



LANGUAGE STYLE BETWEEN PUBLIC SPEAKERS IN PUBLIC SPEAKING PERFORMANCES

Rizky Satria¹, Hamzah², Fitrawati³

English Department

Faculty of Languages and Arts

Universitas Negeri Padang

email: knight.rizky@gmail.com

Abstract

Although there have been many studies show that different style in using language, there are very few studies that compare language style in public speaking through three levels of metafunction. This study aims to compare the differences and the similarities between two public speakers in 1) the level of ideational metafunction, 2) the level of interpersonal metafunction, and 3) the level of textual metafunction. This is comparative study within qualitative approach. The results of the study show that they share three similarities and two differences in the level of ideational metafunction. Then, there are six similarities and four differences in the interpersonal level. Meanwhile, there are four similarities and two differences found for textual metafunction. The conclusion obtained from the findings is that they are more similar rather than different and the differences in style are affected by the differences in cultural background of the speakers which are represented through speech and lead to the different ways of producing structure of clauses and selection of words in the three levels of metafunction.

Key words: Language style, public speaking, three levels of metafunction, Manoj Vasudevan and Simon Bucknall.

A. INTRODUCTION

Public Speaking is one of skill in a language which is used to entertain, inform, motivate and persuade audiences about the idea of a speaker. It is a representation of spoken language which is unique since the way of delivering idea through speaking must be different between a speaker and other speakers to speak about the same genre. A public speaker must prepare his/her speech

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

² Lecturer of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang

³ Lecturer of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang



structurally before he/she performs it but he may speak differently than what written is. This is what we call as style. It reflects different ways to express the same thing. Thus, this matter of style becomes the matter of linguistics since it is correlated with the use of language, spoken or written.

Spoken language could also become a proper object of analysis for stylistics discipline. Lately, many researchers focus on the analysis of stylistics to literary works or written medium of language and have left the spoken language behind. As it is stated by Crystal (1970: 192) that stylistics could shape people's awareness about style of spoken language with the given circumstances. It means that the use of spoken language could also different with one to another as well as it is found in written one. In other words, differences and similarities in spoken language like public speaking is able and essential to be discovered so the perspective about stylistics, as the discipline to discover style in written language only, can be regenerated.

The styles of two top international public speakers, Manoj Vasudevan and Simon Bucknall, must be the best sample to be discovered. As they have been the best among the others through competition and they are also different in ethnic which affects the way they deliver the information, they must share many similarities and differences reflected through their performances. Hence, the stylistic viewpoint could be used to differentiate and determine the style in speaking as the effect of cultural background and break the old superficial concept about style in language.

For last few years, researchers on Linguistics; teaching and applied, have committed research on public speaking. Some of them have committed the matter in public speaking through the Gender perspective; Broadbridge (2003), Gaibani & Elmenfi (2014). Another has conducted research in this skill to improve speaking competence as the matter of pedagogy; Al-Tamimi (2014). The rest has tried to solve speech style and its relation with social strata in the language; Madsen (2017). Thus, none of those latest researches used concept of metafunction as the proper device to reveal complex differences about style in public speaking performances. By applying this device to find the variant ways of constructing clauses, the variation of style can be discovered linguistically and specifically.

In addition, Stylistics is a new arrival discipline in English Department of State University of Padang. It was added to the curriculum in 2013. Therefore, this discipline offers many gaps to be filled by the researcher in order to conduct their research. Thus, conducting a research in this discipline, within functional grammar as the device to explore the phenomenon of style in the level of clause, can be the starting point for the researchers in West Sumatera, especially in English Department State University of Padang, to expand the research in new arrival discipline.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

This is a comparative research within qualitative approach. There is no statistic formulation occur to solve the matter (Richardson: 2018). The data of this research are the clauses which were transcribed from utterances used by two

speakers—Manoj Vasudevan and Simon Bucknall—in four performances of each speaker. The data were analysed to find out the differences and the similarities between two speakers from three levels of metafunction. The sources of the data were the collection of clauses which were gotten by transcribing from selected videos.

There were three steps done in order to collect the data. Firstly, the researcher downloaded four videos for each public speakers from *youtube.com* randomly. Secondly, the researcher did intensive listening to the subjects of the research and focusing on constrains between clauses. Third, the researcher transcribe the data in clause to clause sequences in order to be explored based on their functional structures; ideational, interpersonal and textual levels. After collecting the data, the researcher analysed the data based on three steps. First, the researcher classified the types of process, negotiation, mood, modality, attitude, graduation, involvement and theme, got from the source of the data, based on their occurrences in eight transcribed videos between two speakers. Then, the researcher grouped the occurrences of each indicator in each of two speakers video performances. Next, the researcher compared the grouped and classified data in the clause to clause form to be counted and be represented in percentage in order to find the prominent occurrences of process, negotiation, modality, attitude, graduation, involvement and theme which occurred in each video of two speakers. Lastly, the researcher analysed and compared the results separately depend on each level of metafunctions by relating to the concept of language and culture.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Research Finding

a) Comparison between Manoj Vasudevan and Simon Bucknall in the level of ideational metafunction

After analysing the data, the findings for ideational metafunction are obtained. To answer the first research question, it is found that both speakers are equal in using material process in public speaking since this kind of process has the highest rate for both speakers and they are different variative in using other processes. Table 1 presents the findings in the level of ideational metafunction.

Table 1. The comparison of process occurrences between Manoj Vasudevan and simon Bucknall

Comparison of process occurrences				
Process	Manoj Vasudevan		Simon Bucknall	
	F	%	f	%
Material	207	35.40%	179	27.12%
Behavioural	72	12.3%	56	8.50%
Mental	-		-	
Affection	18	3.07%	30	4.50%
Cognition	47	8.03%	100	15.15%
Perception	25	4.29%	33	5%

Verbal	48	8.2%	50	7.6%
Relational	-		-	
identifying	17	2.9%	23	3.50%
Attributive	140	23.93%	165	25%
Existential	11	1.9%	21	3.18%
Meteorological	0	0%	3	0.45%
Total	585	100%	660	100%

Table 1 above shows the similarities and the differences between two speakers' style in delivering information through process on public speaking. Both speakers share the similarities in using material and attributive processes in presenting their speech which are dominating other processes in the collection of data. In the relation with occurrences of frequent process used in their performances, they are also similar in using cognition mental process, represented through clauses like *I thought, I wonder, I think* in the collection of the data. Related to the least process to be used in their speech, both speakers also share things in common in the matter of meteorological process and relational identifying which indicates that these processes are not that assistive in delivering information at this genre due to their percentage which less than 5%. Hence, *they share similarities in delivering information through the domination material, attributive and cognitive mental processes and the least use of meteorological and relational identifying process.*

Among those similarities, both speakers also share the differences. Vasudevan frequently used behavioural process 3.8% more than Bucknall. In the opposite, Bucknall enriched his performances by producing words which indicate mental process, especially cognition by percentage 15.15% or 7.12% more than Vasudevan. The difference is also indicated by the tendency to indicate the existence of an entity through existential process. Bucknall used this process to indicate the existence twice of Vasudevan did. Thus, *they are different in indicating information through behavioural, types of mental and existential process occurrences.*

b. Comparison between Manoj Vasudevan and Simon Bucknall in the level of interpersonal metafunction

After analyzing the data, the findings for interpersonal metafunction are obtained. To answer the second question, they are compared based on negotiation, modality, attitude, graduation and involvement in order to discover differences and similarities between two speakers. Table 2 presents the findings in the level of interpersonal metafunction while the abbreviation list is presented in List of Abbreviation.

Table 2. The comparison of interpersonal element between Manoj Vasudevan and Simon Bucknall

Comparison of interpersonal elements				
interpersonal element	Manoj Vasudevan		Simon Bucknall	
	F	%	f	%
negotiation				
Declarative	496	84.8%	576	87.3%
interrogative	43	7.35%	59	8.9%
Imperative	43	7.35%	23	3.5%
exclamative	3	0.5%	2	0.3%
Total	585	100%	660	100%
Modality				
MP1	8	16%	29	41.3%
MP2	25	50%	30	43%
MP3	5	10%	3	4.3%
MU1	2	4%	0	0%
MU2	0	0%	1	1.4%
MU3	9	18%	3	4.3%
MoO1	0	0%	0	0%
MoO2	1	2%	3	4.3%
MoO3	0	0%	0	0%
MoI1	0	0%	0	0%
MoI2	0	0%	0	0%
MoI3	0	0%	1	1.4%
Total	50	100%	70	100%
Attitude				
AH+	12	9.75%	10	8%
AH-	1	0.8%	5	4%
ASE+	3	2.4%	5	4%
ASE-	5	4%	19	15%
ASA+	4	3.25%	6	4.7%
ASA-	0	0%	0	0%
JSE+	18	14.6%	10	8%
JSE-	7	5.7%	5	4%
JSS+	6	5%	8	2.3%
JSS-	0	0%	3	6.3%
APP+	45	36.5%	44	35%
APP-	22	18%	11	8.7%
Total	123	100%	126	100%
graduation				
Gup	45	86.5%	56	98%
Gdown	7	13.5%	1	2%

	Total	52	100%	57	100%
C	involvement				
	Naming	0	0%	16	100%
	Swearing	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	0	0%	16	100%

Based on the table 2 above, it reveals the similarities and the differences between two speakers. In the level of interpersonal metafunction, Vasudevan and Bucknall are similar in using declarative mood in all their performance; above 75% for both speakers. Meanwhile, they are quite different in the use of imperative in public speaking in which Vasudevan used it 7% more than Bucknall. This matter indicates that public speaking as one-side negotiation and lack of interaction with audiences.

In the level of modality, they are using medium modality probability such as *will, would, shall* as the dominant type of modality used in their public speaking. Besides the common between speakers' dominant use of modality, they are also similar in less occurrences of obligation and inclination to be the least modality found in their performance. They are different in the use of modality in which Vasudevan is dominant in the use of high modality probability; 10% and usuality; 18%, while Bucknall is dominant in the use of low modality probability; 41.3%.

The next similarity is about the tendency of both speakers to express their comment about a thing which is reflected through their high-rate occurrence of appreciation as the attitude, especially positive appreciation within occurrence percentage above 30%. The difference is about the tendency in choosing attitude toward information. Vasudevan dominates Bucknall in the matter of judgement social esteem positive which indicates his positive perspective about people while Bucknall tends to express his feelings about insecurity through information.

For the fifth similarity, they are the similar in using graduation volume up rather than volume down. There are more than half of a hundred percent gap between them, especially Bucknall who produces almost a hundred percent of occurrence.

Last, both of them did not use swearing words in their selected performances. One more obvious difference between Vasudevan and Bucknall is that Vasudevan does not use naming words as Bucknall does in his speech. Most of Bucknall's naming words are related to the British famous fiction character, Harry Potter. *Thus, there are six similarities shared by Vasudevan and Bucknall and there are four differences found based on the table of findings above.*

c. Comparison between Manoj Vasudevan and Simon Bucknall in the level of textual metafunction

After analysing the data, the findings for textual metafunction are obtained. To answer the third research question, they are compared based on the type of theme which occurs in every initial part of the clause from the collection of data. Table 3 presents the findings in the level of textual metafunction.

Table 3. The comparison of textual elements between Manoj Vasudevan and Simon Bucknall

Comparison of textual elements				
Theme	Manoj Vasudevan		Simon Bucknall	
	F	%	F	%
marked topical				
Adverbial	17	3%	16	2.45%
Prep. Group	5	0.85%	3	0.45%
Complement	6	1%	12	1.85%
unmarked topical				
Nom. Group	216	37%	231	35%
Process	39	6.66%	49	7.42%
Embedded clause	2	0.3%	2	0.3%
Interpersonal				
Vocative	26	4.44%	20	3%
mood adjunct	26	4.44%	16	2.45%
Finite	17	3%	19	2.9%
Wh-interrogative	16	2.7%	21	3.18%
Textual				
Structural	172	29.25%	235	35.6%
Continuative	39	6.66%	28	4.2%
Conjunctive	4	0.7%	8	1.2%
Total	585	100%	660	100%

Based on the table 3 above, there are similarities and differences found between two speakers. First, both of speakers frequently used adverbial group as the marked topical theme. It is above 2%. These adverbial groups mainly indicate time as it was displayed in the data analysis. Meanwhile, they are difference slightly in other theme markers. Vasudevan tends to use continuative like *well*, *now*, *anyway* in his performances more than Bucknall did; 2.46% difference rate. Meanwhile, Bucknall foregrounded the second participant; complement, slightly better than Vasudevan. Second, to indicate unmarked topical theme, both speakers mainly foregrounded nominal group as the usual form for unmarked topical theme—above 30% for both speakers. They also share things in common about the least occurrences of embedded clause in public speaking; less than one percent. This relates to the spoken mode of the information delivered.

Next, structural becomes the common marker used to indicate textual themes rather than other markers such as continuative and conjunctive; it is about 30% domination. It is shown by high-rate of occurrences for this marker in both speakers' performances—29.25% for Vasudevan and 35.6% for Bucknall—which make them similar in textual theme. Thus, these four similarities are found in the

collection of data to show the resemblance of style between two speakers in this genre.

Table 3 also reveals the differences between two speakers. In the matter of interpersonal theme, Vasudevan are balanced in the use of vocative and mood adjunct; 4.44%, but Bucknall dominates interpersonal themes in his performances by using Wh-interrogative; 3.18%. Therefore, *these two differences indicate that there are not many significant differences between two speakers in the level of textual metafunction because they share similarities more than differences*

2. Discussion

The findings on analysis of performance videos about Manoj Vasudevan and Simon Bucknall's speech reveal the similarities and the differences in three levels. They are ideational, interpersonal and textual. This sub-chapter discussed about each level one by one in order to compare one speaker with another speaker from three level of metafunction as the effects of differences in cultural background of the speakers because Manoj Vasudevan is an Indian while Simon Bucknall is a British. These differences in the cultural background must affect style in delivering information. The findings are related to literatures so the assumption can be shaped objectively. Thus, the differences and the similarities obtained from the findings are discussed in the next following paragraphs.

In the level of ideational metafunction, Manoj Vasudevan and Simon Bucknall performances are dominated by the occurrences of material process which is typically found in public speaking because both speakers commonly delivered the speech about daily life activities and phenomena. This is supported by the statement of Hu in Zheng (2014: 17) that explained material process as the dominating process in speaking because material world takes a role as the fundamental base to refer to human activity and existence in the nature. This statement also emphasizes the role of attributive process which comes after material process as high-rate of occurrences in the data. However, there is also difference occur in this matter. Vasudevan tends to use behavioural process such as *live, dream, listen* along his selected performances. It is related to the kinds of topic that he delivered which deal about life lesson indicating dream, hope, life and death as in the video 2 about teak tree. Meanwhile, Bucknall is significantly different from Vasudevan about mental cognitive process. clauses like *I wonder, I think, I thought* as in data analysis occur frequently indicating the use of mental cognitive as his style in delivering a speech. The topic and the way they delivered the topic deals with their cultural background which are represented through their thought.

The similarities also occur in the mental process with the matter of cognitive mental process. This can be understood to be similar because two speakers in delivering a speech must intent to connect to the audience. Therefore, by using cognitive mental process the speakers can attract audience mental reactions about thought to be occurred as it stated by Alaei & Ahangari (2016: 206). He stated that mental process occurs to demand the affective, cognitive and perceptive reaction. They also share similarities in less occurrences of

meteorological and identifying process. It relates to the purpose of this genre which means that it is impossible for a public speaker explaining about weather condition in details because both public speakers explained about daily matter and it is also impossible to identifying process occur frequently because the purposes of public speaking are to inform and to entertain audiences through information in speech.

In the level of interpersonal metafunction, there are similarities and differences between Manoj Vasudevan and Simon Bucknall. *First*, it makes sense due to informative purpose of the public speaking through monologue speech and it is supported by Sipayung (2016: 23) who stated that the interactive structure of declarative mood is to give information. However, they are quite different in the use of imperative in public speaking in which Vasudevan used it slightly frequent rather than Bucknall. It can be assumed that Vasudevan is more attractive in public speaking because he creates the interaction with audiences by demanding services. It is supported by Morgan in Raja (2017: 99) that connect with audiences is one of factors that makes public speaking more attractive.

Second, in the matter of modality, they are using medium modality probability such as *will, would, shall, have to* as the dominant type of modality used in their public speaking. By considering Matthiessen (2014: 176) that stated modality as the gap between yes and no polarity, it can be understood that both speakers tends to put their obviousness about information in the middle between yes and no. On the other side, Vasudevan is dominant in the use of high modality probability and usuality while Bucknall is dominant in the use of low modality probability in which makes Vasudevan seems more certain about the information he delivered.

Third, since there are lacks of imperative clause occurs in their speech so the obligation and inclination are also less to occur to indicate the gap between do and don't. *Fourth*, it is the tendency of both speakers to express their comment about an information which is reflected through their high-rate occurrence of appreciation as the attitude. This finding indicates that both speakers frequently express their perception, reaction or cognition about things rather than human-being in their speech. However, they are also different in other types of attitude. Vasudevan dominates Bucknall in the matter of judgement social esteem positive which indicates the positive perception as his focus in attitude while Bucknall tends to express his feelings about insecurity through information

Fifth, they are the similar in using graduation volume up rather than volume down. This similarity indicates the tendencies of both speakers to emphasize the meaning. *Last*, both speakers do not use swearing words in their selected performances. it is reasonable because they deliver their speech in formal context in which swearing words can be offensive. However, in this indicator also they show differences on the respect with naming involvement. Vasudevan does not use naming words as Bucknall does in his speech. Most of Bucknall's naming words are related to the British famous fiction character, Harry Potter. In this matter, the cultural background of Britain is derived by Bucknall while Vasudevan does not. Thus, they share more similarities rather than differences in this level of metafunction.

In the level of textual metafunction. It is found that there are four similarities between two speakers. First, both speakers frequently used adverbial group as the dominant marker for marked topical. Eggins in Sipayung (2016: 28) stated that the experts on writing or speaking need to choose marked theme to improve the coherence in their texts or in this matter—speech. It means that both speakers did not improve the coherence of the speech too much through adverbial group; circumstances. It can be assumed that it is caused of the genre in which public speaking is presented in spoken medium so the possibility for simple form of clauses, initiated by nominal group as the subject, to be occurred is in the high-rate while in written medium, the coherence of the text is important to show engagement of the idea because the writer cannot clarify directly if there were ambiguities found in it.

Second, in order to indicate unmarked topical theme, both speakers mainly foregrounded nominal group as the common form for unmarked topical theme. It concerns with the common form of declarative mood SPCA so the position of subject is fulfilled by nominal group in order to ease the audiences to catch the meaning. Third, they also share things in common about the least occurrences of embedded clause in public speaking. Embedded clauses are commonly used in writing under the respect with WH-relatives. Fourth, structural becomes the common marker used to indicate textual themes rather than other markers such as continuative and conjunctive. This theme occurs in the forms of conjunction and WH-relative or are also called as transitional signals. Astanti, Rozimela & Fitrawati (2016; 33) stated that the transitional signals are functioned to link words, phrases, clauses, sentences and paragraph. Thus, they are useful in keeping cohesion in a set of information.

Among those similarities, there are two significant differences found from the analysis of the data. First, Vasudevan tends to use continuative like *well, now, anyway* in his performances more than Bucknall did while Bucknall foregrounded the second participant; complement, better than Vasudevan. This difference shows the tendency of each speakers in initiating a new idea. This situation makes Bucknall shape more coherence in his speech because of the occurrence of marked theme while Vasudevan tends to dis-engage the correlation between idea by adding continuative which has a function to initiate a new idea.

Second, in the matter of interpersonal theme, Vasudevan are balanced in the use of vocative and mood adjunct but Bucknall dominates interpersonal themes in his performances by using Wh-interrogative. This matter concerns with the tendency of Manoj to show social relation with the audience through addressee term, vocative, and mood adjunct while Simon builds the social relation with the audience through questions to demand information.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the findings of analysis of eight videos about Manoj Vasudevan's and Simon Bucknall's public speaking performances, it can be concluded that both speakers share similarities and differences in three levels of metafunction. In the level of ideational metafunction, they are similar in three aspects. First, they produce large numbers of material process which dominate their speech. Second, the similarities also occur in the mental process in the matter of cognitive mental process. Third, both of them produce lack of meteorological and identifying process. In the opposite, they also share significant differences in producing other processes. Manoj Vasudevan tends to use behavioural process while Simon Bucknall focuses on the production of mental cognitive process. Thus, these differences in style are affected by the differences in cultural background of the speakers which lead to the different ways of producing process in the ideational level of metafunction.

In the level of interpersonal metafunction, there are six similarities between the two speakers. First, they are similar in the large occurrences of declarative mood. Second, in the matter of modality, they are using medium modality probability as the dominant type of modality used in their public speaking. Third, there are lacks of imperative clause occurs in their speech so the obligation and inclination are also less to occur to indicate the gap between do and don't polarity. Fourth, it is the tendency of both speakers to express their comment about things rather than to feelings or human-being shown by their high-rate occurrence of appreciation as the attitude. Fifth, they are the similar in using graduation volume up rather than volume down. Sixth, both speakers do not use swearing in their selected performances.

In the opposite with previous paragraph, there are four differences between the two speakers. First, they are different in the production of imperative mood in public speaking in which Vasudevan used it frequently rather than Bucknall. Second, Vasudevan seems more certain about the information he delivered because of the occurrences of high modality probability is higher than Simon Bucknall's. Third, Vasudevan tends to use judgement social esteem positive attitude while Bucknall tends to express his feelings about insecurity through affect attitude. Fourth, Vasudevan did not use naming as Bucknall did in his speech. Hence, these differences in style are affected by the differences in cultural background of the speakers which lead to the difference ways of producing interpersonal elements in this level of metafunction.

Last, in the level of textual metafunction, there are four similarities between two speakers. First, both speakers frequently used adverbial group as the dominant marker for marked topical. Second, both speakers mainly produce nominal group as the common marker for unmarked topical theme. Third, there are lesser occurrences of embedded clause in public speaking. Fourth, structural is the common marker used to indicate textual theme.

This study that primarily studied the similarities and the differences in language style on public speaking still has a number of restriction. This study only compared the similarities and the differences between two public speakers in

order to discover the language style. Thus, to obtain a more comprehensive study result, a deeper research in many other public speakers and other genre is necessary. Furthermore, it is suggested that the future researcher will study the language style in this genre from different approach or will study other genres to be compared with this research in order to obtain better understanding about language style in the further.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alaei, Mahya & Ahangari, Saeideh. 2016. A Study of Ideational Metafunction in Joseph Conrad's "Heart of Darkness": A Critical Discourse Analysis. *English Language Teaching*. Vol 9 (4). p 203-213.
- Al-Tamimi, Nasser Omer M. 2014. Public Speaking Instruction: Abridge to Improve English Speaking Comprehension and Reducing Communication Apprehension. *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication*. Vol 2 (4). p 45-68.
- Astanti, Reni, Rozimela, Yenni & Fitrawati. 2016. Cohesive devices in Discussion Text Written by The Students of SMAN 12 Padang. *Journal of English Language Teaching*. Vol 5 (1). p 32-39. Retrieved from ejournal unp <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/jelt/article/view/7265>.
- Broadbridge, James. 2003. An Investigation into difference between Men's and Women's speech. *Module 5 sociolinguistics: The University of Birmingham*.
- Crystal, David. 1970. New Perspectives for Language Study. 1: Stylistics. *ELT Journal*. Vol 24 (2). p 102.
- Gaibani, Ahmed, Elmenfi, Fadil. 2014. The Role of Gender in Influencing Public Speaking Anxiety. *International Journal of Gender and Women's Studies*. Vol 2 (2). p 105-116
- Matthiessen, Christian M.I.M. 2014. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar (4th ed)*. Routledge: New York.
- Raja, Farhan. 2017. Anxiety Level in Students of Public Speaking: Causes and Remedies. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*. Vol 4 (1). p 94-110.
- Sipayung, Kammer Tuahman, Sinaga, Nenni Triana, Sianipar, Maria Olivia Cristina & Napitupulu, Fenty Debora. 2016. Metafunction Realization on Students' Descriptive Paragraphs. *International Journal of Linguistics*. Vol 8 (6). p 20-30

Zheng, Shuyuan, Yang an & Ge, Guangchun. 2014. Functional Stylistic Analysis: Transitivity in English-Medium Medical Research Articles. *International Journal of English Linguistics*. Vol 4 (2). p 12-25..

Kreidler, C. W. (1998). *Introducing English semantics*. New York: Routledge.

Kridalaksana, H. (2008). *Kamus linguistik*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Molina, L., & Albir, A. H. (2002). Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta: Journal des Traducteurs/Meta: Translators' Journal* , XLVII (4), 498-512.

