

An Analysis of Denotative and Connotative Meaning in Students' Utterances in the Campus Environment

Moria Afriani Stefani Silaban ¹, Bernieke Anggita Ristia Damanik ²

Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas HKBP Nomensen Pematang Siantar, Indonesia ^{1,2}

Corresponding Author: moriaasilaban@gmail.com ^{1*}, Bernieke.damanik@uhn.ac.id ²

Info Artikel

Submitted: 19 Januari 2026

Revised : 29 Februari 2026

Accepted: 15 Maret 2026

Published: 25 April 2026

Keywords: denotative meaning, connotative meaning, semantics, students' utterances, campus language

Kata Kunci: makna denotatif, makna konotatif, semantik, ujaran mahasiswa, bahasa kampus

Abstract

This research is designed to examine how students use both denotative and connotative meanings in their everyday utterances within the campus environment. In daily communication, students do not rely solely on literal meanings; instead, their language often conveys implied messages shaped by context, cultural background, and patterns of social interaction. To explore this phenomenon, the study applies a qualitative descriptive approach, focusing on naturally occurring conversations among students in various campus settings. Data were collected through careful observation and documentation of students' spoken interactions, allowing for an in-depth understanding of how meaning is constructed in real-life situations. The results indicate that students actively employ both denotative and connotative meanings in their speech. However, connotative meanings appear more dominant, particularly in informal contexts such as casual conversations with peers. This tendency highlights the role of language as a flexible and dynamic tool for expression. Furthermore, the frequent use of connotative language demonstrates students' creativity in conveying ideas, emotions, and attitudes. It also reflects how language functions as a marker of social identity, helping students build relationships and express group belonging within the academic community.

Abstrak

Penelitian ini dirancang untuk mengkaji bagaimana mahasiswa menggunakan makna denotatif dan konotatif dalam ucapan sehari-hari mereka di lingkungan kampus. Dalam komunikasi sehari-hari, mahasiswa tidak hanya mengandalkan makna literal; sebaliknya, bahasa mereka sering menyampaikan pesan tersirat yang dibentuk oleh konteks, latar belakang budaya, dan pola interaksi sosial. Untuk mengeksplorasi fenomena ini, penelitian ini menerapkan pendekatan deskriptif kualitatif, yang berfokus pada percakapan yang terjadi secara alami di antara mahasiswa di berbagai lingkungan kampus. Data dikumpulkan melalui pengamatan dan dokumentasi yang cermat terhadap interaksi lisan mahasiswa, memungkinkan pemahaman mendalam tentang bagaimana makna dibangun dalam situasi kehidupan nyata. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa mahasiswa secara aktif menggunakan makna denotatif dan konotatif dalam ucapan mereka. Namun, makna konotatif tampak lebih dominan, terutama dalam konteks informal seperti percakapan santai dengan teman sebaya. Kecenderungan ini menyoroti peran bahasa sebagai alat ekspresi yang fleksibel dan dinamis. Lebih lanjut, penggunaan bahasa konotatif yang sering menunjukkan kreativitas mahasiswa dalam menyampaikan ide, emosi, dan sikap. Hal ini juga mencerminkan bagaimana bahasa berfungsi sebagai penanda identitas sosial, membantu mahasiswa membangun hubungan dan mengekspresikan rasa memiliki kelompok dalam komunitas akademik.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

Publisher: Lembaga Penerbit Penelitian Nusantara

Introduction

Language plays a vital role in human communication, particularly within academic settings such as campuses, where interaction is an essential part of daily life. Students use language not only as a means of delivering information but also as a tool to express emotions, attitudes, and social relationships. In this regard, meaning becomes a fundamental element in ensuring effective communication, as it shapes how messages are interpreted and understood by others.

From a semantic perspective, meaning can generally be divided into two categories: denotative and connotative meanings. Denotative meaning refers to the literal or dictionary definition of a word, which is usually objective and widely agreed upon. In contrast, connotative meaning involves additional interpretations that are influenced by emotional associations, cultural background, and individual experiences, making it more subjective and context-dependent.

In everyday campus interactions, students frequently use expressions that extend beyond their literal meanings. For instance, the word “cold” may denote a low temperature, but it can also be used to describe someone’s unfriendly or distant personality. Such usage shows that language is flexible and rich in interpretation. Therefore, this study aims to analyze how students employ both denotative and connotative meanings in their utterances within the campus environment.

Literature Review

2.1 Denotative Meaning

Denotative meaning refers to the primary, literal, and explicitly defined meaning of a linguistic unit, as commonly recorded in dictionaries and widely accepted within a speech community. According to Geoffrey Leech (1981), denotative meaning represents the conceptual or cognitive content of a word, which is independent of emotional associations or subjective interpretations. This type of meaning is considered objective because it remains relatively stable across different contexts and users, making it essential for clear and precise communication.

Furthermore, denotative meaning plays a crucial role in formal discourse, particularly in academic, scientific, and professional settings where ambiguity must be minimized. As explained by George Yule (2010), literal meaning serves as the foundation of semantic interpretation, allowing

speakers and listeners to share a common understanding of language. Without this shared baseline, effective communication would be difficult to achieve.

For example, the word “book” denotes a physical object consisting of written or printed pages bound together, while the word “chair” refers to a piece of furniture designed for sitting. These meanings are universally recognized and do not depend on individual feelings or cultural variations. Because of this clarity, denotative meaning is frequently employed in instructional materials, academic writing, and technical communication, where precision and consistency are highly valued.

In addition, denotative meaning is closely related to the structural aspects of language, as discussed in Ferdinand de Saussure’s theory of signs, which distinguishes between the *signifier* (form of a word) and the *signified* (concept it represents). The denotative meaning corresponds to the signified component, forming the core reference of linguistic expressions.

2.2 Connotative Meaning

In contrast to denotative meaning, connotative meaning refers to the additional, implied, or associative meanings that a word carries beyond its literal definition. These meanings are often influenced by emotional responses, cultural values, social experiences, and individual perceptions. As noted by Geoffrey Leech (1981), connotation involves the communicative value of an expression that arises from what it refers to, above and beyond its purely conceptual content.

Connotative meaning is inherently subjective and context-dependent. The same word may evoke different interpretations depending on the speaker’s background, the situation, or the cultural environment in which it is used. For instance, the word “home” not only denotes a physical place of residence but also conveys emotional associations such as comfort, warmth, security, and belonging. Similarly, the word “snake,” while literally referring to a reptile, may carry negative connotations such as deceit, danger, or betrayal in many cultural contexts.

According to Victoria Fromkin et al. (2011), connotative meaning enriches communication by adding layers of emotional and symbolic significance, making language more expressive and nuanced. This type of meaning is particularly prevalent in informal communication, literary texts, media discourse, and everyday conversations, where speakers aim to convey attitudes, feelings, and interpersonal meanings.

Moreover, connotative meaning often manifests through figurative language such as metaphors, similes, idioms, and slang. These linguistic devices allow speakers to express complex ideas in creative and indirect ways. For example, phrases like “time is money” or “he is a shining star” illustrate how language can go beyond literal interpretation to convey deeper meanings.

In modern communication, especially among younger generations, connotative meaning is constantly evolving due to the influence of social media, popular culture, and peer interaction. Words such as “fire,” “cool,” or “dead” may take on new meanings that differ significantly from their original definitions, reflecting the dynamic nature of language.

2.3 Students' Language in Campus Environment

Language use among students in the campus environment is characterized by its dynamic, flexible, and innovative nature. University students come from diverse social, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds, which significantly influence their communication styles. As a result, their everyday interactions often involve a mixture of formal and informal language, as well as the integration of both denotative and connotative meanings.

According to Dell Hymes (1974), language cannot be separated from its social context, as communication is shaped by factors such as participants, setting, purpose, and norms of interaction. In the campus setting, these factors vary widely—from formal classroom discussions to casual conversations in cafeterias or dormitories—leading to diverse linguistic practices.

Students tend to use denotative meaning in academic contexts, such as lectures, presentations, and written assignments, where clarity and accuracy are essential. However, in informal interactions, they frequently rely on connotative meaning to express emotions, humor, identity, and social relationships. This aligns with the concept of sociolinguistic competence, which refers to the ability to adjust language use according to different social contexts.

Furthermore, as highlighted by William Labov (1972), language variation is a natural phenomenon influenced by social factors such as age, group identity, and peer networks. Among students, the use of slang, metaphors, and expressive language serves as a marker of group belonging and identity. For example, phrases like “I’m broke,” “that class is killing me,” or “this idea is fire” demonstrate how students creatively manipulate language to convey meanings beyond literal interpretation.

In addition, the rapid development of digital communication platforms has further influenced students' language use. Online interactions through messaging applications and social media encourage brevity, creativity, and the use of symbolic expressions, which often carry strong connotative meanings. This evolution highlights the adaptability of language in response to technological and cultural changes.

Overall, the language used by students in the campus environment reflects a balance between functional communication and expressive creativity. Their ability to switch between denotative and

connotative meanings demonstrates not only linguistic competence but also social awareness and adaptability in different communicative situations.

Research Method

3.1 Research Design

This study employs a qualitative descriptive research design to investigate the use of language among students, with a particular focus on identifying and interpreting denotative and connotative meanings in their utterances. A qualitative approach is considered appropriate for this research because it enables the exploration of language as a socially constructed phenomenon, emphasizing meaning, context, and interpretation rather than numerical measurement.

According to John W. Creswell (2014), qualitative research is designed to explore and understand the meanings individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem. In this context, the present study seeks to capture how students naturally construct meaning in their everyday communication within the campus environment.

Furthermore, a descriptive qualitative design is used because the study aims to provide a detailed and systematic account of linguistic phenomena without manipulating variables. As stated by H. Russell Bernard (2017), descriptive research focuses on accurately portraying characteristics of a particular group or situation. This design allows the researcher to document authentic language use as it occurs in real-life interactions.

By adopting this approach, the researcher is able to analyze the richness, variation, and complexity of students' utterances. The emphasis is placed on understanding how meaning is constructed, negotiated, and interpreted within specific social contexts, making this method highly suitable for semantic and sociolinguistic analysis.

3.2 Data Collection

The data for this study were collected using multiple techniques to ensure depth, credibility, and reliability of the findings. The primary method of data collection was direct observation, which involved systematically monitoring students' spontaneous conversations in various campus settings. These settings included classrooms, cafeterias, hallways, and other common areas where natural interactions occur. Through observation, the researcher was able to gather authentic linguistic data without interfering with the participants' communication.

In addition to observation, informal interviews were conducted to gain further insight into the meanings behind specific utterances. These interviews allowed the researcher to clarify participants'

intentions, interpretations, and contextual understanding of the language they used. This step is important because meaning in language is often influenced by internal and subjective factors that may not be immediately visible through observation alone.

To support data accuracy, the researcher also employed recording and note-taking techniques. Audio recordings were used to capture conversations in detail, while field notes were taken to document contextual information such as setting, participants, and situational factors. According to Matthew B. Miles and A. Michael Huberman (1994), combining multiple data collection methods helps strengthen the validity of qualitative research through triangulation.

The participants in this study consisted of 20 students selected using purposive sampling, a technique in which participants are chosen based on specific criteria relevant to the research objectives. In this case, the selected students were actively engaged in campus interactions and represented diverse communication contexts. From these participants, a total of 50 utterances were collected and analyzed.

The variation in participants and settings was intentionally designed to capture a wide range of language use, ensuring that the data reflect different interaction types, communication purposes, and social dynamics within the campus environment.

3.3 Data Analysis

The data analysis process in this study followed a systematic and interpretative procedure to identify and categorize meanings within students' utterances. The analysis was conducted in several stages to ensure clarity, consistency, and depth of interpretation.

First, the researcher transcribed the recorded data into written form to facilitate detailed examination. Transcription is a crucial step in qualitative research, as it allows spoken language to be systematically analyzed. After transcription, the researcher carefully reviewed the data to identify key words, phrases, and expressions that potentially carried significant semantic meaning.

Second, the identified linguistic elements were categorized into two main types of meaning: denotative and connotative. This classification was based on semantic theory, where denotative meaning refers to literal definitions, while connotative meaning involves implied or associative interpretations.

Third, the researcher interpreted the meanings of each utterance by considering the context in which it was used. This included analyzing factors such as:

- the situation of the conversation
- the relationship between speakers

- the intention of the speaker
- the social and cultural background influencing the interaction

This contextual analysis is essential because, as noted by Norman K. Denzin (2011), meaning in qualitative research is always shaped by social context and cannot be separated from the environment in which it occurs.

Finally, the researcher drew conclusions based on patterns and trends identified in the data. The analysis aimed to reveal not only the types of meaning used by students but also the reasons behind their usage and the social functions of their language.

To ensure the trustworthiness of the findings, the study applied techniques such as data triangulation, prolonged observation, and careful documentation. These strategies help enhance the credibility and reliability of qualitative research results.

Findings and Discussion

4.1 Denotative Meaning in Students' Utterances

The analysis of the collected data reveals that denotative meaning is predominantly employed in formal, structured, and academically oriented contexts within the campus environment. In such situations, students tend to prioritize clarity, precision, and directness in order to minimize ambiguity and ensure effective communication. This finding aligns with semantic theory, which emphasizes that denotative meaning functions as the core or primary meaning of linguistic expressions, providing a shared reference point for speakers and listeners.

Denotative expressions are commonly observed in interactions related to academic activities, such as discussing schedules, assignments, classroom instructions, and factual information. In these contexts, students rely on literal language to convey information accurately without leaving room for multiple interpretations.

Based on the data collected, several utterances categorized as denotative meaning are presented in the following table:

No	Utterance	Meaning Type	Explanation
1	"I have a class at 10 AM."	Denotative	Indicates a specific schedule
2	"The assignment is difficult."	Denotative	Literal evaluation of task difficulty
3	"The library is quiet."	Denotative	Describes an observable condition
4	"I need a pen."	Denotative	Refers to a concrete object

No	Utterance	Meaning Type	Explanation
5	"The lecturer explained the topic."	Denotative	Describes an academic activity
6	"Perpustakaan buka jam 9."	Denotative	Provides factual information
7	"Saya ada kelas jam 8 pagi."	Denotative	States a schedule
8	"Tugas ini dikumpulkan besok."	Denotative	Indicates a deadline
9	"Saya mengerjakan tugas kelompok."	Denotative	Describes an activity
10	"Ruang kelas ini penuh."	Denotative	Describes a physical condition

These utterances illustrate that students consistently employ denotative meaning when the communicative goal is to deliver clear, factual, and unambiguous information. The absence of figurative language in these examples suggests that students are aware of the need for linguistic precision in academic settings.

From a broader perspective, this pattern reflects students' communicative competence in adapting their language use according to situational demands. In formal environments, the use of denotative meaning ensures that messages are interpreted uniformly by all participants. This supports the idea proposed by George Yule (2010) that literal meaning serves as the foundation of effective communication, particularly in contexts where misunderstanding can have negative consequences.

Furthermore, the findings indicate that denotative meaning plays an essential role in maintaining academic discourse, where clarity and objectivity are highly valued. The reliance on literal expressions demonstrates that students are capable of using language in a structured and disciplined manner when required.

4.2 Connotative Meaning in Students' Utterances

In contrast to denotative meaning, the findings show that connotative meaning is more dominant in informal communication among students. The data indicate that students frequently use figurative, expressive, and symbolic language to convey emotions, attitudes, and personal experiences. This type of language use reflects a more dynamic and creative approach to communication, where meaning extends beyond literal definitions.

Connotative expressions are particularly prevalent in casual conversations, where students interact with peers in relaxed and socially engaging contexts. These expressions are often influenced by cultural trends, social relationships, and contemporary slang, highlighting the evolving nature of language among young people.

The following table presents examples of connotative utterances identified in the data:

No	Utterance	Meaning Type	Explanation
1	"That class is killing me."	Connotative	Extremely stressful or demanding
2	"She is a star in our class."	Connotative	Highly talented or intelligent
3	"I'm broke."	Connotative	Lacking money
4	"He is a bookworm."	Connotative	Loves studying
5	"This exam is a nightmare."	Connotative	Very difficult and stressful
6	"The lecturer is cool."	Connotative	Friendly and approachable
7	"I'm dead after that test."	Connotative	Extremely exhausted
8	"She has a big heart."	Connotative	Very kind
9	"That idea is fire."	Connotative	Excellent or impressive
10	"Campus life is a rollercoaster."	Connotative	Full of ups and downs
11	"Tugas ini bikin aku stres."	Connotative	Emotional reaction
12	"Dia itu bintang di kelas."	Connotative	High achiever
13	"Aku mati gaya di kelas tadi."	Connotative	Feeling awkward or bored
14	"Dia otaknya encer."	Connotative	Very intelligent
15	"Aku capek mental."	Connotative	Mentally exhausted

These examples demonstrate that students frequently employ metaphor, hyperbole, and slang to enrich their communication. Such expressions allow them to convey complex emotional states and personal evaluations in a more vivid and engaging manner.

From an analytical perspective, the dominance of connotative meaning suggests that language among students is not merely a tool for transmitting information but also a medium for expressing identity and social relationships. This observation is consistent with the view of William Labov (1972), who argues that language variation reflects social identity and group membership.

Moreover, the use of expressions such as "fire," "dead," and "rollercoaster" indicates the influence of modern slang and popular culture on students' language. These terms often carry meanings that differ significantly from their literal definitions, demonstrating how language evolves in response to social and cultural changes.

Another important finding is that connotative language enhances interpersonal communication by making interactions more expressive and emotionally engaging. It allows students to build

rapport, create humor, and strengthen social bonds within their peer groups. In this sense, connotative meaning serves an important social function beyond its linguistic role.

4.3 Discussion

The findings of this study reveal a clear distinction between the use of denotative and connotative meanings based on communication context. Denotative meaning is primarily used in formal, academic situations where clarity, accuracy, and objectivity are essential. In contrast, connotative meaning dominates informal interactions, where expressiveness, creativity, and social connection are prioritized.

This pattern highlights students' ability to shift between different modes of language use depending on situational demands. Such flexibility reflects a high level of communicative competence, as students are able to select appropriate linguistic strategies for different contexts.

Additionally, the dominance of connotative meaning in informal settings underscores the role of language as a social and cultural phenomenon. Students use language not only to communicate information but also to express identity, emotions, and group belonging. This supports sociolinguistic perspectives that emphasize the relationship between language and social context.

Overall, the findings suggest that language in the campus environment is both functional and expressive. While denotative meaning ensures clarity in academic communication, connotative meaning enriches social interaction and reflects the dynamic nature of student language.

Conclusions

This study ultimately demonstrates that both denotative and connotative meanings play significant roles in students' utterances within the campus environment. These two types of meaning are not used separately, but rather complement each other in shaping effective communication. However, the findings clearly indicate that connotative meaning tends to be more dominant, particularly in informal interactions among students.

In academic and formal contexts, students consistently rely on denotative meaning to ensure clarity, precision, and accuracy. Literal language is preferred in situations such as classroom discussions, assignments, and academic exchanges, where misunderstanding must be minimized. This shows that students are capable of using language in a structured and objective way when required.

Conversely, in informal settings, students are more inclined to use connotative meaning as a way to express emotions, opinions, and personal perspectives. Through figurative expressions,

slang, and symbolic language, they are able to communicate more vividly and creatively. This expressive use of language not only makes conversations more engaging but also strengthens social bonds and reflects group identity among peers.

Moreover, the dominance of connotative meaning highlights the strong influence of cultural background, social interaction, and contemporary trends on students' language use. It shows that language is not static, but continuously evolving within a community. Students actively adapt and innovate their expressions, making their communication more dynamic and context-sensitive.

The ability of students to switch between denotative and connotative meanings also reflects their communicative competence. They can adjust their language according to different situations, demonstrating flexibility and awareness in communication. This adaptability is essential for effective interaction in both academic and social contexts.

In summary, understanding the use of denotative and connotative meanings is crucial not only for improving communication but also for gaining deeper insight into how language functions in social environments. This study emphasizes that language serves not only as a tool for conveying information but also as a medium for expressing identity, emotion, and social connection within the campus community

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Leech, G. (1981). *Semantics: The Study of Meaning*. London: Penguin Books.
- Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language* (4th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2011). *An Introduction to Language* (9th ed.). Boston: Wadsworth.
- Saussure, F. de. (1916). *Course in General Linguistics*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.