examples within the broader classification.

Meronyms

Meronyms denote part-whole relationships within language, elucidating the constituent elements or components of entities. By detailing the structural composition of objects or concepts, meronyms contribute to a comprehensive understanding of discourse. In the sentence "The car's wheels spun rapidly," "wheels" function as meronyms, specifying a crucial component of the car and highlighting its role in the depicted action.

Collocations

Collocations, comprising words that frequently co-occur within linguistic contexts, facilitate natural and fluent expression by forming predictable combinations. These lexical pairings contribute to the coherence and fluency of discourse, reflecting the conventions and norms of language use. Examples such as "salt and pepper," "fast food," and "trial and error" illustrate the pervasive presence of collocations in everyday communication, where specific word combinations become entrenched in linguistic usage. Examples across various categories of collocations further illustrate this phenomenon:

Table 1. Types of Collocation

Types of Collocation	Examples
Adverb + Adjective	Incredibly fast car
	Remarkably bright student
	Astonishingly beautiful sunset
Adjective + Noun	Perfect storm
	Bitter cold
	Smooth transition
Noun + Noun	Fish tank
	Coffee table
	Power plant
Noun + Verb	Car engine runs
	Apple tree grows
	Football match ends
Verb + Noun	Break the ice
	Catch fire
	Lose control
Verb + Expression with Preposition	Fall in love
	Look for trouble
	Depend on someone
Verb + Adverb	Speak fluently
	Walk briskly
	Eat slowly

Lexical Cohesion Devices Function

Based on Halliday and Hasan (1976, p. 282), lexical cohesion devices refer to linguistic techniques utilized to foster coherence and connectivity in a text by forging associations between words and phrases. These tools are vital for directing readers through the text and facilitating understanding. Here's a breakdown of their functions:

Maintaining cohesion

Lexical cohesion devices act as linguistic glue, binding different parts of a text together. They ensure that the narrative or argument flows logically, preventing disjointedness and confusion. By establishing connections between words and phrases, these devices create a cohesive framework that aids readers in navigating through the text smoothly.

Providing clarity

In the intricate tapestry of language, clarity is paramount. Lexical cohesion devices serve as signposts, guiding readers through the maze of words and ideas. By signaling relationships between concepts, they eliminate ambiguity and help readers discern the author's intended meaning with greater precision.

Highlighting key concepts

Within the fabric of a text, certain ideas and terms serve as linchpins, holding the entire structure together. Lexical cohesion devices shine a spotlight on these pivotal elements, reinforcing their importance and ensuring they resonate with readers. Through repetition or strategic placement, these devices underscore the significance of key concepts, imprinting them in the reader's mind.

Structuring the text

A well-structured text is like a well-built house—it stands firm and invites exploration. Lexical cohesion devices play a crucial role in organizing the architectural elements of a text. They provide the mortar that binds paragraphs and sections, facilitating seamless transitions and allowing the narrative to unfold in a coherent manner.

Enhancing readability

Reading should be a journey, not a labyrinthine puzzle. Lexical cohesion devices act as guides, smoothing the path for readers as they traverse the terrain of the text. By establishing connections between ideas and phrases, these devices eliminate stumbling blocks and make the reading experience more enjoyable and accessible.

Grammatical Cohesion

Grammatical cohesion refers to the ways in which grammatical elements within a text are used to create a sense of unity, coherence, and flow (Halliday & Hasan,1976). It involves the systematic use of grammatical structures to connect

different parts of a text and to guide readers through its meaning. Grammatical cohesion plays a crucial role in ensuring that a paragraph or text is cohesive and comprehensible. There are several types of grammatical cohesion, each serving a distinct purpose:

Reference

Reference involves the utilization of language elements to refer back to previously or subsequently mentioned words within the text, serving to avoid redundancy and enhance the lucidity of the writing. This practice encompasses two primary categories of reference.

Anaphoric Reference

Anaphoric reference happens when a word or phrase in a text points back to something mentioned earlier. This practice prevents redundancy and enhances the clarity of the writing. It fosters coherence by linking later mentions to previously introduced elements. For example:

"John lost his keys. He searched everywhere for them." Here, "he" refers back to "John."

Cataphoric Reference

Cataphoric reference happens when a word or phrase refers to something mentioned later in the text. This technique serves to preview upcoming elements, contributing to the anticipation and organization of ideas within the text. For example:

"When she arrived, Jane unpacked her bags." Here, "her" refers to Jane, who is mentioned later in the sentence.

Substitution

Substitution entails the act of swapping out a word or phrase with an alternative that conveys a comparable meaning. This method is frequently employed to steer clear of redundancy and uphold cohesion within the text. It maintains coherence by seamlessly replacing repetitive terms while preserving the intended message. For example:

"John likes coffee, and Mary does too." Here, "does too" substitutes for "likes coffee," maintaining cohesion between the two clauses.

Ellipsis

Ellipsis involves omitting words or phrases that are implied by the context but not explicitly stated. This technique is commonly used in conversation and informal writing to make the text more concise. It enhances cohesion by streamlining the expression of ideas, relying on context to fill in omitted elements. For example:

"Sarah can speak Spanish; Jack, French." Here, the verb "speak" is omitted from the second clause but understood from the context.

Conjunction

Conjunction involves using words such as "and," "but," "or," etc., to connect clauses or sentences together. These conjunctions help to show the relationship between different ideas and to create a coherent flow of information. They establish cohesion by linking related concepts and structuring the progression of thought. For example:

"The weather was cold, but we still went for a walk." Here, "but" is used to connect two contrasting ideas.

Parallelism

Parallelism involves using similar grammatical structures to express related ideas. This technique helps to create balance and rhythm in the text, making it easier to read and understand. It enhances cohesion by presenting information in a consistent and harmonious manner, facilitating comprehension. For example:

"She enjoys hiking, swimming, and biking." Here, the parallel structure of the gerunds "hiking," "swimming," and "biking" creates cohesion among the listed activities.

METHODS

The methodology employed in this study is qualitative research, as it focuses on examining and interpreting the lexical cohesion of the movie script. As stated by Creswell (2009, p. 4), qualitative research serves as a strategy to investigate and comprehend the attributes and traits of a phenomenon. Its primary objective is to offer in-depth explanations and analyze the distinctive qualities of a phenomenon, as opposed to elucidating the fundamental reasons or mechanisms behind it. The process of descriptive qualitative research involves gathering, organizing, and analyzing data. This study finds and determines the type of cohesion used in the main character's dialogue. The data source comes from an animated film entitled *Zootopia.*

The research encompasses a structured sequence of steps aimed at analyzing lexical cohesion in the film *Zootopia.* Beginning with the Pre-Research phase, the study's topic, *Lexical Cohesion Analysis in the Film Zootopia*, was selected to delve into the linguistic elements within cinematic discourse, with Zootopia chosen for its intricate storytelling and rich dialogue. Data collection involved meticulous extraction from the film's script and multiple viewings to ensure a comprehensive examination of lexical cohesion elements, complemented by an extensive literature review to contextualize findings within existing scholarship. Subsequently, data were systematically organized based on thematic relevance and linguistic features to facilitate analysis. In the research phase, identified instances of lexical cohesion

were underwent thorough examination to discern patterns and variations across dialogues and characters, with detailed exploration providing insights into linguistic strategies employed within *Zootopia* to enhance narrative coherence. Through these systematic steps, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of discourse in cinematic contexts, shedding light on the intricate mechanisms of lexical cohesion within the film.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Repetition
Data 1

Table 1. The First Sample Data of Repetition

Young Hoops Judy Nick	: Now, **predator and prey live in harmony**. (02:00)
	: Naïve little hick with good gradesand big ideas decides, "Hey lookit me, I'm gonna move to Zootopia--where **Predators and Prey live in harmony** and sing Kumbaya!" Only to find—whoopsie. (24:39)

The lexical cohesion structure utilized in the dialogues above is repetition, particularly focusing on the words "predator" and "prey." This repetition underscores the significance of both predators and prey within the narrative, occurring a total of 18 times for "predator" and five times for "prey" throughout the movie. It serves to emphasize the historical power dynamics between predators and prey, highlighting the fear and tension that once characterized their relationship. The repetition of both terms in various contexts throughout the film underscores the central theme of the predator-prey dynamic within the society of Zootopia.

Specifically, the repetition of the concept of harmony between predators and prey serves to contrast the idealistic aspirations of characters like Judy Hopps with the harsh realities portrayed by characters like Nick Wilde. Judy's repetition of the notion of harmony reflects her hopeful belief in a society where different species coexist peacefully, reinforcing her optimistic worldview. On the other hand, Nick's repetition of the same concept in a mocking tone serves to challenge Judy's idealism and highlight the discord and conflict present within Zootopia. This contrast in the functions of lexical cohesion devices contributes to the development of the film's themes, portraying the tension between optimism and cynicism regarding societal harmony amidst diversity.

Data 2

Table 2. The Second Sample Data of Repetition

> **Nick**: Get in? **Carrots? Carrots!** (54:40)

In the dialogues from Zootopia, a lexical cohesion structure based on repetition is employed, notably with the term "Carrots." Throughout the movie, "Carrots" is mentioned 15 times, serving as a recurring nickname for Judy Hopps. This repetition emphasizes the familiarity and camaraderie among the characters and adds a playful and affectionate tone to their interactions. The context for this repetition arises during a tense chase scene in the Rainforest District, where Judy and Nick confront Renato Manchas, a jaguar who was attacked by the missing otter, Emmitt Otterton. Amidst the chaos of the confrontation, Nick urgently calls out to Judy as they flee from Manchas, affectionately referring to her as "Carrots" while guiding her to safety.

The repetition of "Carrots" functions to establish and reinforce the character dynamics within the narrative. It serves as a lexical device to characterize Judy Hopps and her relationships with other characters, particularly Nick Wilde. The consistent use of this nickname reflects Nick's teasing and affectionate attitude towards Judy while also underscoring their evolving friendship and mutual respect. Additionally, the repetition of "Carrots" contributes to the overall tone of the dialogue, adding humor and warmth to the interactions between the characters. Through this repetition, the dialogue effectively portrays the rapport and camaraderie shared among the characters in the vibrant world of Zootopia.

Synonymy
Data 3

Table 3. The First Sample Data of Synonymy

Young Judy (V.O.): Fear. Treachery. Bloodlust! Thousands of years ago, these were the forces that ruled our world. A world where prey were **scared** of predators. And predators had an uncontrollable biological urge to maim and maul and... (01:00)

In the dialogue spoken by Young Judy in the film *Zootopia*, the use of synonymy is evident in the pairing of "fear" and "scared." By employing both terms in close proximity, Young Judy emphasizes the pervasive atmosphere of anxiety and vulnerability that characterizes the world she describes. This repetition serves to underscore the theme of fear and its impact on the prey population, highlighting their constant state of vigilance in the face of potential danger from predators. Through this use of synonymy, the dialogue effectively communicates the pervasive sense of fear that pervades the world of *Zootopia* and sets the stage for the narrative that follows.

The function of the use of synonymy is twofold. Firstly, it helps to establish the atmosphere and tone of the scene, drawing the audience into the world of the

story and conveying the challenges faced by the characters. Secondly, it contributes to character development by revealing Young Judy's perspective and mindset. Through her choice of words, we gain insight into her experiences and beliefs, as well as her determination to confront and overcome the obstacles in her path. Thus, synonymy in Young Judy's dialogue serves both narrative and character-building purposes, enriching the storytelling experience in *Zootopia*.

Data 4

Table 4. The Second Sample Data of Synonymy

Hoops: What is your problem? Does seeing me fail somehow make you feel better about your own **sad**, **miserable** life? (44:58)

In terms of lexical cohesion, the repetition of the words "sad" and "miserable" creates a sense of emphasis and intensification. These words serve as synonyms, both conveying a similar emotional state of unhappiness or despair. The context of this dialogue suggests a confrontation or conflict between two characters, with one character accusing the other of finding satisfaction or superiority in the speaker's perceived failures. The use of "sad" and "miserable" in close proximity reinforces the idea of emotional distress experienced by the speaker and implies that the other character's actions contribute to this distress.

The function of using the synonyms "sad" and "miserable" serves several purposes in the dialogue. Firstly, it emphasizes the emotional turmoil experienced by the speaker, highlighting the depth of their feelings of unhappiness. By repeating similar sentiments with different words, the speaker intensifies the impact of their accusation. Secondly, the use of synonyms adds variety and nuance to the language, making the dialogue more engaging and expressive. Additionally, by characterizing the other character's life as "sad" and "miserable," the speaker aims to provoke a reaction and potentially guilt or shame the other character for their behavior. Overall, the repetition of these synonyms contributes to the emotional intensity and confrontational tone of the dialogue, enhancing its effectiveness in conveying the speaker's feelings and intentions.

Antonymy

Data 5

Table 5. The First Sample Data of Antonymy

Young Judy Hopps: Back then, the world was divided in two - **vicious predators** and **meek prey**. (01:48)

In the dialogue spoken by Young Judy Hopps in the film *Zootopia*, the use of antonymy is evident in the contrast between "vicious predators" and "meek prey." These terms represent opposite ends of the spectrum when it comes to describing the animals in the world of Zootopia. While "vicious" conveys aggression and predatory behavior, "meek" suggests timidity and vulnerability. By juxtaposing these antonymous terms, Young Judy highlights the stark division that existed in

society between those who wielded power and those who were perceived as more passive or submissive. This antonymic structure serves to underscore the social hierarchy and power dynamics within the world of *Zootopia*, emphasizing the challenges faced by prey animals in a society dominated by predators.

The use of antonymy in Young Judy's dialogue serves several functions within the narrative of *Zootopia*. Firstly, it helps to establish the central conflict and tension that drives the story forward, namely the struggle for equality and acceptance among the different animal species. By highlighting the division between predators and prey, Young Judy's dialogue sets the stage for the exploration of themes such as prejudice, discrimination, and social injustice. Secondly, the antonymic structure contributes to character development by revealing Young Judy's perspective and values. Through her words, we see her commitment to challenging the status quo and advocating for change, positioning her as a protagonist who seeks to bridge the divide between predator and prey. Thus, the use of antonymy in Young Judy's dialogue not only enhances the thematic depth of *Zootopia* but also enriches the characterization and narrative trajectory of the film.

Hyponymy
Data 6

Table 6. The First Sample Data of Hyponymy

Hopps: So, no matter what type of **animal** you are, from the biggest **elephant** to our first **fox**... (01:34:07)

In the dialogue from the movie *Zootopia*, specifically the line "So, no matter what type of animal you are, from the biggest elephant to our first fox," a form of lexical cohesion known as hyponymy is employed. Hyponymy involves the relationship between a broader category or superordinate term and its specific instances or subtypes, known as hyponyms. In this context, "elephant" and "fox" are examples of hyponyms within the broader category of animals. By mentioning these specific animals, the speaker is exemplifying the diversity of species within the overarching category of animals, thus establishing a hierarchical relationship between the superordinate term "animal" and its hyponyms.

The function of employing hyponymy in this dialogue serves to illustrate the inclusivity and diversity of the animal population in the world of *Zootopia*. By referencing animals ranging from the "biggest elephant" to the "first fox," the speaker emphasizes the wide range of species present in their society. This not only highlights the richness of the fictional world but also reinforces the theme of unity and acceptance among different animal types. Furthermore, it sets the stage for exploring the challenges and prejudices faced by various species within the narrative as characters navigate their interactions in a society where diversity is celebrated but also sometimes met with discrimination. Thus, hyponymy functions

not only as a linguistic device but also as a narrative tool to enhance world-building and thematic exploration within the film.

Data 7

Table 7. The Second Sample Data of Hyponymy

Hopps: Those are a **crocus varietal** called **Midnicampum Holicithias**. They're a Class C Botanical, sir. (01:31:13)

The type of lexical cohesion evident in this dialogue is hyponymy, which is a linguistic relationship where one word (the hyponym) represents a subclass or specific instance of a broader category denoted by another word (the hypernym). In this case, "crocus varietal" serves as the hyponym, representing a specific type or variety within the broader category of crocus flowers. The term "Midnicampum Holicithias" likely further specifies or categorizes a particular subtype or species within the crocus varietal category. The use of botanical terminology establishes coherence by providing precise and specialized terms related to the subject matter, contributing to the clarity and specificity of the dialogue.

The function of employing hyponymy in this dialogue serves several purposes. Firstly, it enhances the authenticity and credibility of the character providing the information, indicating their expertise or familiarity with botanical taxonomy. By using specialized terminology, the character demonstrates their knowledge and proficiency in the field, adding depth to their characterization. Secondly, hyponymy facilitates communication and understanding among characters within the context of the scene. By using specific terms to describe the flower, the character effectively conveys detailed information to others present, ensuring clarity and accuracy in communication. Additionally, the use of hyponymy contributes to the world-building aspect of the narrative, enriching the fictional setting with elements of realism and complexity. Overall, hyponymy functions to enhance characterization, facilitate communication, and enrich the narrative environment in the dialogue.

Meronymy

Data 8

Table 8. The First Sample Data of Meronymy

Hopps: Oh, Nick! **Night howlers** aren't wolves. They're **toxic flowers**. I think someone is targeting predators on purpose and making them go savage... (01:20:10)

In the dialogue, "night howlers" are referred to as "toxic flowers." This relationship can be illustrated as an instance of meronymy. Meronymy focuses on the part-whole relationship within a linguistic context, where one term represents a constituent part of another term. In this case, "toxic flowers" are seen as a part or component of the broader category represented by "night howlers." The term "night

howlers" refers to the entire entity, encompassing not only the flowers themselves but also potentially other characteristics or aspects associated with them. "Toxic flowers" specifically denotes a part or attribute of the night howlers, contributing to their overall nature or identity.

In this context, meronymy serves the function of specifying a particular subset within the broader category of flowers. It allows the characters to refer to "night howlers" as a distinct type of flower with shared attributes and functions. The emphasis on the toxic nature of the flowers provides clarity and specificity in communication, enhancing the audience's understanding of their significance within the narrative. By focusing on meronymy and the part-whole relationship between "night howlers" and their toxic nature, the dialogues effectively convey information about the unique characteristics of these flowers without confusing them with other types of flora. This ensures that the audience can differentiate between "night howlers" and other flowers, thereby avoiding any potential misunderstanding or misinterpretation.

Collocation
Data 9

Table 9. The First Sample Data of Collocation

Nick: It's called a hustle, **sweetheart**. And I'm not the liar, he is. (01:32:25)

In the dialogue provided from *Zootopia*, the term "sweetheart" serves as an example of collocation, a linguistic phenomenon where certain words tend to appear together frequently within the same language. In this case, "sweetheart" is composed of two words, "sweet" and "heart," which are commonly used together to refer to someone who is loved or cherished. This collocation of "sweetheart" provides a distinct and recognizable meaning in English, denoting affection or endearment towards the person addressed.

The function of collocation in this dialogue is to convey familiarity and a particular tone of speech between the characters. By using the collocation "sweetheart," Nick adopts a casual and somewhat patronizing manner towards the character he is addressing. This choice of language adds depth to the interaction and characterizes Nick's personality as smooth-talking and charismatic. Furthermore, the collocation reinforces the dynamic between the characters and enhances the overall realism of the dialogue, as it reflects common language patterns and expressions used in everyday conversations. Overall, the collocation "sweetheart" contributes to the cohesion and authenticity of the dialogue in *Zootopia*, enriching the character interactions and enriching the storytelling experience for the audience.

Data 10

Table 10. The Second Sample Data of Collocation

Nick: Oh, you bunnies... You're so emotional. There we go. **Deep breath**. (01:37:41)

In the dialogue from *Zootopia*, the phrase "deep breath" exemplifies collocation, a linguistic concept referring to words that naturally occur together in the same language and have a strong semantic relationship. In this context, "deep" (meaning "profound" or "intense") is frequently paired with "breath" to form a phrase that denotes the action of taking a breath deeply or deeply inhaling. As such, "deep breath" is a common collocation in English, representing the act of inhaling deeply.

The function of the collocation of "deep breath" in this dialogue is to convey a sense of reassurance or calmness. Nick uses this phrase to encourage the bunny character, Hoops, to compose herself and regain control of her emotions. By employing the collocation "deep breath," Nick suggests a physical action that is often associated with calming oneself down or managing stress. This choice of language not only serves to comfort Hoops but also reflects Nick's character as someone who is observant and perceptive of others' emotions. Additionally, the collocation adds realism to the dialogue, as it reflects a common expression used in real-life situations to offer support or encouragement. Overall, "deep breath" contributes to the cohesion and authenticity of the interaction between the characters in *Zootopia*, enhancing the emotional depth of the scene and enriching the storytelling experience for the audience.

DISCUSSION

This study draws upon significant research in the field of discourse analysis, particularly focusing on lexical cohesion in various forms of narrative texts. Previous studies have analyzed lexical and grammatical cohesion across diverse contexts, from official regional regulations to student writings, revealing the critical role of cohesive devices in enhancing text coherence and meaning.

Delfia, Wijana, and Kesuma (2023) explored both lexical and grammatical cohesion in the discourse of West Sumatra Province's special regional regulations, highlighting how these cohesive elements reflect social realities and ideational coherence within the text. The study emphasized the interconnectedness of lexical cohesion types, such as repetition, synonymy, meronymy, hyponymy, and collocation, in constructing cohesive and harmonious discourse. This foundational research offers a comparative framework for understanding how different types of lexical cohesion contribute to discourse structure, which aligns with the current study's focus on Zootopia's narrative strategies.

Sidabutar (2021) examined lexical cohesion in students' narrative writings, identifying repetition as the most frequently used type. This finding mirrors the current study's observation that repetition is one of the prominent forms of lexical cohesion in the dialogues of Zootopia, specifically in emphasizing key ideas and emotions to enhance message clarity. However, unlike Sidabutar's findings, where hyponymy was the least frequent, this study found that both synonymy and hyponymy occur minimally, indicating their selective use for nuanced character expression in cinematic dialogue.

Latifah and Triyono (2020) analyzed cohesion and coherence in the social media story "Layangan Putus," finding that both lexical and grammatical cohesion is essential for conveying a message effectively to readers. The current research extends this concept by focusing exclusively on lexical cohesion within cinematic discourse, particularly collocations, which emerged as the most dominant type (51.2%). This aligns with Latifah and Triyono's emphasis on the importance of cohesive elements in narrative comprehension, but in the context of animated films, it underscores the strategic deployment of word combinations to enhance thematic resonance and character development.

These studies collectively enhance the field of discourse analysis by exploring different aspects of lexical cohesion in a variety of texts, including regulations, narratives, and social media stories. The insights gained from these works serve as a basis for the current research, offering a deeper understanding of the role and frequency of various types of lexical cohesion in cinematic dialogues, especially in the animated film Zootopia.

Building upon these foundational studies on lexical cohesion, this research addresses several gaps identified in previous works: 1) Previous studies, such as those by Delfia, Wijana, and Kesuma (2023), predominantly focus on formal texts like regional regulations. A significant research gap lies in exploring lexical cohesion within the dynamic context of animated films. This study addresses this gap by examining how various lexical cohesion types function in dialogues of Zootopia, specifically focusing on their role in enhancing narrative coherence and character development; 2) While Sidabutar (2021) found repetition to be the most frequent type in student writing, this study reveals a different trend in cinematic discourse, where collocations are more dominant. This discrepancy highlights a gap in understanding how different types of lexical cohesion, like collocations, are strategically employed in film narratives to reinforce themes and maintain viewer engagement, a phenomenon less explored in the context of cinematic texts; and 3) Existing research, such as that of Latifah and Triyono (2020), emphasizes cohesion in narrative texts like social media stories. However, there is limited research on how lexical cohesion functions in animated films to develop plot and character dynamics. This study expands the scope of lexical cohesion analysis by focusing on the dialogues of animated characters, offering new insights into how filmmakers utilize linguistic strategies to create compelling narratives.

While these identified gaps primarily concern lexical cohesion's role in discourse structure, the broader gap involves understanding how these cohesion types influence narrative strategies in films. This study aims to provide a nuanced perspective on how filmmakers employ lexical cohesion to enhance storytelling, thereby contributing to a deeper comprehension of discourse dynamics in animated films.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the lexical cohesion in the dialogues of Zootopia's main characters, Hoops and Nick, revealing how linguistic strategies enhance character development and narrative coherence. The analysis identified collocations as the most dominant type of lexical cohesion, accounting for 51.2% of all instances, followed by repetition at 45.2%. Other types, such as synonymy and hyponymy, each made up 1.2%, while antonymy and meronymy were the least frequent at 0.6% each. Regarding their functions, "Providing Clarity" and "Highlighting Key Concepts" were the most prevalent, each representing 41.07% of the total, while "Maintaining Cohesion" and "Structuring the Text" were both at 6.55%, and "Enhancing Readability" was the least common at 4.76%. These findings underscore the strategic use of lexical devices to reinforce themes, develop character dynamics, and advance the plot, contributing to the film's cohesive and engaging narrative. The results and contribution of this research lie in providing a deeper understanding of how linguistic strategies are employed in animated film dialogues to create compelling narratives, enriching the field of discourse analysis and enhancing the understanding of character development and narrative dynamics.

REFERENCES

Abass, H. G. (2021, April 2). *Lexical Cohesion*. LinkedIn. https://www.linkedin.com/in/heba-gomaa-abass-12345678/

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. the Press Syndcate of the Unlverslty of Cambridge.

Delfia, E., Wijana, I. D. P., & Jati Kesuma, T. M. (2023). Lexical and Grammatical Cohesion in the Regional Regulation Discourse of West Sumatra Province. *Journal of Language and Literature*, *23*(2), 447–463. https://doi.org/10.24071/joll.v23i2.6081

Eggins, Suzanne. (2007). *An introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Continuum.

Episiasi, E., Syaputri, W., Suramto, S., & Kasriyati, D. (2022). Lexical and Grammatical Cohesion in the Undergraduate Students' Abstracts. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal*, *5*(2), 143–152. https://doi.org/10.31539/leea.v5i2.3310

Fathani, M. H., Novan, D., & Nugraha, S. (2022). Grammatical Cohesive Devices in "The Secret" by Rhonda Byrne. *Budapest International Research and*

Critics Institute-Journal, *5*(2), 13728–13733. https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v5i2.5234

Halliday, & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (4th ed.). Pearson Longman.

Hernawati, Z., & Simatupang, E. C. M. (2022). Grammatical Cohesion Found in "Venom: Let There Be Carnage" Moviescript. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, *5*(3). https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v5i3.5890

Landsteen. (1976). *Children learn to communicate*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

McCarthy, M., Christian, M., & Slade, D. (2019). *Discourse Analysis* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Mohebbi, H. (2020). ebk. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *8*(2), 136–138. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2020.120894

Morley, J. (2009). Lexical cohesion and rhetorical structure. In & M. M. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Lexical Cohesion and Corpus Linguistics* (pp. 5–22). https://doi.org/10.1075/bct.17.02mor

Latifah, A., & Triyono, S. (2020). Cohesion and Coherence of Discourse in the Story of "Layangan Putus" on Social Media Facebook. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, *5*(1), 41–56. www.indonesian-efl-journal.org

Pratiwi, N. A. (2019). *Lexical Cohesion Types Used in the Discussion Section of English Journal Articles*.

Portner, P., Maienborn, C., & Heusinger, K. von. (2019). *Semantics - Sentence and Information Structure*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Sidabutar, U. (2021). An Analysis of Lexical Cohesion on the Students' Writing. *JETAL: Journal of English Teaching & Applied Linguistics*, *2*(1), 62–67.

Spencer, C. (Producer), & Howard, B. , M. R. (Directors). (2016). *Zootopia*. Walt Disney Pictures.

Stubbs. (1983). *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. Basil Blackwell.

Sujatna, M. L., Hasna Pratiwi, U., Nur Iqlima, G., Hertiza Pebriana, S., Nurmayanti, M., & Ayu Sudiarti, L. (2021). Lexical Cohesion in Meghan Trainor's lyrics in "TITLE (DELUXE)." *Review of International Geographical Education (RIGEO)*, *11*(3), 1514–1519. https://doi.org/10.48047/rigeo.11.3.144

Ulfa, R. L., & Ramadhani, R. (2024). Grammatical cohesion found in undergraduate student's thesis writing: A case study at one private university in Indonesia. *English Learning Innovation (Englie)*, *5*(1), 120–131. https://doi.org/10.22219/engli

Velev, G. (n.d.). *Lexical Cohesion Summary*. Academia.Edu. Retrieved August 30, 2024, from https://www.academia.edu/9212437/Lexical_Cohesion_Summary

Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language* (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press.