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Abstract
This study wishes to clarify the definition or description of the object language between two Malay monolingual dictionaries, namely Kamus Dewan, 4th Edition (KD4) and Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia, 4th Edition (KBBI4) that have been known to be credible both in Malaysia and Indonesia. Researcher will analyze the definition of object language using the Component Analysis Theory of Meaning led by Nida (1975) on the descriptive basis. Object language is the language which describes the lexical item or entry. A total of 1087 entries were selected using simple and systematic approaches. The study adopts the library and content analysis methods. Our methods are literature review and content analysis. The objective clarifies the description of object language and the defining entry based on both dictionaries. The results show that indeed, there is a similarity in the arrangement of the object language, but there are similarities and differences about the component meaning entries in KD4 and KBBI4. An advantage of the analysis is to help the lexicographer improve a dictionary for it to be better and more complete, especially among the Malay monolingual dictionaries already available.
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Introduction
The importance of knowledge in every knowledge field is indeed, undeniable. According to Asmah Haji Omar (1993), language serves to be an instinct or a clue for a particular culture. Language can also signify a stream of thought and reflect the identity of the speaker. It is also language that is able to determine the formation of thought based on the forms and classes that the language contains. Thus, as a way to understand the meaning of a lexical word as a whole, a close observation based on linguistic knowledge needs to be performed so that all the ambiguity and vagueness of a lexical meaning can be elaborated empirically.

With this in mind, all languages in this world tend to have their own dictionaries. They function as documents which enlist all the words that are available in a language. The production of a dictionary is classed under lexicography. Zgusta (1971:5) opines that lexicography is a very difficult field in linguistic endeavours. One of the aspects in the framework of the lexicography principles is the language that dwells into the object language. Following the view expressed by Nor Azizah Abu Bakar (2000) who states that from the language aspect that talks about object language, the content of lexicography in a monolingual...
A dictionary can be divided into two sections: one would be the content in the object language and the second is the content in the meta-language. Both these sections are important in the process of arranging a monolingual dictionary.

Furthermore, one of the important elements that fabricate the object language and meta-language in a monolingual dictionary is the definition of meaning or the definition of an entry. According to Ibrahim Ahmad (2011), the semantics is seen as a knowledge field that is associated with meaning. It means that every lexeme or word that is to be made an entry in a dictionary must have meaning and support a particular interpretation. For every entry, it should have several important parts, including semantic elaboration (Katz dan Fodor, 1963). However, in this current work, the semantic approach is analysed using the Component Analysis Theory of Meaning (CATM) to find similarities and differences of meaning association in both KD4 and KBBI4. Meaning interpretation is a component included in the micro-lexicography structure. This component stands out to be the most important level or degree in dictionary arrangement especially monolingual dictionaries. This is the core level in the dictionary arrangement which demands an in-depth mastery in pragmatics and semantics fields, other than mastery in diverse knowledge fields. The main choice for dictionary users when referring to a dictionary would be defining the meaning. The aspect of meaning definition which is a common selection for dictionary users is based on several studies that have been conducted by dictionary observers (Henri B., 1981; and Hartmann, 1983).

**Problem Statement**

Our concentration on the discussion of this study is related to the paucity of past studies, despite relevant literature by Asmah Hj. Omar (1987), Ibrahim Ahmad (1991), Hartmann, Reinhard R.K. (1993), Newell, Leonard E. (1995), and Nor Azizah Abu Bakar (2000). They are still inadequate as we have yet to come across the principles and examples of this subject. For example, Asmah Hj. Omar (1987) did broach the historical advent of a dictionary and raised an issue concerning the circle of meaning. She posited that the circle of meaning of a general dictionary or term dictionary can be resolved by way of including characteristics of difference in reference to the particular context. Other than that, there should be an improvement done on the current Malay dictionaries where they cannot necessarily be confined by additions of words, reduction of words (if necessary) and definition improvement, but techniques which highlight derivatives in terms of the grammar, labeling, are also required to demonstrate the social context and pragmatic words in the discourse. Apart from that, Ibrahim Ahmad (1991) stated that the classifications that are able to class a dictionary, are based on lines, perspective and representation. She also discussed the comparison of the information arena between the Kamus Dewan (KD4) and Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (KBBI4). There are indeed some differences between both the dictionaries. Although the use of the meta-language has been mentioned by Asmah since 1987, there is no researcher who has done a study in this field. Hartmann, Reinhard R.K. (1993) and Newell, Leonard E. (1995) had also given a brief and a rather general explanation on the lexicography metalanguage and have not provided any example in their studies. Nor Azizah Abu Bakar (2000) was only able to make a list of several metalanguage aspects that all this while, is felt to be overestimated by dictionary users and critics. All these studies have discussed lexicography which is linked with metalanguage, in general, and is not related to object language used in a monolingual dictionary. Nonetheless, this is open to researcher’s explanation on the object language and its definition through the AKM theory in both KD4 and KBBI4.

**The Significance of Study**

The findings of this study will help lexicographers improve a monolingual dictionary so that it will be more credible and able to fulfil general requirements especially Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka (DBP), Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia and PT Gramedia Pustaka Umum, Jakarta, Indonesia. This is because both the dictionaries are great dictionaries of the Malay Language which are the most authentic and serve as main
reference for both native and non-native speakers. Other than that, it can be used to expose educators, students and academicians or general users on the importance of meaning or the definition of the object language and its metalanguage in monolingual dictionaries. The outcome of this study should be able to benefit the users where they can have a good and comprehensive dictionary.

Literature Review

In the writing of Asmah Hj. Omar (1987), I wish to discuss the production of a monolingual dictionary that clearly has its own complexity, that is in terms of the complexity in defining the words or giving the definition for the entry-words. In giving the definition, lexicographers use several approaches such as giving elaborations, providing synonyms, antonyms and so on. Automatically, the problem of meaning ambiguity will not be the case here. Malay dictionaries, either monolingual dictionaries or bilingual dictionaries still lack the technique in highlighting the derivatives in terms of the grammar, and also display poor labeling to show the social and pragmatic contexts in the discourse. For example, Kamus Dewan uses the label of ‘etymology’ on the entry-words such as from Arabic, Sanskrit, Javanese and so on. However, this label is not comprehensive, and is just assigned, according to the existing knowledge on the lexicographers at the time. When giving meaning or label to an entry, lexicographers must be sensitive to the changes that happen. She had given focus to the Kamus Dewan instead of other dictionaries. She had also touched on the issue of the definition of the metalanguage in a very general manner (that is the language used by language members in their professions) whereby the language explains all that one needs to know about language. This definition serves for the dictionary in a meta-textual manner, where the text explains other texts when we refer to them. Therefore, a study that discusses the aspect of metatextual comparison should be done between two Malay monolingual dictionaries.

As a follow-up study, the work by Ibrahim Ahmad (1991), explained the classifications which can categorise a dictionary, that are based on lines, perspective and presentation. He was also aware of the comparison between Kamus Dewan and Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia. The aspects of the information arena that have been compared are entry, form of word, speech and spelling, type of word, synonym, the level of word usage, definitive language, note of word usage, definition-type description, word derivation, phrase, quotation, foreign word and cross-reference. He gave an example of the entry ‘juang’ for Kamus Dewan and ‘adu’ for Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia as an example of the information arena. It is found that the latter’s entry is more detailed and concise, as compared to the former, or Kamus Dewan. This means that Kamus Dewan must be improved so that it is more comprehensive for general use.

Hartmann, R. R.K. (1993), was more into enlisting the principles and practice in lexicography. He also discussed the lexicography metalanguage in general and rather briefly. He defined the metalanguage as the language used to deal with and present language information. Next, he discussed lexeme that is a fundamental unit comprising of a phonetic form and a semantic content, but it cannot stand on its own. A lexeme comprises of some smaller elements, namely phoneme, grapheme, syllables and morpheme. This lexeme is inserted in a larger context which comprises of phrase, clause, sentence, and paragraph which are part of the wider speech acts and extra-linguistics genre. There are two selected frameworks showing this relationship namely the linguistic framework and semiotic framework. Both these frameworks are enough to show the use of the general principles of lexicography. For Newell Leonard E. (1995), he elaborated on the existing guideline in the field of lexicography by referring to the Ifugao language in The Phillipines. In his writing, metalanguage is the language used to define the lexical item of the object language in the dictionary. For a monolingual dictionary, object language and its metalanguage suggest the use of the same language, meanwhile for a multi-lingual dictionary, its object language and the metalanguage are of a different language. In terms of the percentage of the content in the metalanguage and yet its role in the presentation of meaning, lexical definition or explanation serves to be a section of the metalanguage that is the most significant.
We also have Nor Azizah Abu Bakar (2000) who was able to discuss several metalanguage aspects and utterance of definition in the Malay lexicography that have, all this while, assumed to escape the attention of dictionary users, critics or researchers. He observed the metalanguage of Malay lexicography which is an issue seldom debated academically or debated by lexicographers in Malaysia. In actual fact, there are a lot of metalinguistic issues that can be discussed in lexicography. This is because all the information in the object language of a dictionary is contained in the metalanguage. Thus, the meaning of the metalinguistic terms is analysed based on the definition found in the dictionaries and lexicography books. The metalanguage in several Malay dictionaries is also discussed to show characteristics that impede the understanding and criteria for dictionary usability. Apart from that, he recognized the definition of utterance in a dictionary as a part of the metalanguage that is the most important and significant. Thus, he had talked a lot about metalanguage in lexicography because in the metalanguage, much has been mentioned regarding the dictionary’s object language. To know whether or not a dictionary is suitable, good or otherwise, we can simply refer to the metalanguage. Thus, the metalanguage element is able to guarantee the real quality of a dictionary especially as far as monolingual Malay dictionaries are concerned. Therefore, this aspect requires an in-depth analysis by linguists as it happens in the West.

Methodology

The study framework used in this study is based on the use of the general principles of lexicography guided by a review by Béjoint (1994). He recommended three general principles obtained in the metalanguage. This study will use the second principle which is the way the language presents linguistics and extra-linguistics information of the object language or the way the object language is discussed. Other than that, researcher will use the AKM theory in the definition of meaning or definition of entry for the dictionaries. This study is limited to the aim and objective which explain about the object language, especially meaning definition in both these Malay monolingual dictionaries. The study data amounting to 1087 entries from both dictionaries were selected systematically and manually using the random sampling method. The methods used are library study and content analysis. The instrument of study comprised of two monolingual dictionaries, namely KD4 (2010) published by the DBP, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia; also KBBI4 (2011) published by PT Gramedia Pustaka Umum, Jakarta, Indonesia. Data obtained were analysed qualitatively and quantitatively (basic percentage).

Research Findings

Language discussing on the Object language

From the language aspect which discusses the object language, Nor Azizah Abu Bakar (2000) had the opinion that the lexicographic content in a monolingual dictionary can be divided into two sections. The first section is the section of the object where the lexical items are explained. Normally, this content can be found in the left-hand side of the dictionary page and printed in blocked letters. For the second section, the content is displayed through the metalanguage. Normally in the right-hand side of the dictionary, part of it is printed with normal letters, and another part with slanting letters and blocked letters. The Linguistic Dictionary (1993) defines the object language as the language of the object of analysis for other languages.

In the field of linguistics, the metalanguage is a term used to explain about the human language. In lexicography, the metalanguage encompasses the conventions of lexicography such as the grammar code, labeling, word usage and definition presentation (Hartmann & James, 1998). According to Newell (1995), metalanguage is the language used to define the object language’s lexical items in a dictionary. Thus, the object language and the metalanguage in a monolingual dictionary use the same language. For instance, an English or Mandarin monolingual dictionary has both the object language and metalanguage in English and Mandarin. Therefore, KD4 and KBBI4 are two Malay monolingual dictionaries. Object language and the
metalanguage of both the dictionaries are the same which is the Malay Language. The following Example 1 and Diagram 1 are the entry data of “orang” in KD4 and the explanation of the object language and the metalanguage, whereas Example 2 “o.rang” and Diagram 2 are examples for KBBI4.

Example 1

**orang** 1. manusia (sbg peribadi): *dr sini kami lihat ~ berkelahi...* 8. = ~ lain lain drpd diri sendiri...
9. Jk kerana, lantaran (sebenarnya): *mana dapat membayar, ~ belum gajian;* 10. bp diri sendiri dan sbg penguat utk kata ganti spt awak (kau) ~, *dia ~...* a) (Udg) orang yg bukan warganegara ... b) orang luar; *~ asli*
penduduk asal sesebuah negara... a) bp isteri; b) orang yg akan...c) Sr orang yg dijemput ...d) Kl orang yg dapat...c) Kl, *ki orang yg tidak tahu akan perkara;* d) Mn orang bahagian... b) sj kkerja
besar, mawas, *Pongo pygmaeus;...* c) Mn tukang salung (tari dll)... ~ *setangga = ~ sebelah jiran,* ... *apabila ~ miskin menghendaki wang, dia mendapat anak, apabila ~ kaya menghendaki anak, dia mendapat wang prb perihal menyatakan bahawa manusia... lain ~,lain hati = makin banyak ~ makin banyak niat prb kesuakan tiap-tiap orang itu tidak sama (fikiran, kemahuan, dll); ...
**seorang** 1. satu orang; *salah ~ mana-mana satu orang (drpd... 2. sendiri; ~ diri sendiri sahaja; ~ budi-budian, ~ tabung...**
**seseorang** seorang (drpd yg banyak) yg tidak dapat...**berseorang, berseorang** 1. dgn cara seorang-seorang,... 2. seorang diri: *soalan ini tidak akan selesai kalau hanya... keseorang terasing seorang diri, tinggal seorang diri...**
**perseorang** dgn cara berseorang-seorang (tidak secara...

**orang-orang, orang-orang** 1, tiruan orang, boneka,... 2. sj patung yg dibuat utk menakutkan burung: *menerima berorang* ada orang: *rumah itu sepi tidak ~;**
**berorang** Mn secara dgn orang lain (bukan secara... **perorang** perihal orang seorang: *sajak ini menyiarkan ... (KD4, 2010: 1100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Metalanguage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| orang 1. manusia (sbg peribadi): *dr sini kami lihat ~ berkelahi...* 8. = ~ lain lain drpd diri sendiri...
9. Jk kerana, lantaran (sebenarnya): *mana dapat membayar, ~ belum gajian;* 10. bp diri sendiri dan sbg penguat utk kata ganti spt awak (kau) ~, *dia ~...* a) (Udg) orang yg bukan warganegara ... b) orang luar; *~ asli*
penduduk asal sesebuah negara... a) bp isteri; b) orang yg akan...c) Sr orang yg dijemput ...d) Kl orang yg dapat...c) Kl, *ki orang yg tidak tahu akan perkara;* d) Mn orang bahagian... b) sj kkerja
besar, mawas, *Pongo pygmaeus;...* c) Mn tukang salung (tari dll)... ~ *setangga = ~ sebelah jiran,* ... *apabila ~ miskin menghendaki wang, dia mendapat anak, apabila ~ kaya menghendaki anak, dia mendapat wang prb perihal menyatakan bahawa manusia... lain ~,lain hati = makin banyak ~ makin banyak niat prb kesuakan tiap-tiap orang itu tidak sama (fikiran, kemahuan, dll); ...
**seorang** 1. satu orang; *salah ~ mana-mana satu orang (drpd... 2. sendiri; ~ diri sendiri sahaja; ~ budi-budian, ~ tabung...**
**seseorang** seorang (drpd yg banyak) yg tidak dapat...**berseorang, berseorang** 1. dgn cara seorang-seorang,... 2. seorang diri: *soalan ini tidak akan selesai kalau hanya... keseorang terasing seorang diri, tinggal seorang diri...**
**perseorang** dgn cara berseorang-seorang (tidak secara...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Metalanguage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Diagram 1: Clear Explanation on Object language and Meta-Language in KD4
Example 10

**o.rang** n 1 manusia (dl arti khusus); 2 manusia (ganti diri ketiga yg tidak tentu); jangan lekas percaya pd mulut --; 3 dirinya ...10 eak karena (sebenarnya): ...-- beraja di hatinya, pb menurutkan rasa...-- aluan Md orang atau anak buah yg...-- am orang awam; -- antum orang... -- asing 1 orang lain;... 2 orang yg bukan ahli dl suatu bidang...--halus 1. roh; jin; 2 ark orang pandai; ...3 Mk tukang salung... -- ombak ki orang yg tingkah lakunya... -- palung Md n orang atau anak buah... -- rumah n istri; ...3 ki orang yg kurang ...Pongo pygmaeus;... 

meng.o.rang.kan v menganggap atau menghargai sbg orang; 
orang-orang.an n tiruan orang; boneka; patung; ~ di tengah ... 
ber.o.rang-o.rang Mk v berlaku spt orang lain (bukan secara... 
per.o.rang.an n perihal orang; 
se.o.rang n 1 satu orang: yg datang hanya ~ pegawai; 2 sendiri... 
per.se.o.rang.an n yg berkaitan dng orang secara pribadi; 
se.se.o.rang n seorang yg tidak kental: tadi ada ~ menelepon... 
ke.se.o.rang.an n dl keadaan seorang diri (kesunyian, terpencil,dsb) (KBBI4, 2011: 987)

### Diagram 2: Clear Explanation on Object language and Meta-Language in KBBI4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object language</th>
<th>Metalanguage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **o.rang**      | n 1 manusia (dl arti khusus); 2 manusia (ganti diri ketiga yg tidak tentu); jangan lekas percaya pd mulut --; 3 dirinya ...10 eak karena (sebenarnya): ...-- beraja di hatinya, pb menurutkan rasa...-- aluan Md orang atau anak buah yg...-- am orang awam; -- antum orang... -- asing 1 orang lain;... 2 orang yg bukan ahli dl suatu bidang...--halus 1. roh; jin; 2 ark orang pandai; ...3 Mk tukang salung... -- ombak ki orang yg tingkah lakunya... -- palung Md n orang atau anak buah... -- rumah n istri; ...3 ki orang yg kurang ...Pongo pygmaeus;... 
|                 | meng.o.rang.kan v menganggap atau menghargai sbg orang; 
|                 | orang-orang.an n tiruan orang; boneka; patung; ~ di tengah ... 
|                 | ber.o.rang-o.rang Mk v berlaku spt orang lain (bukan secara... 
|                 | per.o.rang.an n perihal orang; 
|                 | se.o.rang n 1 satu orang: yg datang hanya ~ pegawai; 2 sendiri... 
|                 | per.se.o.rang.an n yg berkaitan dng orang secara pribadi; 
|                 | se.se.o.rang n seorang yg tidak kental: tadi ada ~ menelepon... 
|                 | ke.se.o.rang.an n dl keadaan seorang diri (kesunyian, terpencil, dsb) |

Based on the explanation of the above examples, there is indeed a difference between the object language and the metalanguage for KD4 and KBBI4. Object language comprises of an important section of the main entry or root entry. The main entry for the above example is “orang/o.rang”. The main entry for both the dictionaries is placed on the left side of the dictionary page and printed in blocked letters. There is a word pronunciation label for the root entry in KBBI4 “o.rang”.

Meanwhile, for the metalanguage section, it is on the right-hand side of the dictionary page. Part of it is printed in common letters, and another is printed in slanted letters and blocked letters. Examples such as terms or jargons, proverbs, word classes, word classes, word style, and word usage are printed using slanted letters. Other than that, the meaning definition for the object language, explanation for the proverbs, definition of meaning of the entry phrases, acronyms, proverbs (KD4) and the use of abbreviation are printed using normal letters. Only the sub-entries, examples of entry phrases, and entry’s polysemy number use blocked letters.
The sub-entries or derivatives for KD4 contain 11 word-entries namely “seorang; sesorang; berseorang, berseorang; keseorang; perseorang; orang-orang, orang-orang; berorang-orang; perorang-orang; perorang”. For KBBI4, there are only 8 entries which have sub-entries or derivatives: “meng.o.rang.kan, orang-orang.an, ber.o.rang-o.rang, per.o.rang.an, se.o.rang, per.se.o.rang.an, se.se.o.rang, ke.se.o.rang.an”.

KD4 and KBBI4 use block letters for the polysemic number of an entry in the metalanguage. The outcome of the analysis for Example 1 above is found to use the numbers 1 to 10 printed with blocked letters for the root entry or main entry in both the dictionaries. For the sub-entry, the use of numbers 1 to 2 is applied to the entries: “seorang; berseorangan, berseorang; keseorangan; perseorangan; orang-orangan, orang-orangan; berorang-orang; perorang-orang; perorangan” in KD4, whilst for KBBI4 it is only applied to the entry of “se.o.rang”. KBBI4 also uses blocked letters for examples like ‘-- aluan, -- am, -- asing, -- ombak, -- antum, -- halus’ and so on. The examples of the entry phrases in KD4 are not printed using blocked letters but instead, using slanted letters such as ‘~ asli, salah ~, ~ diri, ~ tabung, ~ budi-budian’ and others in reference to the example.

Next, the application of entries such as ‘dr sini kami lihat ~ berkelahi... (KD4), jangan lekas percaya pd mulut -- (KBBI4)’ and an example of a jargon like ‘Pongo pygmaeus’ in printed in slanted letters in both dictionaries. Other than that, KBBI4 uses slanted letters in proverbs and the examples are ‘….. beraja di hatinya, ph; word class label ‘v, n’; word style ‘cak, ki, ark’; and language usage ‘Md - Melayu Medan’, ‘Mk – Minangkabau’. However, in KD4, an instance of the proverb is printed in slanted letters - ‘lain ~, lain hati = makin banyak = makin banyak niat’, ‘prb’ printed in common letters. Other labels in KD4 which is language style ‘bp, ki’, field label ‘Udg’, and etymology label ‘Jk – Jakarta, Mn – Minangkabau, Kl – Kelantan, Sr – Sarawak’, abbreviation label in the definition of the meaning of the entry and sub-entry ‘sbg, utk, spt, yg, sj, drpd, dgn’ dan ‘dl, yg, sbg, spt, dng’ (in KBBI4) are printed in common letters.

Briefly put, the process of arranging the object language and the metalanguage for KD4 and KBBI4 assumes the same position. Object language is on the left-hand side of the dictionary page, whereas the metalanguage is all the information contained in the definition of meaning of the object language or entry. There is no difference in the explanation of the object language and the metalanguage as both the dictionaries are of the same type, which is monolingual by nature.

**Definition of Meaning or Interpretation of the Object Language Through the CATM Theory**

One of the important elements that fabricate the object language or the metalanguage in a monolingual dictionary is the definition of meaning or interpretation of an entry. According to Ainon Muhammad (1976), the field of linguistics which analyses meaning or interpretation is the semantic field. This semantic term originates from Greek. It is seen as a knowledge field that is associated with meaning. It means that every lexeme or word made as an entry in a dictionary has its own meaning and carries a certain interpretation. For Karts and Fodor (1971), every entry should have certain parts, including semantic elaboration. However, in this research, the semantic approach is seen using the AKM concept to find the similarities and differences of the association of meaning in KD4 and KBBI4.

The definition of meaning or interpretation is a component included in the micro- lexicography structure. This component constitutes the most important stage in the arrangement of a dictionary, in particular monolingual ones. This is a core level in the process of lexicography which demands for thorough mastery in both semantics and pragmatics fields, other than developing mastery in various knowledge fields. The main choice of dictionary users refers to a dictionary to find out the meaning definition. It is a fact that the aspect of meaning definition tends to be selected by users based on several studies done by lexicography observers (Henri, B., 1981; dan Hartmann, 1983). Following Zgusta (1987), there are four central tenets of lexicography for meaning definition or lexical definition, namely the definition of lexicography, synonyms, examples of usage, and gloss.
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The CATM serves to be a meaning analysis method according to the features of meaning or meaning component. This theory is pioneered by Katz dan Fodor (1963) who explained that an entry has a relationship of meaning between one another. This is called the lexical structure. The application of this theory is to see the relationship of meaning for a word with a number of elements or meaning components. The meanings contained in each word can be analysed and defined through the word’s component of meaning.

Nida (1975) opined that words or entries with the same meaning group have features that can be shared together and features that are different among the words. The meaning component is absorbed following the features with the marking (+) for features that become the word meaning component, and the marking (-) for features that do not become the word meaning if words with the same meaning group are not enlisted. As it is characterized by a list of meanings, then it is only suitable to deal with the cultural aspects comprising of noun category and adjectives (Goh Sang Seong, 2012). As a limitation of the study, researcher agrees with the opinion of Goh Sang Seong (2012) whereby only data categorized as nouns and adjectives are used in this study. Through the AKM theory, these entries can be divided into five types, namely:

a. the same entry but the whole meaning component is different
b. the same entry but meaning component overlapped, with either similarities or differences
c. the same entry and the whole meaning component is the same
d. entry that is different but meaning component overlapped, with either similarities or differences
e. entry that is different but the whole meaning component is the same

a. The same entry but the whole meaning component is different

This first type means that the entry in KD4 and KBBI4 is the same, but the whole meaning component differs after the comparison is drawn. In this research, there are 87 entries or 8.00% from the total number of study data which support this type. From the total data, 53 entries or 60.92% were categorized as nouns, while 8 entries or only 9.20% were categorized as adjectives. The remaining entries or 26 entries or 29.89% which do not have word match from the noun or adjective categories will not be analysed in this work. We provide below one of the noun entry data (Example 1) and adjective data (Example 2) that fulfill the same entry but with different meaning component.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KD4/ KBBI4 Entry</th>
<th>KD4 Data</th>
<th>KBBI4 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alternator/alter.na.tor</td>
<td>pengulang-alik</td>
<td>generator elektris yg digunakan untuk menghasilkan arus bolak-balik; dinamo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meaning of alternator/alter.na.tor in KD4 and KBBI4

KD4
[ + manusia berulang-alik ]
[ - alat generator ]
[ - tenaga elektrik ]
[ - arus bolak-balik ]
[ - dinamo ]

KBBI4
[ - manusia berulang-alik ]
[ + alat generator ]
[ + tenaga elektrik ]
[ + arus bolak-balik ]
[ + dinamo ]

The whole meaning of the entry alternator/alter.na.tor in KD4 and KBBI4 differs in terms of its meaning component. There are five different components in KD4 and KBBI4. In KD4, alternator is defined as human on the commute and there is no interpretation associated with the concept of alter.na.tor in KBBI4. In KBBI4, the entry alter.na.tor is reflected as a generator device which uses the electrical power which current flows to and fro, or known as dynamo.
Example 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KD4/ KBB14 Entry</th>
<th>KD4 Data</th>
<th>KBB14 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bacak I/ ba.cak</td>
<td>lunak kerana</td>
<td>banyak berbintik-bintik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>airnya (tanaman dll), basah (tt bulu)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meaning of bacak I/ ba.cak in KD4 and KBB14

The whole meaning of the entry bacak I/ ba.cak in both dictionaries has a different meaning component. There are eight different components in KD4 and KBB14. In KD4, bacak I is soft or mild due to excess water, especially for plants and so on, or wet and with no definition related to the concept ba.cak in KBB14. In KBB14, the entry ba.cak is portrayed as spotty, or having dots related to fur or hairs, of either human or animals.

b. The same entry but Meaning Component Overlapped, With Similarities and Differences

This second type is that both dictionaries have the same entry word, but the meaning component overlaps with either similarities or differences. From the finding, a major part of the entry word supports this pattern with 576 entries or 52.99%. 438 entries (76.04%) are nouns, and 90 entries for adjectives (15.63%). About 48 entries (8.33%) do not match with either one, so they are not studied by researcher. Only one entry, a noun (Example 3) and an adjective (Example 4) support the same entry but have the meaning component overlapped, with similarities and differences will be imposed on the analysis of meaning.

Example 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KD4/ KBB14 Entry</th>
<th>KD4 Data</th>
<th>KBB14 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alternatif/al.ter.na.tif</td>
<td>pilihan yg merupakan kemestian (keharusan)</td>
<td>pilihan di antara dua atau beberapa kemungkinan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meaning of alternatif/al.ter.na.tif in KD4 dan KBB14

The whole meaning of the entry alternatif/al.ter.na.tif in both dictionaries has an overlapping meaning component that shares some similarities and differences. There are six components of meaning which are different or similar in KD4 and KBB14. In KD4, alternatif is a choice that is a must or which is known as

The whole meaning of the entry alternatif/al.ter.na.tif in both dictionaries has an overlapping meaning component that shares some similarities and differences. There are six components of meaning which are different or similar in KD4 and KBB14. In KD4, alternatif is a choice that is a must or which is known as
Meanwhile in KBBI4, the entry *alter.na.tif* is depicted as a choice between two and several possibilities.

**Example 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KD4/ KBB14 Entry</th>
<th>KD4 Data</th>
<th>KBB14 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ajaib/<em>aja.ib</em></td>
<td>sangat menghairankan, aneh, ganjil, pelik (luar biasa atau jarang terdapat dsb)</td>
<td>ganjil, aneh, jarang ada, tidak spt biasa, mengherankan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meaning of ajaib/*aja.ib* in KD4 and KBBI4**

**KD4**

| [ + perasaan ] | [ + perasaan ] |
| [ + manusia ] | [ + manusia ] |
| [ + sangat ] | [ - sangat ] |
| [ + menghairankan ] | [ + menghairankan ] |
| [ + aneh ] | [ + aneh ] |
| [ + ganjil ] | [ + ganjil ] |
| [ - jarang ada ] | [ + jarang ada ] |
| [ + pelik ] | [ - pelik ] |
| [ + luar biasa/tidak seperti biasa ] | [ + luar biasa/tidak seperti biasa ] |
| [ + jarang terdapat ] | [ - jarang terdapat ] |

**KBBI4**

The whole meaning of the entry *ajaib/*aja.ib* in both dictionaries overlaps in its meaning component, with similarities and differences. There are nine meaning components that are different or the same in both KD4 and KBBI4. In KD4, *ajaib* is a human feeling that is causing awe, that is strange, awkward which is extraordinary or seldom felt and so on. Meanwhile in KBBI4, the entry *aja.ib* is portrayed as a human feeling that is strange, weird, seldom occurring and causing awe.

**c. The same entry and The Whole Meaning Component is The Same**

For the third type, the entry word and the whole meaning component is the same in both KD4 and KBBI4. Only 124 entries (11.41%) have such definitions or interpretations. Nouns total 80 entries or (64.52%). Meanwhile, there are 21 entries or 16.94% for adjectives that have the same entry and meaning component. The remaining entry which is 23 entries (18.55%) will not be studied in this work. In this paper, only one noun-entry (Example 5) and an adjective-entry (Example 6) have supported the same entry and the whole meaning component as shown in the following:

**Example 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KD4/ KBB14 Entry</th>
<th>KD4 Data</th>
<th>KBB14 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bad/bad</td>
<td>angin</td>
<td>angin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meaning of bad/bad in KD4 and KBBI4**

**KD4**

| [ + angin ] | [ + angin ] |
| [ + kejadian alam ] | [ + kejadian alam ] |
| [ + udara ] | [ + udara ] |

**KBBI4**

The whole meaning of the entry *bad/bad* in both dictionaries has the same meaning component and there is no difference. There are three meaning components that are the same in KD4 and KBBI4. The entry *bad* in KD4 and KBBI4 is the wind that is a natural phenomenon and is related to the air.
**Example 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KD4/ KBB14 Entry</th>
<th>KD4 Data</th>
<th>KBB14 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>jeli</em>/jeli.ili</td>
<td>elok dan bercahaya (mata)</td>
<td>elok dan bercahaya (tt mata)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meaning of *jeli*/jeli.ili in KD4 and KBB14

KD4

[ + elok ]
[ + bercahaya ]
[ + mata ]
[ + manusia ]
[ + binatang/haiwan ]

KBB14

[ + elok ]
[ + bercahaya ]
[ + mata ]
[ + manusia ]
[ + binatang/haiwan ]

The whole meaning of the entry *jeli*/jeli.ili in both dictionaries has the same meaning component with no difference. It has five similar meaning components in KD4 and KBB14. The entry *jeli* or *je.li* in KD4 and KBB14 refers to a bright, shiny eye (human or animal).

d. Different entry with Meaning Component Overlapped, Which is With Similarities and Differences

The fourth type supports a different entry between KD4 and KBB14, but it has an overlapping meaning component (either similarities or differences) in both dictionaries. The total data which are also the least total 16 entries (1.47%) in this work that fulfill the concept mentioned. From this amount of data, nouns total 12 entries (75%), and adjectives 4 entries (25%). Thus, what follows is one of the noun-entries (Example 7) and adjectives (Example 8) which fulfill the requirement of this type of entry.

**Example 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KD4/ KBB14 Entry</th>
<th>KD4 Data</th>
<th>KBB14 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>banderul</em>/ban.de.rol</td>
<td>pita cukai (pd rokok, cerutu, dll)</td>
<td>pita cukai (pd rokok, cerutu, dsb) sbg tanda bahwa pajaknya sudah dibayar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meaning of *banderul*/ban.de.rol in KD4 and KBB14

KD4

[ + wang ]
[ + cukai ]
[ + rokok ]
[ + cerutu ]
[ - pajak ]
[ - bayaran ]

KBB14

[ + wang ]
[ + cukai ]
[ + rokok ]
[ + cerutu ]
[ + pajak ]
[ + bayaran ]

The whole meaning of the entry of a noun *banderul*/ban.de.rol in both dictionaries is a different entry, but with meaning component overlapped, with similarities and differences. There are four meaning components that are the same in KD4 and KBB14. However, only two components in KBB14 prove to be different from KD4. The entry *banderul* or ban.de.rol in KD4 and KBB14 means money used to pay taxes like cigarettes, cigars, and so on as a symbol of which the lease has been paid.

**Example 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KD4/ KBB14 Entry</th>
<th>KD4 Data</th>
<th>KBB14 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>inkontinens</em>/in.kon.ti.nen.sia</td>
<td>keadaan tidak upaya mengawal bersifat tidak mampu buang air kecil atau air besar</td>
<td>menahan buang air kecil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meaning of *inkontinens*/in.kon.ti.nen.sia in KD4 and KBB14
The overall meaning of the adjective *inkontinens/in.kon.ti.nen.sia* in KD4 and KBBI4 is a different entry, but it has an overlapping meaning, that is with similarities and differences. Both dictionaries have five similar meaning components and only one different meaning component, where this component can be found in the KD4 entry. Thus, the entry *inkontinens/in.kon.ti.nen.sia* means the state, or characteristic of human who is unable to control/retain his or her urine or stools.

### c. A Different Entry Yet With The Whole Meaning Component is the Same

The fifth type is a different entry between KD4 and KBBI4, but the whole meaning component is the same, which indicates that there is no difference in both dictionaries. There are only two nouns as the entries in the dictionary, *kuwung/ku.wung* and *paramasastera/pa.ra.ma.sas.tra* that fulfill the fifth type. The two entries begin with the letter K (Example 9) and the letter P (Example 10) in KD4 and KBBI4. Both entries will be analysed in terms of their meaning.

#### Example 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KD4/ KBBI4 Entry</th>
<th>KD4 Data</th>
<th>KBBI4 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>kuwung/ku.wung-ku.wung</em></td>
<td>Pelangi</td>
<td>pelangi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meaning of *kuwung/ku.wung-ku.wung* in KD4 and KBBI4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KD4</th>
<th>KBBI4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ + kejadian alam ]</td>
<td>[ + kejadian alam]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ + pelangi ]</td>
<td>[ + pelangi]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ + tujuh jenis warna ]</td>
<td>[ + tujuh jenis warna]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The whole meaning of the entry *kuwung/ku.wung-ku.wung* in both dictionaries is a different entry but it has the same overall meaning. There are three meaning components that are the same in KD4 and KBBI4. In KD4, *kuwung* or *ku.wung-ku.wung* (in KBBI4) is the rainbow which is a natural phenomenon and has seven colours.

#### Example 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KD4/ KBBI4 Entry</th>
<th>KD4 Data</th>
<th>KBBI4 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>paramasastera/pa.ra.ma.sas.tra</em></td>
<td>tatabahasa</td>
<td>tata bahasa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meaning of *paramasastera/pa.ra.ma.sas.tra* in KD4 and KBBI4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KD4</th>
<th>KBBI4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ + tatabahasa ]</td>
<td>[ + tatabahasa ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ + linguistik ]</td>
<td>[ + linguistik ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ + pelbagai bahasa ]</td>
<td>[ + pelbagai bahasa]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall meaning of the entry *paramasastera/pa.ra.ma.sas.tra* in both the dictionaries has a different entry but the whole meaning is the same. There are three meaning components that are the same in KD4 and KBBI4. In KD4, *paramasastera* or *pa.ra.ma.sas.tra* (in KBBI4) is the grammar contained in the linguistic field of various languages.
It is clear that the CATM has been able to unravel comprehensively several similarities and differences of entry or lexical that exists in the KD4 and KBBI4. It is obvious that there are differences and similarities of the meaning of the entry included in both dictionaries.

Conclusion

In brief, the findings show that the process of arranging the object language and the metalanguage for KD4 (2010) and KBBI4 (2011) is in the same position. Object language is in the left hand side of the dictionary page whereas the metalanguage is all the information contained in the meaning definition of the object language or the entry. There is no difference in the explanation of the object language and its metalanguage since both the dictionaries are of the same type where they are credible monolingual dictionaries in Malaysia and Indonesia. In terms of the definition of the object language through the AKM theory, both dictionaries are found to have entries that fulfill all five types of meaning definition of the object language. However, there is no adjectival entry in the fifth type whereby the entries are different but the whole meaning component is the same. There is also a difference in the meaning definition of the entry based on the theory of AKM in KD4 and KBBI4. Another remarkable difference of the second type is that the entries are the same but the meaning component overlaps, with both differences and similarities; and for the fourth type, the entries are different but the meaning component overlaps, with differences and similarities. Entries in both these types have differences and similarities in their components of meaning. Clearly, the AKM theory is able to unravel comprehensively several similarities and differences of the entry or lexical which exist in both KD4 and KBBI4. This provides the evidence that there are differences and similarities of the entry meaning occurring in both dictionaries. Conclusively, the advantage of a dictionary can be seen in the object language and the metalanguage. However, a more heated lexicography practice shifted from the conventional form (printed copies) to the electronic or digital form, more or less influences the presentation and content of the information in the metalanguage of the dictionary entry (Tan Kim Hua & Woods, 2008). Therefore, dictionary users are not ‘influenced’ by the physicality (name and images) of the dictionary but they have the right, and are able to assess, the information in the dictionary’s metalanguage well. A good dictionary is a dictionary where its arrangement is appropriate with the targeted needs (Rahim Mat Leh, 2000). Automatically, a ‘good’ and ‘comprehensive’ monolingual dictionary will surely be able to enrich the users of the Malay Language knowledge as well as popularizing Malay Language internationally.
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