CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter presents the theoretical framework that forms the foundation for the process of the thesis research in conducting research on the use of polysemy in creating multiple-meaning titles in the Breaking Bad television series. The theory chosen is relevant to the research theme and is aimed to provide guidance in analyzing the phenomena of polysemy in the television series. This part of the chapter also contains a review of previous studies conducted by scholars in the related fields, highlighting the comparisons and connections between their work and my study. By examining existing theories and previous studies, this chapter lays the platform needed for a deeper understanding of the phenomena used in creating complex multiple-meaning titles that are depicted in the story in the television series. Content analysis is used as a tool of analysis in this thesis as it is be used for the analysis of the polysemy depiction of the multiple-meaning titles of the episodes in the story in the television series.

2.1.   Polysemy
2.1.1. Sense Enumeration Lexicons

Sense enumeration lexicon allows for a person's vocabulary to have multiple listings of words, each annotated with separate meanings (Devitt, 2021). The Sense Enumeration approach claims that the meanings of all ambiguous words are stored and processed similarly. In a sense enumeration lexicon, all the related senses of a polysemous word are stored in the mental lexicon as separate representations. According to this theory, both the related and unrelated senses of polysemous and homonymous word forms are stored as distinct representations and the speakers and hearers have to select one of these fully specified senses out of a list. In this theory also words are assumed to be understood by selecting their intended sense from an exhaustive list of potential senses which are stored in the mental lexicon. Therefore, sense enumeration lexicons make two assumptions: They believe that all senses for

each polysemous word form are established in the mental lexicon separately and that the intended meaning is selected from these senses when required, which is the standard way lexicographers put dictionaries together (Pérez, 2018).

Katz provided a theory that different readings, both polysemy and homonymy, of a lexical item (a word or a group of words) are listed under a single dictionary entry. The definition between those two could be drawn based on 'semantic similarity.' According to his definition, the meanings of two elements are similar if they have a semantic marker in common; 'semantic marker' as explained by Katz is "the semantic component of the grammar contains a *dictionary*, which lists under a single lexical entry the different senses of a word (which together constitute the *meaning* of that word), each of which can be broken down into a set of *semantic markers*.

Lakoff's theory of knowledge representation is an influental sense enumeration approach to word meaning and polysemy. In Lakoff's framework, idealized cognitive models (ICMs) are relatively stable mental structures that represent theories about the world with respect to a particular domain, and which guide categorization and reasoning. In this approach, a single concept can be represented in terms of a combination of a number of individual ICMs in a 'cluster concept,' and it grounds sense extensions and gives rise to *radial categories*. In this approach, which takes linguistic categories to be no different from other kinds of conceptual categories, most word meanings are seen as a type of radial category in which the different senses of a word are organized with respect to prototypical senses. Brugman has discussed this matter with the preposition 'over':

A.   The bird flew *over* the house. ('above and across')

B.   The painting is *over* the couch. ('above')

C.   The truck ran *over* the rabbit. ('across')

D.   Sarah lives *over* the hill. ('on the other side')

E.   Mary nailed a board *over* the hole in the ceiling. ('covering')

F.   I will read the paper *over* the weekend. ('temporal')

The idea of this is, 'over' constitutes a radial category composed of a range of distinct but related senses that are organized around a central sense in the lexial network structure. The different senses of *over* show typicality effects, that more typical senses are located 'closer' to the prototypical sense in the network while less typical senses are located in its periphery (the edge of it). Such peripheral senses are derived from more typical senses by a set of cognitive principles for meaning extension thus giving rise to meaning chains (Vicente & Falkum, 2017); what this means is sense in example A is related to sense B by virtue of some shared attribute(s), sense B is related to C, C relates to D, and so on. '... in virtue of some shared attribute(s) ..." to be more clear is the sense of example A, "the bird flew *over* the house" and B "the painting is *over* the couch," have a relation because the meaning of the word *over* in A is that the bird is flying above the house and in B, the painting is above the couch, thus it can be concluded that both the meaning of the word in both example has the same meaning, that is they are both above an object, and this shows that they share the same attribute. Next, example B and C might not be related at a glance but when we are talking about radial category, we must look at the context of example A. The bird in A shows that it is on top of the house and it is moving, hence the "above and across." So, not only is it related to A (being on top of something and moving), but it also relates to B (being on top of something). So, the truck in C has a relation with A, that is, it shares the same attribute, being "across" of something, and also relates to B since they are both on top of something. As for D, it has to be treated as a metaphor. In A, the bird has moved from being directly on top of the house to another position because it is flying, the same as C since the truck has moved. So, since the bird and the truck are on the other side, the preposition 'over' in D is being used as a metaphor for 'the other side,' thus making A and C have a metaphorical relation with D. It is valid with metaphorical sense in D as Lakoff said the sense can be metaphorical. E shares the same attribute as D because in D, Sarah's house covers the other side since she lives there and in E, the board covers the hole. For F, it relates to E because F says that they will cover their weekend by reading the paper. F also has a metaphorical sense same as D and E.

Sense relation finds for the adjacent senses of the category first, then after it will look for senses that are indirectly connected that may have a difference in semantic content. The central aspect of the approach by Lakoff and Brugman is, that the radial categories are stored in the long-term semantic memory of speakers, and the radial category account of polysemy is a radical version of a *sense enumeration lexicon*. The full range of senses is stored as part of a semantic network in it (Vicente & Falkum, 2017).

In short, the sense enumeration lexicon shows how in the brain, polysemous words are stored; this allows for a person's vocabulary to have multiple listings of words each annotated with separate meanings. This approach claims that polysemous words are stored similarly; in the mental lexicon, and they are processed as a distinct representation; on a list and the person will select them based on what they hear. Homonymous words are also treated the same and they will not be confused with one another. Katz provided a theory that two words are similar when they both have the same semantic marker; the dictionary of the word's meaning. In sense enumeration lexicon, Lakoff provided an influential theory of approach to word meaning and polysemy, the "theory of knowledge representation," where idealized cognitive models (ICMs) are used to represent theories about the word with respect to a particular domain to guide categorization and reasoning. With this, a word has a radial category in which the different meanings of the word are organized with respect to prototypical senses. The more typical meanings are prioritized while the less typical meanings are put behind. Sometimes, the meaning must be analyzed closely since context can matter, and the possibility of metaphoric meanings are allowed.

2.1.2. Types of Polysemy
2.1.2.1. Metaphors

Metaphors are so common in every aspect of our language that it is almost impossible to communicate effectively without using metaphors In the research from Banaruee, recent studies have investigated the use of metaphoric language in editorial

cartoons, online consultations, newspapers, political speeches, and religious discussions. A fundamental question of why metaphors are extensively used in our language has risen and depending on the perspective, the question may be answered differently. From a literary perspective, it might be because it can be used to make language more beautiful since they are a literary device that can be used to make language colorful and attractive. Therefore, from a literary perspective, metaphors are used to make a profound impact on the target audience and to get them involved in the content of the message. Besides helping to decorate our speeches, metaphors can also be used as a medium for understanding abstract and concrete concepts.

The difference between abstract and concrete concepts and the mechanism through which they are processed in our mind is one of the most-discussed subjects in the literature of cognitive science as abstract concepts cannot be pinned down to easily identifiable referents; the way they are perceived through our senses does not have clear identifiable referents. An instance of an abstract concept is the concept of "sympathy" as it does not have a clearly identifiable or perceivable referent. It is more detached by our sensorial experience, unlike concrete concepts. While concrete concepts can directly be perceived through sensorial system, abstract concepts need some kind of mediatory tool to be understood, and one of those is metaphor. According to Lakoff and Johnson, the essence of metaphor is understanding one thing in terms of another thing. Although abstract concepts cannot be directly perceived through our sensorial system, they can be described in terms of concrete concepts that have clearly identifiable referents and are perceivable through our sensorial system, effectively making a concrete concept function as a mediator tool for abstract concepts as it already had a clearly-identifiable referent and are perceivable through our sensorial system. The process of understanding an abstract domain in terms of a concrete domain can be seen as a kind of representational transformation, in which an abstract domain is described represented, and comprehended by a concrete domain. In this process, one domain can be represented in terms of another domain while the two domains may be completely dissimilar in terms of concrete and non-concrete features (Banaruee et al., 2019).

Metaphors are figures of speech that are used to compare one thing to another, with a more complex meaning. Scholars considered metaphors as instruments of meaning making and how people construct reality. Metaphors associate unrelated concepts, and it requires the audiences to think about the main object of comparison to think of it in new and different ways, thus sometimes metaphors require knowledge, interpretation, and potential clarification so it is not to make a confusion. Context also affects in understanding metaphor, for example calling a friend "workhorse," the intended meaning by the speaker is that their friend is large with a lot of stamina and good at physical labor, but without knowledge, interpretation, potential clarification, and context, other hearers might understand it as their friend being a livestock and that is not in any way a compliment. *Metaphors We Live By*, a critical book written by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, which is considered to be the most extensive theoretical exploration of metaphor to date, demonstrated how people use metaphors not only to make speech more interesting but also actually structure people's perceptions and understanding of the world. Their pivotal work outlined how taken for granted features of language actually make up people's "conceptual systems." Metaphors are viewed as mechanism that are integrated into how people think, act, and communicate, then metaphors offer an important avenue for researchers interested in understanding why people act and speak as they do.

One way to analyze metaphor is through rhetorical criticism. According to reputable dictionary websites such as *Merriam-Webster, Cambridge, and Oxford Learner's Dictionary*, rhetoric is a speech or writing that is intended to influence people in a fun way. This way, audiences were asked to think about it in a particular frame. For instance, in Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s speech, participants were asked to think about racism and equality in terms of banking ("America has given the Negro people a *bad check* which has come back marked *insufficient funds*), food and drink ("Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of *bitterness and hatred*), buildings ("Now is the time to open the *doors of opportunity*"), nature ("now is the time to lift our nation form the *quicksands* of racial

injustice to the *solid rock* of brotherhood"), and music ("when we allow *freedom to ring*").

Other ways to do analysis are via elicitation, ideographically, and via drawing. With elicitation, or a "forced metaphor approach," researchers can ask people to assign metaphors with their experiences, for instance describing their marriage as a "battle." Trouble thinking of metaphors on the spot is a drawback of this approach, thus to compensate for this, researchers may provide a list of metaphors for people to choose from in turn of limiting people's creativity and one's development of metaphors.

Idiographic approach in metaphor analysis many scholars considered to be the most rich and generative. The approach inductively examines metaphors that appear originally in talk and text meaning they happen in a conversation or writing without researchers prompting. An example of this is, in the study of metaphors related to the medication-assisted treatment of Malvini Redden and colleagues, they began their analysis with a general inductive approach of open coding with research goals initially unrelated to metaphor analysis. As they combed through focus group transcripts, certain common metaphors were noticed in the data. One of it is the phrase "money in the pockets" when the participants talked about enjoying sobriety. The phrase seemed to be a symbolic virtue of being drug-free that extended beyond the literal benefit of having funds, and more to the connoted status, security, pride, and ability. It appeared in every focus group around the country and among different ethnic and cultural groups.

Drawing is another method of generating metaphorical data. It can be coupled with either an elicitation or ideographic approach. Researchers have asked focused questions to participants to generate categories of metaphors, For instance, Bell and Clark asked "If a management researcher were an animal, what kind of animal would they be?" to business school students, then analyzed the resulting images. With this type of question, participants were forced to assign a category of metaphor to their experience which can be useful for direct comparisons among participants. This has also generated metaphors about a particular topic which later the images be evaluated

for a wider range of symbolism and metaphor, for instance, Schyns, Tymon, Kiefer, and Kerschreiter asked students to think about leadership characteristics and then draw a leader. The analysis was later used as theories for leadership and advocate adjustments to leadership development practices. The findings suggested that drawing is a potentially valuable learning intervention for students to acknowledge, question, and possibly transform their implicit theories and beliefs. With visual metaphors as a method of analysis, there are a number of benefits including crystallization (a process where thoughts or opinions become clear and fixed) when combined with other methods of data collection. According to Vince and Broussine, Drawings act as a catalyst for members of teams to 'say the unsaid' both on an emotional/psychological and a political level. This method can also be helpful for people who have trouble articulating their experiences, like children, people who have experienced trauma, and those with low literacy skills (Redden, 2017).

In short, metaphors are common in every aspect of our language. They are a figure of speech to compare one thing to another with a more complex meaning, and as the matter of fact, understanding one thing in terms of another thing is the essence of metaphors. They are considered by scholars as an instrument of meaning making and how people construct reality. Metaphors associate unrelated concepts and require the audiences to think of the main object of comparison in new and different ways, thus requiring context, knowledge, interpretation, and potential clarification in order to not make confusion.

Besides the mentioned above, metaphors have other uses. They can be used to decorate our speeches beautifully. People use metaphors not only to make speech more interesting but also to structure people's perceptions and understanding of the world. They are used to make a profound impact on the target audience and to get them involved in the content of the message.

Other than those things, metaphors can be a medium in understanding abstract and concrete concepts. This is possible because the way abstract concepts are processed in our minds is different with concrete concepts. The way they are perceived through our senses does not have clear identifiable referents, thus making it

harder to pin down to it. For instance, the concept of "sympathy," does not have a clearly identifiable or perceivable referent, our sensorial experience made it understandable. So, to help in understanding abstract concepts, concrete concepts can be used to help describe them since they already have clearly-identifiable referents and are perceivable through our sensorial system. Because of all these, metaphors are viewed as mechanisms that are integrated into how people think, act, and communicate.

2.1.2.2. Metonymy

People treat metonymy as rhetoric mainly because of its grammatical and logical oddness or semantic abnormity. Like other figures of speech, the usage of metonymy can achieve certain communication effects. Besides rhetorical, metonymy can be a means of referring to something. Additionally, people use metonymy as their way of thinking. Metonymy comes from the Greek word "metonumia," which means "a change of name." This means instead of referring to something directly, we can use some other terms related to it to refer to the specific thing, for example, the word "skirt" can be used to refer to a woman, a capital to refer to the country, special kind of metonymy such as using a part of something to represent the whole thing and vice versa, and concrete for the abstract. Such a figure of speech is called rhetorical synecdoche. Some scholars discussed it as a category of rhetoric but there is a tendency to admit that the distinction between synecdoche, a phenomenon of using the substitution of the whole word as the representative, and metonymy, is blurred and is regarded as a special case of metonymy, which involves part-whole relationship. Being rhetorical, the usage of metonymy can enhance the language to be clear, convenient, and concise. An example of this is the sentence "Can I borrow your *Shakespeare?*." Without the metonymy, the sentence becomes "Can I borrow your book written by Shakespeare." It can be identified that the *Shakespeare* is the metonymy for "... book written by Shakespeare," the author of the work, and even though there is no problem in using the non-metonymy sentence, usually the case is that sometimes it is unused since it is not an economical use of words. The usage of

metonymy can help people achieve the communicative purpose of expressing clearly while simultaneously allowing for economic and effective in referring to something, thus getting the name "referential metonymy."

According to Yule, reference in pragmatics is "an act in which a speaker, or writer, uses linguistic forms to enable a listener, or reader, to identify something." The reference expressions can be used to designate anything related to them. According to Yule, an expression provides "a range of reference" and may be used to identify any entity in several possible referents. Reference involves the speaker referring to something or the writer concluding the hearer or the reader, thus requiring collaborative work from both parties of the conversation. While expressing reference, the speaker will adjust their linguistic choice based on the hearer's ability to make inferences. Successful reference happens when the speaker or writer makes a good choice in expressing reference and expects the ability of the hearer or the reader to make the correct inference. In reference, it is assumed typically that certain referring expressions are utilized in designating certain entities. For instance, Shakespeare, is assumed to be used to identify the great person. More examples of this can be found below:

1.   *Brazil* wins World Cup.
2.   *Moscow* and *Washington* will hold talks on this problem.

In these examples, metonymy is utilized in the replacements of the football team in example 1 and the cities, the capital for the government, for the countries in 2. Other than a direct one-to-one relationship between names and objects, there exists a pragmatic connection. In some situations, the regular referring or designating function of an expression might be invested with some feature. Therefore, the interpretation of the reference may require a local socio-cultural context.

According to Lakoff and Johnson, metonymy is a rhetorical device not only to achieve reference but also serves the function of providing understanding. Lakoff and Johnson first revealed the cognitive property of metonymy in the 1980s. Instead of

being a poetic imagination and language ornament out of choice, metonymy structures not just our language but our thoughts, attitudes, and actions. Many scholars have studied how metonymy works in people's minds. Metonymy works by involving only one domain by requiring association, while metaphor involves two domains and mapping (the process of linking two related concepts in the brain) of the two domains due to similarity. While similarity causes metaphor, connection and salience (stand-out things) cause metonymy. In this instance, a part of the human body is used to metonymically refer to people: "More *hands* make light work." In this example, a salience part; "hands," is used as a metonymy for replacing "people." People use their hands while doing things (Zheng, 2014), so, it can be understood that more hands equals more help thus making the work lighter. "Hands" is an ICMs; the referred entity is "person," and the ICMs is capable of replacing it with "hands" since the context stands out more and is logical so metonymy comes out on the basis of the salient part of the ICMs.

Radden and Kovecses argue that in ICMs of metonymy, the main entity provides easy mental access to the target entity and language is metonymical in nature. They argue that since people tend to use language economically in expressing their thoughts, metonymy allows for the possibility of people expressing themselves concisely. So, people's thinking is metonymical, and evidently metonymy is important to us. As the result of a fundamental element in people's thinking, it can easily slip up in their minds without notice. Its concepts are grounded in people's experiences and language since they involve direct physical or casual association (Zheng, 2014).

Metonymy, apart from being a rhetorical device, is a basic mode of thinking, a cognitive process of people in which we represent something with a salient, well-understood, and easily perceivable part for the whole or half of the thing, or the whole can be used to represent one of its parts as half of the thing. Langacker proposes that the principle of information maximization and economy maximization govern people's expression in intercultural communication. Also, humans tend to choose related, typical, and easily perceivable things to refer to instead of those that are not (Siyi & Yueling, 2023). This journal by Siyi and Yueling later found that the

metonymies utilized are being used to replace things like rainy and sunny weather as a way to tell bluntness to people, employed nature in a way to tell bad effects of factories, utilizes the word "tears" as a metonymy for expression instead of describing a complicated and abstract feeling in detail, uses "a warm heart" as a metonymy for gratitude and affection, and rivers and mountains are utilized as metonymy to describe separation.

In summary, metonymy is a rhetorical device people use to refer to something clearly, conveniently, and concisely. It is an economical and efficient way of communication since humans tend to choose related, typical, well-understood, and easily perceivable things to refer to instead of those that are not. Metonymy also allows us to express our thoughts clearly and concisely while maintaining the economical use of words. How metonymy works is by involving only one domain, that is association. On the other hand, metaphor requires two due to similarity. Connection and salience also cause metonymy.

Metonymy represents something for the whole or half of the thing, or the whole can be used to represent one of its parts as half of the thing. It comes from the Greek word "metunomia," which means "a change of name," and can be utilized to refer to a specific thing with other related terms. For instance, "skirt" can be used to refer to the word "woman" since a skirt is the clothing of a woman, thus it makes sense to be utilized to replace it. Another example is the word "hands" in "more hands make light work" which is being used metonymically to refer to people since we use our hands to do things.

2.2.   Content Analysis

2.2.1. Content Analysis - WAC Clearinghouse

Provided by the WAC Clearinghouse educational website, content analysis is a research tool used to determine the presence of certain words or concepts within texts or sets of texts. The presence, meanings and relationships of such words and concepts are to be analyzed, then they are inferred about the messages within the texts. Text here means books, book chapters, essays, interviews, discussions,

newspaper headlines and articles, historical documents, speeches, conversations, advertising, theater, informal conversation, or any communicative language occurrence. Content analysis can be applied to examine any piece of writing or occurrence of recorded communication. It is currently used in a large array of fields, including literature and rhetoric. Content analysis can be conducted by breaking it down, into manageable categories on a variety of levels: word, word sense, phrase, sentence, or theme (Busch et al., 2024).

2.2.2. Content Analysis - Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology, Fourth Edition

Gathered from the book by Klaus Krippendorf titled "Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology" fourth edition, which provided a great understanding of what content analysis is, is a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from meaningful matter, text alike, to the context of its use. It is also a scientific tool that provides specialized procedures that allow the provision of new insights and enhance the researcher's understanding of the particular phenomena. Content analysis can discover stylistic features that express the same idea: "empty, unfilled, vacant, and void" (Chapter 12, Page 221). Content analysis is chosen when the meanings of selected texts: implications, associations, metaphors, uses, etcetera, are to be recognized because content analysis is concerned with them. In this instance, "text" does not have to be written material that can be found in a book alike, but the works of images, sounds, and signs, can be included as data and may be considered as texts. The way texts gain their meanings depends on their usage for the context; it is the construction of the author, in which they make the environment for the texts that exist the role for them. The content analyst then later analyzes how the texts came to be and what they mean, and during the entire analysis, the analyst may embrace empirical evidence to apply to the given texts. Back to what content analysis is, Berelson has defined it as "a research technique for the objective, systematic and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication," which Krippendorf implies that content obviously *manifest* in messages and is

waiting to be separated from its forms and described. The word manifest means something clearly shown, and manifest content, taken from this book, is "texts that are easy to read, generally understood, unambiguously interpretable" (Krippendorff, 2018). For easier reading, I put further explanations taken from the book in sub-sections below.

2.2.2.1. Semantical Content Analysis

Content analysis is a technique that allows researchers to analyze data(s) in pursuit of their meaning, symbolic qualities, and expressive content and the communicative roles they play in the lives of the data's source. There are two classifications in content analysis, but this thesis only focuses on one, which is semantical content analysis. Semantical content analysis is a procedure that classifies signs according to their meanings. In this procedure, there are three types of analysis but one that stands out for this thesis is attribution analysis which provides the frequency where certain characterizations are referred, for example "reference to dishonesty" (Chapter 3, Page 52) (Krippendorff, 2018).

2.2.2.2. Context

Content analysis must answer questions on how the text being analyzed appears in the form of that, what they mean, and if they can answer the research questions related to their context. Based on how the texts were made, texts acquire meanings in the context of their use, because they are someone else's construction, the conceptual environment, and the situation in which the texts play a role (Krippendorff, 2018).

2.2.2.3. Analytical Construct

Analytical constructs operationalize what the analyst knows, help understand the context, what are the texts used in a context. and finally making inferences out of that text. To correspond to the context, the analytical construct must also be a model of the relationship between the texts and the target of intended inferences about

unobserved variables of that context. After a good understanding of this book, the word "model" means "representation," so the analytical construct must also be the representation of the context. "Variables" means something that can vary. Analytical construct is extracted from the known or assumed context and entered into the research process, it ensures that the analysis of the given texts models the texts' context of use and does not violate the known conditions surrounding the texts. Oftentimes, content analysts empirically draw obtained correlations between observed and currently unobserved variables and the correlations measure the extent of a linear relationship between variables. For instance, the rate between recorded speech disturbances and anxiety, if sufficient, yields a prediction of a speaker's anxiety. The explicit nature of the model is the reason why inferences are easily executed reliably and repeatedly, and a demonstration, or at least an arguable assumption, that the analytical construct is empirically rooted in the context of the given body of text, that it represents the stable correlations with a context, backs these inferences. The most traditional way of testing analytical constructs as hypotheses is by testing them empirically. Once the correlations between textual and extratextual features are known, analysts can use these correlations to infer contextual correlations from given texts, if the correlations specify sufficiently and are generalizable to the current context (Krippendorff, 2018).

2.2.2.3.1. Variables

Variables can vary, allow for variations. They can affect the correlations relied on them to lead to the intended inferences. The definition gathered by Krippendorff from a dictionary, they mean "able to apt or vary" and the noun variable is defined as "something that can vary." Variable must be mutually exclusive, this means that two things cannot go together at once. Found in the book is the example of what are variables, that is males and females are the variables of sex and it is pretty self-explanatory that they cannot exist together at once and must select one of them. This makes a variable partitioned and cannot be included in another variable. Lastly, there are two types of variables; dependent and independent. Dependent variables can

be exemplified as the operation of counting, and independent as the objects that are being counted. They must be distinct conceptually or logically otherwise the numerical outcome would not make sense. An example of distinction is that pennies can be counted but not individual water (Krippendorff, 2018).

2.2.2.4. Inferences

Content analysis is used to make inferences, that is "[...] asking why something is said" (Chapter 3, Page 53). Content analysis can also make inferences to the consequences of communication, that is "[...] asking with what effects something is said" (Chapter 3, Page 53). Inferences are an act of acquiring reasoning; an act of concluding an evidence. It is a process in which valid propositions, statements, or data are preserved and passed to other propositions or statements. In this book, there are multiple inferences mentioned but a couple of them stand out to be the best-suits for this thesis, and also because it is central to content analysis. The inferences that will be selected are Indices and Symptoms, and for the central-to-content analysis, is abductive inferences. Before proceeding, the book implied that an analyst can use multiple inferences. They are justified in doing so to increase the quality of the inferences. The first one that is explained here is Indices and Symptoms. This book explained that Indices and Symptoms are variables that are claimed to correlate with other variables of interest to analysts. It depends on the correlation like smoke indicates fire. Variables in Indices and Symptoms correlate with the phenomena they claim to represent and must be distinguishable from other phenomena. They also need to correlate with the phenomena they claim to represent. In addition, indices also must satisfy two additional conditions. Firstly, indices must point and be distinguishable from other phenomena: a chosen answer to a research question must exclude other answer. This book exemplify this clearly with "a therapist cannot identify a patient's mental illness from the way the patient talks unless there is enough variation in the ways different people talk to allow the therapist to draw distinctions and exclude some illnesses from the list." Secondly, indices should not be affected by other variables that are accidental or irrelevant to the

phenomenon indicated. To make this clearer, I attempted to summarize the exemplification this book made. This book says that it will not be a good judgment to use a method of counting nouns in the attempt to infer the authorship of the Federalist Papers since individuals may write on different subjects and their choice of words may contaminate any attempt to reveal an author's identity. The second and last one to be explained is what is abductive inferences. From the book, there are three types of inferences, but one that stands out to best suit this thesis is abductive inferences. Krippendorff states that abductive inference is central to content analysis, unlike deductive and inductive inferences. This is the case because content analysis is about inferring. Abductive inference is the process of proceeding from true propositions in one logical domain to propositions in another logical domain, that is believed to be true based on the empirical relationships between them. Not only that, abductive inference relies on empirical evidence. Generalization between both of the particular things to another particular is not needed. The phenomena outside the text being analyzed is also inferred abductively, with the reliance on empirical evidence. In order to make abductive inferences justifiable, analyst abducts analytical construct. This warrants abductive inference because analytical construct is backed by evidence. The backing is possible because it is provided by analytical construct that are backed by everything known about the context. Analytical construct operationalizes (formalizes) the knowledge of the analyst about how text is used in a chosen context. Makes abductive inferences to the given text justifiable. To make an abductive inference, it starts with the body of data(the text), and the hypothesis(the analytical construct) will explain the data if true and no other hypothesis will work in explaining as good as the chosen one, thus making the chosen hypothesis able to answer the research question. Back to why abductive inference is central to content analysis and why content analysis is about inferring, abductive inference can infer someone's affiliation based on the metaphors used in their speech (Krippendorff, 2018).

2.2.2.5. Research Questions

Research questions are the targets of the analyst's inferences from available text and through that text the analyst must be able to answer their question. Analyst who starts with a research question read the texts for a purpose; that is to pursue the answer for their question. This pursuit based the analysis empirically and it is believed that it is possible to abductive infer it by examinations of a body of texts. Content analysis answers research questions through the hypothesis; the analytical construct, from the text being analyzed. Analyst finds answer to their questions by interpreting the details of the currently-analyzed text, and also through a mixture of statistical knowledge, experience, and intuition. Texts inform the analyst about extratextual phenomena, about meanings, consequences, or particular uses. As explained before, analytical construct is the context in which what the analyst get about the text. The context specifies how the text can be related to the analyst's research questions, but this context must make sense to be able to answer the question in the first place. If the analytical construct is true, then it is capable in answering the research question. The chosen answer to a research question must exclude other answer. The book put up an example at Chapter 9 Page 187, that is "a therapist cannot identify a patient's mental illness from the way the patient talks unless there is enough variation in the ways different people talk to allow the therapist to draw distinctions and exclude some illnesses from the list" which explains why a chosen answer must be able to exclude other answer. When the inference is right, then the validation of the evidence can occur (Krippendorff, 2018).

2.2.2.6. Validating

In principle, content analysis should be validateable. Validity is when the research result of the text is accepted to be true. For example, a measuring instrument is considered valid if it measures what its user claims it measures. The validation is taken from the inferences drawn from the available texts that can withstand the test of interpretations, and validation is important in content analysis because content analysis relies on face validity to have common sense with the analyzed text and

fundamentally concerned about what it is about, what the symbols mean, and how the images are interpreted. There are multiple validations for validating evidence, but a couple of them are selected for this thesis. They are semantic validity and empirical validity. Semantic validity is the degree to which the texts correspond to the chosen context, and successful validity relies on the chosen context. Other people's interpretations of the given text can be used as another validation source the analysis employs. The main purpose of establishing semantic validity of content analysis qualitatively is to make sure the texts remain arguably consistent with the chosen context. The other one is empirical validity. Empirical validity is the degree to which the evidence and established theory support further stages of the research process and the result too should be unaffected throughout the research. Empirical validity ensures the analyst pursues only the results that are guaranteed to be backed with evidence or able to answer the research questions with empirical validation. Since content analysis is about analyzing the relation of a text with the chosen context, an analyst should be able to demonstrate the context sensitivity of their research empirically. Thus, there are a couple of things that may enter a content analysis (Krippendorff, 2018):

1. Evidence that justifies the treatment of text, what it is, what it means, and what it represents.
2. Evidence that justifies the abductive inferences that a content analysis is making.

Those two mentioned are then separated into two different groups of evidence justification (Krippendorff, 2018):

1.   Evidence that justifies the treatment of texts concerns largely the sampling and recording phases of a content analysis. Such evidence may be divided into two kinds:

   1.1.   Evidence on sampling validity concerns the degree to which a sample of texts accurately represents the population of phenomena in whose place it is analyzed.

   1.2.   Evidence on semantic validity ensures the categories of an analysis of texts correspond to the meanings these texts have within the chosen context.

2.   Evidence that justifies the abductive inferences of a content analysis sheds light on how well the analytical construct in use actually does model what it claims to model. Two kinds of such evidence may be distinguished (Krippendorff, 2018):

   2.1.   Evidence on structural validity demonstrates the connection between the available data or established theory, and the modeled relationships or the rules of inference that a content analysis is using.

   2.2.   Evidence on functional validity demonstrates a functional connection between what a content analysis does and what the successful analyses the analysis did, including how the chosen context is known to behave. If these behaviors varied repeatedly and over a variety of situations, one can suspect that they share an underlying construct.

2.2.2.7. Components

Krippendorff elaborated on the features of texts. Their meaning speaks something other than the given text and can also lead to responses of various kinds. The meanings are relative to particular contexts or purposes. For every text examined,

content analysts must have context for them, and be able to make them make sense and answer the analyst's research questions. It is the nature of the text to demand analysts to draw specific inferences from a body of texts to their chosen context, and the systematic reading of a body of texts lets it narrow the conclusion of unobserved facts. When the context has been selected by the analysts in which they intend to make sense of a certain text, the diversity of the interpretation can be reduced to a manageable number, sometimes to one. When the analyst successfully understands the context for that certain body of text, certain kinds of questions become answerable and others make no sense. Krippendorf then later provided more of the components of texts, simple and in general; a body of text to be analyzed, the research question to be answered by the analysis, the analyst's chosen context to make sense from the body of text, an analytical construct to help the analyst understand the context, inferences to answer the research question, and ultimately validation of the evidence (Krippendorff, 2018).

1. *Unitizing* relies on the definition of relevant units. Unitizing draws systematic distinctions continuously of undifferentiated text: documents, images, voices, videos, websites, etcetera, that are of interest to the analysis but still exclude irrelevant matter while keeping it without loss of meaning. Analyst must justify their methods of unitizing by showing that the information they need for their analysis is represented in the collection of units (Krippendorff, 2018).

2. *Sampling* relies on sampling plans. It allows the analyst to economically restrict observation of units on the research efforts that are conceptually representative of the set of all conceivable relevant units or the interest. Texts can be read on several levels and might need to be sampled accordingly. It can be at the level of words, sentences paragraphs, chapters, or whole publications: literary works or discourses, or as concepts, frames, plots, or genres. In qualitative research, the selective use of quotes and examples presented is intended to hold the same purpose as samples. Quoting typical

examples supporting a general point implies the claim that they are fair representations of the phenomena of interest (Krippendorff, 2018).

3. *Recording/coding* is the component analysts use to transform unedited texts and original images into analyzable representations (Krippendorff, 2018).

4. *Reducing* data to manageable representations allows analysts to do efficient representations, especially of large volumes of data. In qualitative pursuits, rearticulations and summaries have similar effects, that is reduce the diversity of text ideally to what matters (Krippendorff, 2018).

5. Abductively *inferring* contextual phenomena relies on established analytical constructs of the chosen context as a warrant, and it will be backed by evidence provided by analytical constructs which is backed by everything known about the context. Abductively inferring data outside the text bridges the gap between the description of it and what it means, what it refers to, provokes, or causes (Krippendorff, 2018).

6. *Narrating*, lastly, is the component in which analyst attempts to explain the practical significance of the findings. At other times, it means arguing the appropriateness of the use of content analysis (Krippendorff, 2018).

2.2.2.8. Unitizing

In unitizing, the analyst selects the most meaningful and informative units empirically that are not only efficiently and reliably identifiable but also well-suited to the requirements of available analytical techniques. Units are wholes that the analyst distinguishes and treats as independent elements. Units are often considered to be empirically persistent functions of what is observed, but the act of unitizing is the one to recognize it as such. By unitizing, it readies information-bearing instances, or units for short, for a following analysis. To achieve this, the analyst must make compromises by letting unreliable information go. They also draw relevant distinctions within observational fields. The importance of making distinctions has been exemplified by the book with, we can count pennies but not individual water. The distinctions make the outcome make sense conceptually or logically. In

differentiating units, for example, from the book, might collect not one speech but many that are delivered during a particular political campaign and identify different kinds of units in them to be compared with one another or relate them to other data. Before defining units, the analyst must know what they are and what usage are they for. There are three kinds of units of distinction, and I intend to explain them below.

The first one is Sampling Units. The selective inclusion in an analysis distinguishes these kinds of units. It could be by sampling letters, issues of newspapers or certain issues of a newspaper; could be drawn from a larger population of issues or may include every issue ever published, or time periods of movie production. The analyst gets their answer by enumerating sentences, categorizing references, or interpreting the details of visual images.

The second one is Recording/Coding Units. These units are distinguished for separate description, transcription, recording, or coding. They are represented by an enumerable record, code, or datum; "Semidurable records taken as the unquestioned basis for reasoning, [...]. Data must show some diversity (convey information—hence the plural of datum), must be comparable with each other, [...]. The data of Content analyses are Texts." (Glossary, Page 408). Recording Units can also be distinguished by separately described or categorized analyses, unlike Sampling Units which distinguish units from an analysis for inclusion or exclusion ideally in a way that still acknowledges the natural boundaries of it. This makes Recording Units contained in Sampling Units, coinciding but never exceeding them. According to Holsti, as taken from the book, defines a recording unit as "the specific segment of content that is characterized by placing it in a given category" (Chapter 5, Page 104). The text in these units does not have to be close to each other, and the text analyzed can be in parts that is actually matter which then it can later be compared, analyzed, summarized, and used as the basis for intended inferences. Besides, the information is distributed throughout the text in bits and pieces, so it makes more sense to analyze it by just taking what matters. This makes units in Recording/Coding Units smaller than the ones in Sampling Units, which makes it a good thing; it is easier to describe reliably since they are not too complex and rich. The book provides exemplification

of why Recording/Coding Units are a good thing; "for example, whole movies are conventionally labeled "documentary," "fiction," "comedy," "tragedy," "popular," "class A (or B or C)," "R-rated," and so on. Such categories are very superficial and say little about what movies of each type mean in the lives of viewers [...]" (Chapter 4, Page 104). By describing larger units of text in smaller units, the analyst made themself conveniently easy to agree and then use analytic procedures to obtain descriptions of larger units. While doing the analysis, recording units may also be distinguished and described on several levels of inclusion. This book further explains this by exemplifying: "in recording newspaper data, for example, an analyst may have one set of categories for describing the newspapers included in the sample, such as cosmopolitan versus local, or having a certain circulation; a second set of categories for addressing the actual newspaper issue being included in the sample, weekday or Sunday edition, or consisting of a certain number of pages; a third set of categories concerned with a particular article printed in that issue, its writer or source, its placement in the issue (front, middle, or last page), and its length; and a fourth that is concerned with the individual propositions in that article. These multilevel recording units form inclusion hierarchies" (Chapter 5, Page 105).

The third one is Context Units. These units limit what are to be considered when Categorizing, or describing Recording/Coding Units. In describing characters in a narrative, using the whole narrative in which the characters play the role they do may be a natural choice for the context unit but when only for a certain particular character, chapters would be a better choice as the context units. When one wants to analyze what a word is supposed to mean in a sentence, the sentence is the context unit and the word is recording unit. The size of the context units should logically have no limit. The bigger the size, the more specific and semantically sufficient the recording unit is. The larger the size is the more effort the analyst have to give, and could be unreliable if allowed to be too large. If the size is too small or have nothing at all, the analyst may lose on the important information as to how the units came to be, for instance personal pronouns are meaningless without reference to the contexts in which they occur. The size matters to the reliability and efficiency of descriptive

efforts. Because the analyst have to read the unit in order to get understanding of what is to be analyzed, anything bigger will consume a lot of time. Besides time, larger unit invites unreliability since the analyst have to keep in minds all the details while reading, which if some are lost might affect the analysis; "[...] the analyst would have to keep the whole in mind when making judgments. Going through a document sentence by sentence, or watching one scene of fictional programming at a time (perhaps even in slow motion), or recording dramatic encounters within their immediate setting, or looking for the characterization of a concept within a context no larger than a paragraph might be more reliable and more efficient, provided what is lost is not too significant"(Chapter 5, Page 106).

The book provides ways to define units, but one must select one that best fits their research. For this, I have selected one that best suits this thesis and that is categorial distinctions. When things have something in common, categorial distinctions can be chosen because they define units by their membership in a class or category. Typically, common things are any character string that refers to a particular object, event, person, act, or idea. "Sociologists may define a family as a group in which members are related through marriage or descendancy. This definition may be at variance with how the members of a family define their family, but it may serve analysts well when they are recording how families appear in texts" (Chapter 5, Page 109). Even though this thesis is not about sociology, the reason why I quote this is because the act of the quoted is almost the same as what I am doing with my thesis, just a different objective; to analyze how the polysemous titles found in the titles in TV shows and a movie depicted in the story came to be. "Early content analysts defined symbols (usually single words) by their denotations but categorized them according to the values, attributes, and the qualifications associated with them" (Chapter 5, Page 109). Because categorial distinctions rely on interpretations, defining such units, one must be familiar with the meanings of the text: character strings, references of names, and the like (Krippendorff, 2018).

2.2.3. Summary

Briefly, content analysis is a research technique and a scientific tool that provides specialized procedures that provide new insights and enhance the researcher's understanding of a particular phenomenon which allows the determination of the presence of certain words or concepts within texts or sets of texts.

Content analysis is a technique that allows researchers to analyze data(s) in pursuit of their meaning, symbolic qualities, and expressive content and the communicative roles they play in the lives of the data's source. The way texts gain their meanings depends on their usage for the context; it is the construction of the author, in which they make the environment for the texts that exist the role for them. The content analyst then later analyzes how the texts came to be and what they mean, and during the entire analysis, the analyst may embrace empirical evidence to apply to the given texts.

When the analyst knows what to pursue, they quantify and analyze the presence, meanings and relationships of words and concepts, and then infer the message within the texts. The analyst might also infer the consequences of the texts. Content analysis makes inferences because it is what it does. They are an act of reasoning; an act of concluding an evidence. It is a process in which valid propositions, statements, or data are preserved and passed to other propositions or statements.

It needs clarification that "texts" here do not have to be written material that can be found in books, book chapters, essays, newspaper headlines and articles, or historical documents, but the works of images, sounds, signs, discussions, speeches, conversations, advertising, theater, informal conversation, or any communicative language occurrence, can be included as data and may be considered as texts.

Content analysis can be conducted by coding the texts, or breaking them down, into manageable categories on a variety of levels: word, word sense, phrase, sentence, or theme. In principle, content analysis should be validateable. Validity is when the research results of the texts are accepted to be true. For example, a

measuring instrument is considered valid if it measures what its user claims it measures. Ultimately, research questions are the targets of the analyst's inferences from the available texts, and through them, the analyst must be able to answer their question. Content analysis must answer questions on how the text being analyzed appears in the form of that, what they mean, and if they can answer the research questions related to their context.

2.3.   Previous Related Studies

To support this thesis research, I have collected related studies with similarities and differences. Despite using different objects as the subject of research, it is still relevant as it uses the same theory as this thesis. This section can help find the differences to the previous related studies and to help tell why this thesis is important and can be of help for other students who are studying and researching the same topic, and to the general readers for potentially spark interest in this topic of how useful polysemy can be in plot-building.

The first research is an article titled "What is to be sustained? The polysemy of sustainability and sustainable tourism across languages and cultures" by Thomas Bausch, Tilman Schröder, and Verena Tauber. In this qualitative article, they focus on the polysemous phrases "sustainability" and "sustainable tourism" in tourism. Those phrases must be explained based on the target culture and language. Because the meanings contained are relatively abstract and vague, while translating, the meaning may be added, changed, or lost, so they must explain it clearly based on the language, culture, and environment involved. In short, while this article focuses on how to translate polysemous phrases into the target language and culture, my thesis focuses on how polysemous titles are depicted in a story's plot.

The second research is a journal titled "The Patterns of Arabic Morphological Polysemy and Their Equivalence in Indonesian Language" by Wagino Hamid Hamdani. This qualitative research focuses on how the morphological polysemy in Arabic in the Quran has equivalence in the Indonesian language. Because Arabic is full of patterns, its application requires the support of syntactic connection and lexical

meaning. Because of that, the Arabic morphology system contains homograph shapes and polysemic forms, resulting in some written symbols being difficult to prescribe their form, category, and morphological meaning when it is out of context or syntactic relation. Its polysemic form often causes morphological errors. This research stated that polysemy patterns of Arabic morphology have a level of significant equivalence in Indonesian translated Qur'an related to the usage of Indonesian morphological forms, caused by characteristics of Arabic morphology, application of arbitrary rules, i'rab cases, syntactic relationship, lexical meaning, and genitive construction. In short, while this journal shows how morphological polysemy in Arabic in the Quran has equivalence in the Indonesian language, my thesis shows polysemous multiple-meaning titles depicted in the plot of the Breaking Bad television series.

The third research is a journal titled "The Semantic Analysis of Polysemy Concepts in Avengers End Game (2019)" by Agustri and Aztri Dera Nalurytha. This qualitative research focuses on the analysis of multiple-meaning dialogues by the characters of the film. This research concludes that the purpose of the writers of this film utilize polysemy in making the dialogues, is to make the viewers of this film easily understand what the characters are talking about because the words used are common, for instance, the word "break" that one of the dialogue uses. Not only to ease the viewers in understanding the meaning of the dialogue, it is concluded that the usage of polysemy in making the dialogue is to make them interesting to viewers. This thesis, on the other hand, focuses on how polysemy can create polysemous titles whose depictions are in various ways in the plot of the Breaking Bad television series.

The fourth research is a journal titled "Polysemy in Justin Bieber's Song Lyrics" by Rafislam Dilapanga, Indri Wirahmi Bay, and Jefriyanto Saud. In this qualitative research, the researcher intends to discover polysemy words in Justin Bieber's song lyrics. They deem that the lyrics by Justin Bieber use the same words for his lyrics but have different functions in each of them. Also, the words in each lyrics, though are the same, still differ from each other because of contexts. The difference between this journal and my thesis is that while this journal is about a song creator who chooses to use the same words in his lyrics and the context of the songs

affects what the words mean, my thesis focuses on how the depictions of the episodes' titles appear variously that are hidden at face value.

The fifth research is a journal titled "English Homonym And Polysemy Words Through Semantic Approach: Novels Woy & The Dancer" by Ayu Bandu Retnomurti. The researcher thinks that polysemous words are easily digestible to people of their attached meanings that are familiar, and this research proves the usage of polysemy in the writing of the novels. While this research is about the usage of polysemy in helping people easily understand what the words mean, my thesis focuses on the utilization of polysemy in creating multiple-meaning titles whose depictions are various.

These past studies prove the novelty of this thesis; it shows how polysemy can be used effectively to make polysemous titles whose depictions appear variously which can give layers of complexity to the plot, and their depictions, at face value, are hidden.