An Analysis of Denotative and Connotative Meanings in College Students' Interaction

Alfridus Kofi Talan[1], Adrianus Gude[2], I Putu Eka Suardana[3]
English Department, Bali Dwipa University
Email: talanalfriduskofi@gmail.com[1], adrianusgude23@gmail.com[2], siputuekasuardana@gmail.com[3]

Abstract

This study, entitled *An Analysis of Denotative and Connotative Meanings in College Students' Interaction*, aims to explore how college students use and interpret language in terms of its literal (denotative) and implied (connotative) meanings during their daily communication. Language plays a critical role in interpersonal interaction, and understanding how meaning is constructed and conveyed is essential in a college setting where communication occurs across academic, social, and cultural contexts. The research focuses on identifying the types of words and expressions students commonly use, analyzing how these are understood both literally and contextually, and examining the potential for miscommunication caused by differing interpretations of connotative meanings. The data were collected through observation and documentation of natural conversations among English Department students at Bali Dwipa University, followed by a semantic analysis based on theories of meaning. The findings reveal that while students are generally aware of denotative meanings, they frequently rely on connotative meanings to express emotions, attitudes, or social alignment. However, varied personal and cultural backgrounds sometimes lead to misinterpretation, particularly with words or phrases that carry strong emotional or cultural connotations. The study concludes that there are 20 utterances highlighting the rich interplay between denotative and connotative meanings in everyday student communication. While the denotative meanings provide a straightforward, literal understanding of the expressions, it is the connotative meanings that reveal deeper social, emotional, and relational nuances. An increased awareness of both denotative and connotative meanings can improve communication effectiveness and reduce misunderstandings in academic and informal settings.

Keywords: Denotative Meaning, Connotative Meaning, College Students' Interaction, Semantic Analysis, Miscommunication

1. Introduction

Language is not only a means of communication but also a reflection of thought, emotion, and culture. In the context of college students' interaction, language use becomes a critical component of academic success and social cohesion. The study entitled *An Analysis of Denotative and Connotative Meanings in College Students' Interaction* focuses on how students use words that carry both literal and implied meanings in their daily conversations. Denotative meaning refers to the direct, dictionary definition of a word, while connotative meaning encompasses the emotional, cultural, or associative significance a word might carry (Leech, 1981). Understanding how students navigate between these two layers of meaning is essential for improving communication skills and fostering better interpersonal relationships.

This study is significant as it sheds light on the role of Semantics in real-life communication, especially among young adults in a multicultural academic environment. According to Lyons (1995), Semantics is central to the study of language because it examines how meaning is conveyed and interpreted. Misinterpretation of connotative meanings often leads to communication breakdowns, as noted by Riemer (2010), who emphasized the importance of context in understanding meaning. This extensional process is known as connotation, and the new reference is known as connotation (Peterson, 2021). Additionally, college students are at a developmental stage where language not only conveys ideas but also constructs identity and social relationships (Gee, 2014). Thus, exploring how they use and understand denotative and connotative meanings can provide valuable insights into the dynamics of their communication.

The research is guided by the following question: *How do college students use and interpret denotative and connotative meanings in their interactions?* The study draws on the semantic theory of meaning proposed by Ogden and Richards (1923), which highlights the relationship between symbols (words), referents (objects), and thoughts (meanings). It also considers Leech's (1981) classification of meaning, particularly his emphasis on conceptual and associative meaning. These theoretical frameworks offer a foundation for analyzing how students construct meaning and how miscommunication may occur when connotative meanings vary between speakers.

The hypothesis proposed in this study is that *college students are more likely to rely on connotative meanings in informal settings, which can lead to varying interpretations depending on the cultural and personal backgrounds of the speakers*. This hypothesis aligns with findings from previous studies, such as Crystal (2003), who noted that language users often depend on implied meanings in spontaneous conversation. In support, Wierzbicka (1992) argues that language reflects cultural norms and values, which are embedded in connotative meaning. Holmes (2013) also highlights how sociolinguistic variation influences meaning interpretation. By integrating these theoretical and empirical insights, this study aims to provide a deeper understanding of the semantic complexity present in everyday student interaction.

2. Method

This research, entitled *An Analysis of Denotative and Connotative Meanings in College Students' Interaction*, adopted a qualitative descriptive method to investigate how students use

literal and implied meanings in everyday communication. The qualitative approach was chosen to gain a deep understanding of how meanings are formed, understood, and occasionally misinterpreted within real-life contexts. The study focused on 20 English Department students at Bali Dwipa University, selected through purposive sampling based on their active involvement in both formal and informal interactions. Observations were carried out in a range of settings, including classroom discussions, seminars, and casual conversations on campus, to gather a well-rounded perspective of their language use.

Data collection involved audio-recording spontaneous conversations, transcribing them, and taking supporting field notes to capture non-verbal cues and the communication environment. To enhance the reliability of the findings, data were gathered over four weeks. Follow-up interviews were conducted to clarify the participants' intended meanings behind selected words and phrases. The collected data were then analyzed thematically, with a focus on identifying and categorizing expressions based on their denotative and connotative content. The analysis was guided by semantic theories from Leech and Ogden & Richards, allowing the researcher to interpret how students construct and respond to different layers of meaning. The overall aim was to uncover patterns of meaning use and explore how students' understanding of Semantics impacts their communication effectiveness.

2.1 Research design

This study utilized a qualitative descriptive approach to investigate the use of language in the everyday interactions of college students, with a focus on semantic aspects specifically, denotative (literal) and connotative (emotional or implied) meanings. The primary goal was to understand how students express and interpret meanings during both academic and informal conversations. The qualitative nature of the study allowed for an in-depth examination of how meanings are shaped by context and social dynamics in real communication settings.

To achieve this, the research design incorporated several key methods: observing participants in natural environments such as classrooms and casual campus settings, recording conversations for accurate transcription, and taking field notes to capture non-verbal cues and the broader communicative atmosphere. These data were then analyzed through thematic coding, where language use was classified based on whether it conveyed denotative or connotative meaning. By doing so, the study aimed to uncover patterns in how students communicate meaning and how interpretations may vary based on individual or cultural factors.

2.2 Participants

The participants in this study consisted of 20 college students from an English Department at a university located in southern Indonesia. They were selected through purposive sampling, targeting individuals who were actively engaged in both academic and informal communication activities within the campus environment. The sample included both male and female students, ranging in age from 19 to 23 years old, and representing various semesters of study, from early to final-year students.

These participants came from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds, including those from urban and rural areas, as well as different family income levels. All of them had been studying English for at least five to seven years, with varying levels of proficiency and confidence in using the language in real-life contexts. While some participants were more accustomed to academic English, others were observed to be more expressive in casual settings. To ensure ethical integrity, pseudonyms were used in all documentation, and the name of the university was withheld to maintain participant confidentiality. This variety among participants was intended to provide a rich and balanced insight into the different ways students express and interpret denotative and connotative meanings in everyday interactions.

2.3 Data Collection

To gather data for this study, the researcher employed several qualitative instruments aimed at capturing the authentic language use of college students and identifying semantic elements within their interactions. The main tools included audio recording devices to document natural conversations in both academic and informal settings, field notes to capture contextual and non-verbal cues, and semi-structured interviews to delve deeper into the meanings behind selected expressions. These instruments allowed the researcher to observe and record not only what was said, but also how it was communicated, including emotional tone and social context.

The data collection process began with obtaining ethical clearance and informed consent from all participants. Observations were conducted over a four-week period in various campus settings, such as classrooms, hallways, and cafeterias. All recorded conversations were transcribed verbatim, and field notes were organized to provide context for analysis. Selected excerpts containing denotative or connotative elements were then analyzed further. Brief follow-up interviews helped clarify the intended meanings behind emotionally nuanced or ambiguous expressions. This multi-phase procedure ensured that the data collected were both rich and reliable for analyzing how students use and interpret language in real-life interactions.

2.4 Data Analysis

The analysis of the collected data in this study followed a qualitative descriptive approach, with a focus on interpreting language use through semantic analysis. After the participants' conversations were recorded and transcribed verbatim, the researcher applied thematic analysis to identify and categorize instances of denotative and connotative meanings. Each utterance was carefully examined to determine whether it conveyed a literal (denotative) meaning or an implied/emotional (connotative) meaning based on context, tone, and non-verbal cues.

The coding process involved marking keywords, phrases, or expressions that reflected either neutral, dictionary-based meanings or culturally/emotionally influenced interpretations. To guide this analysis, the study adopted the semantic theories of Geoffrey Leech (1981), who

distinguishes between different types of meaning, and Ogden & Richards (1923), who introduced the triangle of meaning model. Utterances were grouped into themes such as "literal description," "emotional expression," "irony/sarcasm," or "cultural reference."

In addition, the data were cross-validated by comparing transcripts with field notes and insights from follow-up interviews with participants. This triangulation method ensured a deeper understanding of the students' intentions and reduced potential researcher bias. Patterns and recurring themes were then synthesized to draw conclusions about how denotative and connotative meanings influence communication among college students, including instances of misinterpretation or successful expression. The findings from this analysis provided a comprehensive view of semantic awareness in student interactions and highlighted the importance of contextual understanding in interpreting meaning effectively.

3.   Findings

1.   Utterance: "Kamu pintar banget!"
   - Denotative: You are very smart.
   - Connotative: Could be sincere praise or sarcasm depending on tone.
2.   Utterance: "Anak emas dosen itu."
   - Denotative: The golden child of the lecturer.
   - Connotative: Someone favored by the lecturer, sometimes with jealousy.
3.   Utterance: "Santai aja."
   - Denotative: Just relax.
   - Connotative: Could imply "don't overreact" or "don't take it seriously."
4.   Utterance: "Kamu berubah, ya."
   - Denotative: You've changed.
   - Connotative: May imply disappointment or surprise.
5.   Utterance: "Dia itu pendiam."
   - Denotative: He/she is quiet.
   - Connotative: Could imply shyness, indifference, or even arrogance.
6.   Utterance: "Biasa aja mukanya."
   - Denotative: His/her face is ordinary.
   - Connotative: Implies not attractive or lacks charm.
7.   Utterance: "Kamu lucu."
   - Denotative: You're funny.
   - Connotative: May express affection or sarcasm.
8.   Utterance: "Si rajin masuk kelas."
   - Denotative: The one who always comes to class.
   - Connotative: Could imply being overly ambitious or teacher's pet.
9.   Utterance: "Jangan SKSD deh."
   - Denotative: Don't act like we're close.
   - Connotative: Suggests irritation with someone being overly friendly.

10.   Utterance: "Dia itu terlalu baik."
- Denotative: He/she is too nice.
- Connotative: May imply naïve or easily manipulated.
11.   Utterance: "Temen-temennya high class."
- Denotative: Their friends are of high status.
- Connotative: May imply arrogance or exclusivity.
12.   Utterance: "Sok sibuk banget."
- Denotative: Pretending to be busy.
- Connotative: Suggests showing off or avoiding responsibility.
13.   Utterance: "Baper banget sih."
- Denotative: Very sensitive.
- Connotative: Negative judgment on being overly emotional.
14.   Utterance: "Doi ghosting aku."
- Denotative: He/she stopped contacting me.
- Connotative: Feelings of rejection, confusion, or betrayal.
15.   Utterance: "Dia anak motor."
- Denotative: He rides a motorcycle.
- Connotative: Implies a rebellious or cool personality stereotype.
16.   Utterance: "Wah, sultan baru dateng."
- Denotative: A rich person has arrived.
- Connotative: Used humorously or enviously for wealthy students.
17.   Utterance: "Dia gak punya attitude."
- Denotative: He/she lacks proper behavior.
- Connotative: Expresses disappointment or disapproval.
18.   Utterance: "Kamu terlalu kaku."
- Denotative: You are too stiff/rigid.
- Connotative: Socially awkward or not fun to be with.
19.   Utterance: "Dia gaya banget."
- Denotative: He/she is stylish.
- Connotative: Can imply arrogance or showing off.
20.   Utterance: "Itu bukan level kita."
- Denotative: That's not our level.
- Connotative: Suggests class or status distinction, often negatively.
.

4.   Discussion

Here is a descriptive analysis of each of the 20 utterances, focusing on both denotative and connotative meanings, as used in the context of college students' interactions:

1. "Kamu pintar banget!"
- Denotative: A direct compliment on someone's intelligence.
- Connotative: Depending on intonation and context, this can be genuine praise or sarcasm. Among students, it may also be used to mock someone who always answers in class or acts superior.
2. "Anak emas dosen itu."
- Denotative: A student who is highly favored by the lecturer.

- o Connotative: Often used with a negative undertone, implying favoritism and possibly generating envy or resentment from peers.

3. "Santai aja."
   - o Denotative: A suggestion to relax.
   - o Connotative: Might be used to downplay a serious situation or to dismiss someone's concerns, sometimes suggesting apathy.

4. "Kamu berubah, ya."
   - o Denotative: Indicates that the speaker perceives a change in the other person.
   - o Connotative: Commonly implies a sense of disappointment, nostalgia, or judgment, especially in friendships or romantic contexts.
5. "Dia itu pendiam."
   - o Denotative: Describes someone as quiet.
   - o Connotative: Can be neutral or negative, possibly implying the person is shy, unfriendly, or even arrogant depending on the speaker's tone and context.
6. "Biasa aja mukanya."
   - o Denotative: Refers to someone's average appearance.
   - o Connotative: Often used to suggest that someone is not attractive or lacks distinguishing features; can be dismissive or judgmental.
7. "Kamu lucu."
   - o Denotative: Complimenting someone as funny.
   - o Connotative: May also imply charm or romantic interest, or, conversely, be used sarcastically to mock.
8. "Si rajin masuk kelas."
   - o Denotative: Describes a student who is always present in class.
   - o Connotative: Could suggest admiration, but more often hints at annoyance or sarcasm, labeling the person as a "teacher's pet" or overly diligent.
9. "Jangan SKSD deh."
   - o Denotative: Advises someone not to act overly familiar.
   - o Connotative: Shows irritation and sets a boundary; implies that the speaker feels the other person is faking closeness.
10. "Dia itu terlalu baik."
    - o Denotative: Someone is described as too kind.
    - o Connotative: Suggests vulnerability, gullibility, or a lack of assertiveness— may be a subtle criticism masked as a compliment.
11. "Temen-temennya high class."
    - o Denotative: Describes friends who are wealthy or of high status.
    - o Connotative: May carry tones of sarcasm, envy, or critique of elitist behavior or social exclusivity.
12. "Sok sibuk banget."
    - o Denotative: The person pretends to be very busy.
    - o Connotative: Implies that the person is trying to look important, avoid responsibilities, or is unapproachable.
13. "Baper banget sih."
    - o Denotative: Someone is being overly sensitive.

      o Connotative: Often a critical statement, suggesting the person is emotionally weak or cannot take a joke.

14. "Doi ghosting aku."
- o Denotative: Someone suddenly cut off communication.
- o Connotative: Reflects emotional hurt, betrayal, and confusion, often in romantic contexts among students.

15. "Dia anak motor."
- o Denotative: Describes someone who rides a motorcycle.
- o Connotative: May evoke a stereotype of being cool, rebellious, or part of a particular social group or subculture.

16. "Wah, sultan baru dateng."
- o Denotative: A rich person has arrived.
- o Connotative: Used jokingly or with envy to comment on someone's wealth or showy behavior—often popular in student slang.

17. "Dia gak punya attitude."
- o Denotative: Lacks proper behavior.
- o Connotative: Expresses strong disapproval, signaling that the person is rude, disrespectful, or socially inappropriate.

18. "Kamu terlalu kaku."
- o Denotative: Someone is stiff or rigid.
- o Connotative: Implies social awkwardness or lack of humor; may be used to criticize someone for being overly formal or serious.

19 "Dia gaya banget."
- o Denotative: He/she has style.
- o Connotative: May imply admiration or, more often, mock someone for trying too hard to look fashionable or cool.

20. "Itu bukan level kita."
- o Denotative: Suggests a difference in status or rank.
- o Connotative: Reflects elitism or social hierarchy; often used to exclude or look down on others.

These utterances show how language functions as more than a tool for conveying information. It reflects interpersonal dynamics, power relations, emotional nuance, and cultural identity. The connotative meanings are especially shaped by tone, context, and shared understanding among peers, making them key indicators of how students relate to one another in daily communication.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the analysis of these 20 utterances highlights the rich interplay between denotative and connotative meanings in everyday student communication. While the denotative meanings provide a straightforward, literal understanding of the expressions, and real word of dictionary definitions (Hadi, 2021), it is the connotative meanings that reveal

deeper social, emotional, and relational nuances. These connotations often emerge through tone, context, and shared cultural codes among peers, allowing simple phrases to carry sarcasm, affection, criticism, or even social judgment. This demonstrates how language, especially in informal settings like among college students, serves not only to inform but also to express identity, manage relationships, and navigate social hierarchies.

Furthermore, the presence of connotative meanings in these utterances underscores the importance of pragmatic competence, understanding what is meant beyond what is said. Students rely on these subtle linguistic cues to build rapport, assert boundaries, or negotiate their social standing. As such, these utterances are not merely conversational fillers but powerful tools for expressing emotions, opinions, and attitudes. They reflect the dynamic nature of language and illustrate how communication is deeply embedded in the social and emotional realities of student life.

References

Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Hadi, I. (2021). Denotative and Connotative Meaning Analysis in the Greatest Showman AlbumHadi, I. (2021). Denotative and Connotative Meaning Analysis in the Greatest Showman Album. Jurnal Bahasa Indonesia Prima (BIP), 3(2), 181–189. https://doi.org/10.34012/bip.v3i2.1987. *Jurnal Bahasa Indonesia Prima (BIP)*, *3*(2), 181–189.

Holmes, J. (2013). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). Routledge.

in Social Semiotic Perspective. London: Deakin University.

Juliarta, I. M. (2020). THE MAPPING OF MOVEMENT VERBS FOUND IN THE GOOD EARTH. *LET: Linguistics, Literature and English Teaching Journal*, *10*(2), 116-136.

Juliarta, I. M. (2021). The noun phrase and its translation in the novel "Budha, a story of enlightenment". *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, *5*(1), 10-22.

Juliarta, I. M. (2022). Noun Phrase and its Translation Found in the Novel "The Wonderful Wizard of Oz". *International Journal of Linguistics and Discourse Analytics*, *3*(2), 73-85.

Leech, G. N. (1981). *Semantics: The study of meaning* (2nd ed.). Penguin Books.

Lyons, J. (1995). *Linguistic semantics: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Ogden, C. K., & Richards, I. A. (1923). *The meaning of meaning: A study of the influence of language upon thought and of the science of symbolism*. Harcourt, Brace & World.

Peterson, A. M. (2021). Connotation and denotation. *Leprosy and Identity in the Middle Ages*, *2*(1), 31–41. https://doi.org/10.7765/9781526127426.00023

Riemer, N. (2010). *Introducing semantics*. Cambridge University Press.

Suardana, Ketut. (2021). Social semiotics of Mẻn Brayut text: systemic functional linguistics perspective. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, [S.l.], v. 5, n. 1, p. 108-116, June 2021. ISSN 2615-4706. Available at: <https://ojs.pnb.ac.id/index.php/JASL/article/view/2393>. Date accessed: 08 mar. 2025. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.31940/jasl.v5i1.2393.

Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantics, culture, and cognition: Universal human concepts in culture-specific configurations*. Oxford University Press.
.