

REPRESENTATION OF CHILDREN'S THOUGHT AND BEHAVIOR IN THEIR DRAWING

Keni Pradianti, Didi Sukyadi
Indonesia University of Education
kenipradianti@upi.edu; dsukyadi@upi.edu

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze and to describe on how children show their thoughts through hand drawing and also their communication skill. The data were taken from preschool age children (between 5-6 years old) in As-Shula kindergarten, Cililin, West Java. There are 6 collected hand drawing taken from one class. This paper discussed a type of drawing in ideational function of images such as narrative and analytical. To analyze this paper, qualitative research approach was used to describe the phenomenon occurred in children's drawing. It meant that this paper was going to give interpretation based on the theories that would be used to show and describe the happening phenomenon. The interpretation of children's drawing was compared to their thought and behavior in the classroom. In order to develop those findings, this paper revealed that hand drawing was a powerful mode in representing children's way of thought and also it was related to their communication skill that showed how children behave and how they could react in the classroom activities. The result showed that the children with material process drawing, narrative, realistic and connected interplay of the drawing, tended to be more active, while it did not happen to the children with passive behavior.

Keywords: children, communication, hand drawing, ideational, behavior.

INTRODUCTION

Children are currently being a concern to some researchers to analyze. Some studies which are done by Hopperstad (2008 & 2010) and by Literat (2013) shows that children are able to create such meaningful lines, objects, and another representative vectors onto their drawing. So, the researcher is inspired to develop and to compare those typical research with the region where the samples are taken differently.

The previous analysis revealed that children tended to describe something related to their own conventional experience cognitively. In this study, the researcher tries to analyze hand drawing of 5-6 years old children in preschool to know how their behavior is showed in the class. According to Ossorio in Bergner (2011) behavior is an attempt on the part of an individual to bring about some state of affairs, either to effect a change from one state of affair to another or to maintain a currently existing one. That is the reason why this research is interesting.

The purpose of the research is to look for the relevances and also the way children represents their thoughts into drawing in order to see drawing in the perspective of meaning making, communication, and visual representation in order to foster teaching and learning (Kellogg, 1970; Golomb, 1992; Matthews, 1999, 2003 Anning and Ring, 2004; Hope, 2008 in Anim, 2012). According to Riley's argument (2015), it is believed that drawing is mostly made of some variations and patterns which are visually expressing any kind of things in social communication. Freeman (1997) stated that there is a similarity between words and drawing in their social effects that each can communicate meanings to other people. As a communication mode, drawing tells so many things that sometimes words can not even describe. Drawing shows a person's emotional state of mind much better than verbal definitions or descriptions (Diem and Wille 2008; Knight 2008). Similarly, O'Halloran and Smith (2012) even called drawing as a product of human technology.

In analyzing drawing and its relation with behavior of the drawing makers, there is one crucial part of research that can not be forgotten, which is multimodal approach. Leeuwen (2005) stated that multimodal is the combination of different semiotic modes in a communicative artefact or event. That kind of communication can be presented verbally or visually. Besides, drawing involves the act of choosing available visual– graphic forms to make intended meaning (Hopperstad, 2008). According to O'Halloran and Smith (2012), Multimodal analysis is a type of analysis that includes any forms of communication.

If it is seen from the function, Riley (2015) describes that drawing is formed by the matrixs that is related to the particular function which are compotitional, interpersonal, and experiential function. To see those functions, especially to interpret the visual image of drawing, we can analyze the drawing through the level of engagements, such as the drawing as displayed as context; subdivisions of the drawing's surface; combinations of drawn marks; and a drawn mark itself. Besides, Kress and Leeuwen (2006) believe that drawing and any other kind of visual design has three major meaning, namely 1) ideational meaning, 2) interpersonal meaning, and 3) textual meaning. Moreover, ideational meaning is a function

of representing 'the world around and inside us', interpersonal meaning used to enacting social interactions as social relations, and textual meaning is an element where the text coheres internally and also relevant environment. (Kress and Leeuwen, 2016).

If it is compared to the traditional function of language, the use of transitivity is much wider in criticizing language use phenomenon. Simpson (2005:82) said that transitivity concerned with the transmission of ideas, is part of the ideational function of language. The way in which transitivity carries out this ideational function is by expressing processes. The semantic processes expressed by clauses have potentially three components. These are: (1) Process itself, which will be expressed by the verb phrase in a clause. (2) The participants involved in the process. These roles are typically realized by noun phrases in the clause. (3) The circumstances associated with the process, normally expressed by adverbial and prepositional phrases.

Process, in transitivity, is realized by verbs. There are six kinds of processes in transitivity; they are *material*, *behavioral*, *mental*, *verbal*, *relational*, *existential*, *Circumstance* answer the questions like *when*, *where*, *why*, *how much*, and *as what*. *Participant* is the element which is provided in every processes. *Participant* can be as *actor*, *goal*, *initiator*, *range*, or *receiver* in *material process*; *behaves* and *range* in *behavioral process*; *senser*, *phenomenon*, and *inducer* in *mental process* (Eggins, 2004).

According to Ossorio in Bergner (2011) behavior is an attempt on the part of an individual to bring about some state of affairs, either to effect a change from one state of affair to another or to maintain a currently existing one. Thus it can be reached within communication resources, either words or drawing (Ribes-Iñesta, 2006). According to the statements above, it can be inferred that there is a line between drawing, communication and behavior. The meanings related to the emotions and thoughts of the drawing maker can be analyzed not only through the type of line strokes but also colours because it is widely known that children's drawings convey emotions in their bold use of colour and line (Golomb 1992; Misalidi and Bonoti 2008). That is why children's drawings are often compared by psychologists (Golomb 1992; Misalidi and Bonoti 2008). Freeman (1997) believed that the interpretation of language – behavior and representational drawing are natural skill of human being. Children naturally develop their communication skill through many ways, either language or drawing. They have to master the use of conventional signs and symbols. That is why communication has become a constant behavior of people.

METHODOLOGY

This study is using qualitative method with descriptive approach to analyze drawings. The researcher choose this method because it is an effective design to deeply understanding the object of study. That statement is similar to Cresswell's that "*Qualitative research is descriptive in that the researcher is interested in process, meaning, and understanding gained through words or pictures*" (John W. Cresswell, 1994:145). And then, drawings are described based on representation theory from Kress and Leeuwen (2006).

According to Coates in Hopperstad (2010), drawing should also be available as a free-choice activity as this may activate other parts of the children's visual literacy to the teacher-initiated sessions. Therefore in collecting data for this research, preschool students were asked to draw anything they wanted. While they were drawing at the class, the researcher gave them questions about the objects they drew on the paper. They were allowed to tell and describe the story that they tried to visualized. Besides, the teacher was also interviewed by the researcher in order to get more detail informations about the students.

ANALYSIS

This research was conducted in a preschool with a group of student among 5-6 years old. To see ideational meaning of the drawing transitivity is used to analyze the process, participant and the circumstances of the picture. And then, the Systemic Funtional Semiotics of drawing theory by Riley (2015) is used to describe how children draw their drawing by seeing three aspects of semiotics drawing functions, such as compotitional, interpersonal, and experiential. However, in this research the researcher is trying to more focus on experiential function of the drawing. In supporting the analysis, researcher also interviewed the teacher and asked about daily behavior of the children.



Drawing 4.1 (Material Process of Drawing)

“Drawing 4.1” above is drawn by a boy and it is a narrative process. His picture is imaginative and it has meaning. It is shown by the conversation below.

R: What are you drawing? Could you explain to me?

A: This is robot (while pointing to the object)

R: and then, could you tell me who is this? (pointing to the robot object)

A: i am controlling the robot, mam.

The participant of the drawing represented by two characters they are the boy himself and the robot. The picture shows that the boy is controlling the robot. It means that the boy represents the actor and the robot represents the patient or receiver. The background of the boy's picture is represented by the picture of city sight. It is shows that city is the circumstances metafunction in the picture. Moreover, “Drawing 4.1” is defined into three level of engagement. (1) In the term of displayed context, the picture represents an imaginative picture and narative historical genre with realistic objects drawn. In the short interview he said that the drawing tells the activity which is done by him and his robot. He said that they were playing around the city. Then, the picture shows that there is the interplay between its objects. On the other word, the objects, pose, and event are connected and influenced each other. (2) In the term of subdivision surface, the drawer is aware about the distance of the drawing (3) In the term of drawn mark, the picture is bright and it shows day marker.

According to the teacher, the boy who drew “Drawing 4.1” is smart and active in the class. It is proved by the interview between the researcher and the teacher.

R: mam, could i ask about the character of this kid in the classroom?

T: sure, you can

R: since very first time i give attention to this kid i thought this kid was so smart.

T: yes, exactly. This kid is relatively smart and he could easily understand the subject at school. And he could easily remember the lesson.

His ability in understanding and applying the learning material in the classroom activities is outstanding like the teacher statement **“yes, exactly. This kid is relatively smart and he could easily understand the subject at school. And he could easily remember the lesson”**.

Most of the time, he could bravely deliver his ideas and his thought. Moreover, In social relation, he could be kind and warm to everyone, either to his friends or to the teachers. He could also control his emotion very well. It was proved by some cases such as when most of the children were very noisy, he could stay calm sitting on his chair without easily distracted.



Drawing 4.2 (Existential Process of Drawing)

According to the experiential level of engagement of the drawing context, drawing 4 is categorized as imaginative drawing. The process of the picture shows that it belongs to existential process. The participant of the drawing is represented by the house as inanimate object. The circumstance shows that the location of the drawing is in the housing area.

The object is drawn realistic but there is no specific narration about it. In the term of subdivisions of the drawing's surface, there is no action of the object and the drawer is unaware of the distance. It is shown by position of the sun which is linear to the house. It indicates that the drawer did not really understand about the concept of his drawing. Besides, in the term of combinations of drawn marks, there is no distal and aproximal between surfaces.

There is no specific story and action between objects. The position of the sun seems so unrealistic. The compositional of base line and pattern of the line symbolize physical stability and epitomize visual balance (Riley, 2015), thus the way he drew a house shows that he is physically unstable. The researcher tried to ask some questions to trigger the boy to describe what he drew, and to try describe his picture verbally. But it turned out that the boy did not tell anything to the researcher about his drawing. He did not even tell the story of his picture to the teacher. The teacher said that this boy has a problem with his confidence. The teacher told that the boy is introvert and he is not active in the class. To prove teacher's statement, the researcher gives more attention to observe the boy activity in the class. It is showed by the interview with the teacher.

R: I think F is a bit hard to socialize and interact with me, is he shy?

T: ya, he is a bit hard to interact not only with you but also with me.

R: she is a passive student then

T: exactly

It could be inferred that the boy obviously could not socialize and communicate well either with his friends or his teachers. It is proved more deeply by the conversation between the researcher and the student.

R: what are drawing F?

F: ... (no answer)

R: is this house?

F: ... (no answer)

R: Could you tell me whose house is this?

F: ... (no answer)

R: oke, thank you, you can continue your drawing.

Conversation above shows how passive the student is. He could not express and describe his feeling and his drawing to the researcher. He showed his shyness and unconfidence. According to Knight (2008) that meaning inside children's drawing has an equality with their responses to the society. Then, this boy is quite representative to be categorized as an introverted person based on his typical of drawing.

CONCLUSION

The result of the study shows that the children between 5-6 years old have the ability to express and deliver their thought to the drawing form. However, the drawing results of the children could be connected to their behavior. The finding that the researcher got from this research is the kid with active and talkative behavior tend to be more expressive in making their hand drawing. Their drawing is mostly narrative, realistic and the interplay of their drawing is connected from one object to another. Their drawing metafunction tends to be drawn as material process. While the kids with quiet behavior have the tendency to be more passive. It is represented by their drawing which is relative abstract, the interplay of the objects is not connected and their picture tend to be existential. So, it can not be described well. The kids with active behavior are brave to draw the pattern of drawing and shape their drawing into big, large and colorful objects. It did not happen to the kids with passive and quite behavior. Most of passive and introvert kids tend to draw less than two objects. Their drawing is not really colorful and big.

REFERENCES

- Anim, Joyce Ofosua. 2012. *The role of drawing in promoting the children's communication in Early Childhood Communication*. Dublin : University of Malta.
- Anning, Angela. 1997. *Drawing Out Ideas: Graphicacy and Young Children*. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education* (7: 219–239, 1997). Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Bergner, Raymond. M. 2011. *What is Behavior? And so What? . New Ideas in Psychology* (29:147-155, 2011). Amsterdam : Elsevier.
- Cresswell, John W. 1994. *Research design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. California: Sage Publication.
- Diem, Gertraud. Wille. 2008. *A Therapeutic Perspective: The Use of Drawings in Child Psychoanalysis and Social Science*. *Handbook of Visual Analysis* (119 – 113). California : Sage Publication.

- Eggins, Suzanne. 2004. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London : Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Freeman, N.H. 1972. *Process and Product in children's Drawing*. Perception, volume 1 (123-140). Department of Psychology, University of Durham.
- Hopperstad, Marit Holm. 2008. How Children Make Meaning through Drawing and Playing. Visual Communication Article. (Los Angeles London, New Delhi and Singapore). Vol. 7(1): 77-96. Sage Publication.
- Hopperstad, Marit Holm. 2010. *Studying Meaning in Children's Drawings*. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*. 10(4) 430 – 452. DOI: 10.1177/1468798410383251. United Kingdom : Sage Publication.
- O'Halloran, Kay. L. Smith, Bradley. A. 2012. *Multimodal Text Analysis*. DOI : 10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0817. New Jersey : John Wiley & Sons, Inc.All.
- Knight, Linda. 2008. *Communication and Transformation through Collaboration: rethinking drawing activities in early childhood*. Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood Volume 9 Number 4 (309 – 316). DOI : 10.2304/ciec.2008.9.4.306. United Kingdom : Sage Publication.
- Kress, Gunther R.van Leeuwen, Theo. 2006. *Reading Images*. London & New York : Routledge – Taylor and Francis Group.
- Leeuwen, Theo van. Carey Jewitt. 2001. *Handbook of Visual Analysis*. California : Sage Publication.
- Leeuwen, Theo van. 2005. *Introducing Social Semiotics*. New York : Routledge.
- Literat, Ioanna. 2013. *A pencil for your thoughts: Participatory drawing as a visual research method with children and youth*. Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism University of Southern California, Los Angeles. United State. 48 – 98. International Journal of Qualitative Method.
- Misailidi, Plousia. Bonoti, Greece Fotini. 2008. *Emotion in Children's Art do Young Children Understand the Emotions Expressed in other Children's Drawings?*. Journal of early childhood research. Vol 6 (2) 189–200 [ISSN 1476-718 DOI: 10.1177/1476718X08088677. London & New York : Sage Publication.
- Ribes, Emilio. Iñesta. 2006. *Human Behavior as Language: Some Thoughts on Wittgenstein*. Behavior and Philosophy. 34, 109-121 (2006). Cambridge Center for Behavioral Studies.
- Riley, Howard. 2015. *Perceptual Modes, Semiotic Codes, Social Mores: A Contribution Towards a Social Semiotics of drawing*. London : Sage Publication.
- Simpson, Paul. 2005. *Language, Ideology and Point of view*. London: Routledge.

CURRICULUM VITAE

| Complete Name | Institution | Education | Research Interests |
|----------------|---|--|----------------------|
| Keni Pradianti | Postgraduates Studies, Indonesia Univesity of Education | Bachelor, Germany Education | Forensic Linguistics |
| | | Department, Indonesia Univesity of Education | Psycholinguistics |
| | | Graduate Program, Linguistics Studies, Indonesia Univesity of Education (on going) | Clinical Linguistics |
| Didi Sukyadi | | Bachelor, English Education Department, IKIP Bandung | Semiotics |
| | | Graduate Program, Primary English Education, University of London | Multimodality |
| | | Doctoral Program, Linguistics Studies, University of Indonesia | |