

**LEXICAL AND STRUCTURAL AMBIGUITY FOUND IN THE
SCRIPT OF *EMILY IN PARIS* MOVIE SERIES**



**Compiled as one of the requirements for completing the Strata I Study
Program at the Department of English Education, Faculty of Teacher
Training and Education**

By :

BRILLIANT ALIFAZUHA EKARISNA

A320180192

**ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM
SCHOOL OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
MUHAMMADIYAH UNIVERSITY OF SURAKARTA**

2022

APPROVAL

**LEXICAL AND STRUCTURAL AMBIGUITY FOUND IN THE
SCRIPT OF EMILY IN PARIS MOVIE SERIES**

SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS

By :

BRILLIANT ALIFAZUHA EKARISNA

A320180192

Checked and approved for testing by:

Consultant,



Prof. Dr. Endang Fauziati, M. Hum

NIDN. 0615035701

ACCEPTANCE

**LEXICAL AND STRUCTURAL AMBIGUITY FOUND IN THE SCRIPT
OF EMILY IN PARIS MOVIE SERIES**

By:

BRILLIANT ALIFAZUHA EKARISNA

A320180192

Has been defended in front of the Examiner Board
faculty of School Of Teacher Training And Education
Muhammadiyah Surakarta University
Accepted and approved by The Board Examiners
On January 14th, 2022

The Board of Examiners:

1. Prof. Dr. Endang Fauziati, M.hum
(chairPerson) ()
2. Drs. Agus Wijayanto, M.A.,Ph.D
(Member1) ()
3. Dr. Maryadi, M.A.
(Member2) ()

School of Teacher Training and Education

Dean



Prof. Dr. Sutama M.Pd

NIDN.0007016002

STATEMENT

I testify that in this research paper there is no plagiarism of previous literary works which been raised to obtain bachelor degree of certain university, not there are opinions or masterpiece which have been written or published by others, except those in which the writing is referred to the manuscript and mentioned in literary review and bibliography.

Hence later, if it is proven that there are some untrue statements in this testimony, I will fully be responsible.

Surakarta, January 7th 2022

The Researcher,



Brilliant Alifazuha Ekarisna

A320180192

LEXICAL AND STRUCTURAL AMBIGUITY FOUND IN THE SCRIPT OF EMILY IN PARIS MOVIE SERIES

Abstract

This research deals with lexical and structural ambiguity found in the script of Emily In Paris movie series. This research was qualitative descriptive research with content analysis approach. The subject of this research was all of the characters in Emily In Paris movie series season 1 episode 1, 2, and 3. The object of this research was the ambiguous expression. The technique for collecting data in this research was document analysis, which involved reading written texts or documents. To examine the whole data, the researchers applied the Miles, Huberman, & Saldana (2014) approach which was divided into four steps: data collection, data condensation, data display, and drawing conclusion. The result of this research showed that (1) there are two types of lexical ambiguity, namely absolute and polysemy, (2) there are four types of structural ambiguity, namely Type 1 (VP + NP + PP), Type 2 (Gerund + VP), Type 4 (VP + NP + PP1 + PP2), and Type 5 (NP + Adj. Clause), (3) the dominant ambiguity is absolute homonym with frequency 46% of total data, and (4) there are three causes of structural ambiguity that the researcher found in this research. Through this research, the researcher hopes that English users will realize their mistakes which can lead to ambiguity.

Keywords: *Lexical Ambiguity, Structural Ambiguity, The Causes of Ambiguity*

Abstrak

Penelitian ini membahas tentang ambiguitas leksikal dan struktural yang ditemukan dalam naskah serial film Emily In Paris. Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian deskriptif kualitatif dengan pendekatan analisis isi. Subjek penelitian ini adalah semua karakter dalam film seri Emily In Paris season 1 episode 1, 2, dan 3. Objek penelitian ini adalah ekspresi ambigu. Teknik pengumpulan data dalam penelitian ini adalah analisis dokumen, yaitu dengan membaca teks atau dokumen tertulis. Untuk mengkaji keseluruhan data, peneliti menerapkan pendekatan Miles, Huberman & Saldana (2014) yang dibagi menjadi empat langkah: pengumpulan data, kondensasi data, penyajian data, dan penarikan kesimpulan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa (1) ambiguitas leksikal ada dua jenis, yaitu absolut dan polisemi, (2) ambiguitas struktural ada empat jenis, yaitu Tipe 1 (VP + NP + PP), Tipe 2 (Gerund + VP), Tipe 4 (VP + NP + PP1 + PP2), dan Tipe 5 (NP + Adj. Clause), (3) ambiguitas yang dominan adalah homonim absolut dengan frekuensi 46% dari total data, dan (4) ada 3 penyebab ambiguitas struktural yang ditemukan penulis pada penelitian ini. Melalui penelitian ini, peneliti berharap pengguna Bahasa Inggris menyadari kesalahan mereka yang dapat menyebabkan ambiguitas.

Kata kunci: *Ambiguitas Leksikal, Ambiguitas Struktural, Penyebab Ambiguitas*

1. INTRODUCTION

People in society try to convey their thoughts and intentions through words and phrases, either spoken or written. In general, people interpret the meaning of words. Because meaning is the problem that all units at linguistic levels strive to solve, meaning is the result of linguistic levels. Because everyone interprets words and sentences differently, they frequently discover that people do not comprehend what they say. People must have the same notion or concept associated with each word in order to grasp the meaning. A change in meaning might occur through switching from one phoneme to another, or from one verb to another. This is referred to as ambiguity by linguists, and it may cause difficulty for certain individuals. Ambiguity, as a complicated concept, is difficult to express and comprehend, yet it is a fundamental component of human language and is present in all domains of language. In a brief, lexical ambiguity induced by polysemy and homonymy. While structural ambiguity is discovered in a phrase or sentence. The existence of ambiguity in language is easily noticed not only by educational researchers but also by common people that come to terms with its consequences in everyday circumstances. The ambiguity also can be presented in textual forms such as movie script.

Ambiguity is divided into two types, there are lexical ambiguity and structural ambiguity (Hurford & Heasley in Nordquist, 2019). Lexical ambiguity is a word that can have two or more different meanings, suitable for a specific context, but have the same form, and two or more different words can sound the same. According to Murphy (2010), lexical ambiguity is divided into two types, namely absolut and polysemy. Homonymy occurs when two separate meanings include two different lexemes that just happen to have the same spoken and written forms, or it may also be the same either spoken or written form. Homonymy is classified into three types: homograph, which is connected to the written form of the word, homophone, which is tied to the spoken form of the

word, and absolute, which is related to both the written and spoken forms. And last, polysemy entails a single term with several meanings and a similar connotation. Structural ambiguity in English grammar is the presence of two or more possible meanings within a single sentence or sequence of words, as opposed to lexical ambiguity, which is the presence of two or more possible meanings within a single word (Nordquist, 2019). Simatupang (2009) stated that structural ambiguity is divided into five types, namely Type 1 (VP + NP + PP), Type 2 (Gerund + VP), Type 3 (NP + VP + more ... than + NP), Type 4 (VP + NP + PP1 + PP2), and Type 5 (NP + Adj. Clause). People should minimize or eliminate lexical and structural ambiguity as much as possible during the process of verbal communication to avoid inconvenience and misunderstanding. According to Yang (2014), there are 5 causes of structural ambiguity: denial scope, words' special syntactic function, improper abbreviation, the unclear characteristics of words, and the unclear relation of the modifier.

Ambiguity can lead to communication problems, thus it must be avoided where possible. In the context of English education, a thorough knowledge of ambiguity will benefit both teachers and students. An appropriate and effective English classroom necessitates the teacher's ability to convey learning materials to the pupils. English learners, on the other hand, must be able to express themselves at the very least. To have well-delivered contents and viewpoints, both teachers and students must avoid ambiguity, which also implies avoiding misunderstanding.

There have been a lot of studies examined about ambiguity. Nwala & Ukumuro (2017), Charina (2017), Aldaw (2018), Wakhidah (2018), and Demir (2018) did not classify the lexical ambiguity as the results. Meanwhile, this research classified the lexical ambiguity into 2 types. The researcher found 4 types of structural ambiguities using the theory of Murphy (2010), meanwhile Almoudi (2017) found 5 types of ambiguity and Wakhidah (2018) found 3 types of structural ambiguity by Fauziati (2016). The researcher found lexical ambiguity as the dominant ambiguity, meanwhile Khoshkhabar & Iraj (2015), Nwala &

Nwaduwa (2017), Charina (2017), Aldaw (2018), and Demir (2020) found the structural ambiguity as the dominant ambiguity.

This research is used to extend the previous study by examining lexical and structural ambiguity that was found in the script of Emily In Paris movie series. The purpose of this research are: (1) to describe what the type of lexical ambiguities are, (2) to describe what the type of structural ambiguities are, (3) to describe the cause of ambiguity.

2. METHOD

This research was qualitative descriptive research with content analysis approach. The data of this study were in the form of excerpts containing lexical and structural ambiguity. The data sources were collected in the form of script from Emily In Paris movie series script season 1 episode 1, 2, and 3 which was containing lexical and structural ambiguity. The data were obtained through watching the movie and reading the script. The researcher analyzed the data based on Miles, Huberman, & Saldana (2014) approach. First, the data collecting step is done by watching the movie and reading the script. Second, the data display step is done by coding the utterances which contain lexical and structural ambiguity. Third, drawing the conclusion step is done by giving an explanation of the utterances which contain lexical and structural ambiguity.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher divided the finding into four sections, they are: the types of lexical ambiguity, the types of structural ambiguity, and the causes of ambiguity.

3.1 The Types of Lexical Ambiguity

The researcher identified the types of lexical ambiguity from the data and found 2 types based on types of lexical ambiguity framework used by Murphy (2010) which are absolute homonymy and polysemy. The researcher found 38 utterances which were lexically ambiguous.

3.1.1 Absolute

Absolute homonym occurs when there are different words which have the same spoken and written form, but have a totally different meaning. In this study, the researcher found twenty-three (23) utterances containing absolute homonyms. In the first example that was uttered by Madeline when she was named director of marketing for Franco firm. The utterance is “Look at their president. He's young. He's *hot*.” (ABS / 1 / 00:01:09,903 → 00:01:11,703). The sentence is an ambiguous sentence. This is included into absolute homonymy. The sentence shows lexical ambiguity because the word ‘hot’ has more than one meaning according to Merriam Webster Dictionary; (1) temperature and (2) physical appearance. In this case, the word ‘hot’ means attractive. Which follow other example;

- (1) Like, *American eyes and ears* to help with the whole transition.
- (2) Oh, I'm sorry. Um, is the seat *free*?
- (3) No problem. *Bang* any time.
- (4) I'm gonna *throw* you a dinner party at their apartment.

3.1.2 Polysemy

Polysemy words occur when there are similar connotations which have the same spoken and written form. In various situations, a word might have many diverse meanings. In this study, the researcher found fifteen (15) utterances containing absolute homonyms. The first example was uttered by Madeline when she was smelling a floral perfume. The utterance is “I'm gonna be *sick*. Uh... I'm gonna be *sick*.” (PLY / 1 / 00:01:59,744 → 00:02:02,413). This sentence contains an ambiguous sentence. This is included in polysemy. The sentence shows lexical ambiguity because the word ‘sick’ in Merriam Webster Dictionary can mean (1) affected with disease or ill health, (2) filled with disgust or chagrin, or (3) impressed (slang). This context refers to ‘throw up’. Which follow other example;

- (1) I'll be handling them, their *account* in Paris. What do you think?
- (2) And you're keeping me out of the *loop*.
- (3) We're not *together* anymore.
- (4) You have so many *cool* places to check out there.

3.2 The Types of Structural Ambiguity

The researcher identified the types of structural ambiguity from the data and found 4 types based on types of structural ambiguity framework used by Simatupang (2009) which are type 1 (VP + NP + PP), type 2 (Gerund + VP), type 4 (VP + NP + PP1 + PP2), and type 5 (NP + Adj. Clause). The researcher found 12 utterances which were structurally ambiguous.

3.2.1 Type 1 (VP + NP + PP)

This type of structural ambiguity results from the lack of information in the construction. If additional information is added to it, the sentence becomes unambiguous. The researcher found four (4) sentences based on the movie. The first example was uttered by Emily Cooper. The utterance is “Chicago-based Gilbert Group expands international portfolio *with acquisition of French luxury marketing company Savoir.*” (SA1 / 1 / 00:00:47,338 → 00:00:53,678). This sentence is an ambiguous sentence. This is included in structural ambiguity type 1. The sentence shows ambiguity because it may mean ‘Chicago-based Gilbert Group, with acquisition of French luxury marketing company Savoir, expands international portfolio’ or ‘international portfolio with acquisition of French luxury marketing company Savoir is expanded by the Chicago-based Gilbert Group’. In this case, it can be interpreted as ‘Chicago-based Gilbert Group, with acquisition of French luxury marketing company Savoir, expands international portfolio’.

3.2.2 Type 2 (Gerund + VP)

The second type of ambiguity has the construction of a gerund followed by a verb. It can be understood in two ways: as a compound noun and as a noun phrase consisting of a modifier plus a noun. The researcher found five (5) sentences that were uttered by the characters in this movie. The first example was uttered by Emily Cooper when she was being introduced by Sylvie to Mr. Bossard, the owner of Savoir. The utterance is “Most of my experience has been in *promoting pharmaceuticals.*” (SA2 / 1 / 00:09:50,464 → 00:09:52,925). This sentence is an ambiguous sentence. This is included in structural ambiguity type 2. The sentence shows ambiguity because ‘promoting pharmaceuticals’ can be understood in two

ways; (1) as a compound noun, or (2) as a noun phrase. When the utterance indicates a compound noun, it can be interpreted as ‘the action of promoting pharmaceuticals’. When the utterance indicates a noun phrase, it can be interpreted as ‘pharmaceuticals of promoting’. In this case, it can be interpreted as ‘the action of promoting pharmaceuticals’.

3.2.3 Type 4 (VP + NP + PP1 + PP2)

The sentence can be ambiguous since the first modifier 1 can modify the closest NP or PP2. It is not clear whether NP modifies modifier 1 or Modifier 2. The researcher found two (2) sentences that were uttered by the characters in this movie. The first sentence was uttered by Emily Cooper when she was listening to Madeline’s excitement. The utterance is “Ooh, I just emailed you my thoughts *on the presentation for the new IBS drug.*” (SA4 / 1 / 00:01:13,782 → 00:01:17,243). This is an ambiguous sentence. This is included in structural ambiguity type 4. The sentence shows ambiguity since the first modifier ‘on the presentation’ can modify the closest NP or PP2. It is not clear whether ‘on the presentation’ modifies ‘my thoughts’ or ‘for the new IBS drug’. If it modifies ‘my thoughts’, it means that her thoughts are already on the presentation and should be put for the new IBS drug. On the other hand, if it modifies ‘for the new IBS drug’, it means that her thoughts should be put from somewhere else to the presentation which is for the new IBS drug.

3.2.4 Type 5 (NP + Adj. Clause)

In spoken language, the first sentence is uttered without juncture, while the second with juncture between the antecedent (NP) and the Adjective clause. This shows the importance of proper punctuation in writing, and juncture in spoken utterance. The researcher found only one (1) sentence that was uttered by the character. The sentence was uttered by Antoine, the CEO of Maison Lavax in the brand launching party. The utterance is “A nose is what we call *the perfumer who composes the scent.*” (SA5 / 2 / 00:05:40,757 → 00:05:43,968). This sentence is an ambiguous sentence. This is included in structural ambiguity type 5. The sentence shows ambiguity since it can be written two ways with absolutely different meanings. (1) we call the perfumer who composes the scent. The

adjective clause ‘who composes the scent’ restricts NP ‘the perfumer’ to give important information ‘which perfumer’ we have called. (2) we call the perfumer, who composes the scent. The second sentence does not restrict the antecedent ‘the perfumer, thus, it gives further information which is not needed to identify the person. It means that ‘we call the perfumer (and the perfumer composed the scent)’.

After the researcher analyzed the types of lexical and structural ambiguity in the movie, there were found 2 types of lexical ambiguity and 4 types of structural ambiguity. Based on the types of lexical ambiguity by Murphy (2010), it is clear that the absolute homonym was the dominant type of ambiguity because the researcher found 23 from 50 ambiguous sentences.

3.3 The Causes of Ambiguity

Structural (grammatical) ambiguity is caused by grammatical factors. Grammatical ambiguity is expressed in a language unit called a sentence or phrase. The researcher found three causes of structural ambiguity: (1) caused by words’ special syntactic function, (2) caused by the unclear characteristics of words, and (3) caused by the unclear relation of the modifier.

3.3.1 Caused by Words Special Syntactic Function

English conjunctions, adverbs and pronouns which introduce subordinate clauses have many kinds of syntactic functions. The subordinate clause possibly is the adverbial subordinate clause, and also it may be the object subordinate clause acting as direct object and also perhaps an attributive clause. For example the sentence from structural ambiguity type 5 “A nose is what we call the perfumer who composes the scent.” (SA5 / 2 / 00:05:40,757 → 00:05:43,968). This sentence can be ambiguous because it can be written in two versions with absolutely different meaning: (1) A nose is what we call the perfumer who composes the scent, or (2) A nose is what we call the perfumer, who composes the scent. In spoken language, the first sentence is uttered without juncture, while the second with juncture between the antecedent (NP) and the Adjective clause. This shows the importance of proper punctuation in writing, and juncture in spoken utterance.

3.3.2 Caused by the Unclear Characteristics of Words

Certain English words have two characteristics of the noun and the adjective, when these words serve as the attribute, ambiguity is easy to produce. The first example comes from the structural ambiguity type 2. The utterance is “Most of my experience has been in promoting pharmaceuticals.” (SA2 / 1 / 00:09:50,464 → 00:09:52,925). The ambiguity in this sentence comes from the phrase “promoting pharmaceuticals”. Because there are two kinds of syntactic explanations: First, “promoting” will be regarded as one present participle, and it explains the condition of the “pharmaceuticals”, “pharmaceuticals” is modified by “promoting”, “promote” is a intransitive verb; Second, we may treat the “promoting” as the gerund, and namely “pharmaceuticals” may be regarded as the logical object of the “promoting”; “promote” as a transitive verb, and the entire sentence’s subject is this movement of “promoting pharmaceuticals”, but is not the “pharmaceuticals”. Therefore the ambiguity exists in this phrase.

3.3.3 Caused by the Unclear Relations of Modifier

If the relations of the modifier are not clear, the syntactic ambiguity can thus produce. For example, from structural ambiguity type 2 “To bring an American perspective from a marketing point of view” (SA2 / 2 / 00:05:50,183 → 00:05:52,977). The ambiguity in this sentence comes from the phrase “marketing point of view”. Because there are two kinds of syntactic explanations: First, “marketing” will be regarded as one present participle, and it explains the condition of the “point of view”, “point of view” is modified by “marketing”, “market” is a intransitive verb; Second, we may treat the “marketing” as the gerund, and namely “point of view” may be regarded as the logical object of the “marketing”; “market” as a transitive verb, and the entire sentence’s subject is this movement of “marketing point of view”, but is not the “point of view”. Therefore the ambiguity exists in this phrase.

3.4 Discussion

This section discussed the discussion of the findings. Related to the findings, the researcher had already analyzed lexical and structural ambiguity in the Emily In Paris movie series. These findings extend the types of lexical ambiguity, the types

of structural ambiguity, the dominant ambiguity, and also the causes of ambiguity. The elaboration of those components gained some new findings.

3.4.1 Types of Lexical Ambiguity

The results of analysis showed that there are two types of lexical ambiguity that were found in this finding, namely absolute and polysemy. The researcher's results are not in line with the theory that is used, Murphy (2010), which found lexical ambiguity in 4 types; homophone, homograph, absolute, and polysemy. This happened because the researcher analyzed the types of lexical ambiguity in the movie from semantic ways. Meanwhile, homophone and homograph are the pragmatic ones.

The results of this finding are not in line with Alerechi & Joshua (2018) findings. The findings showed that they found polysemy in their research but they did not find any absolute homonym. In other words, homonyms are not divided into several parts like the researcher's. The results are also not in line with the results of Khoshkhabar & Iraj (2015) findings of lexical ambiguity. They found 6 types of lexical ambiguity such as polysemy, homograph, homonym, idiomatic/figurative, epenthesis construction, and verb ellipsis. Another result found by Nwala & Ukumuro (2017), Awwad (2017), Charina (2017), Aldaw (2018), Wakhidah (2018), and Demir (2020) did not classify the lexical ambiguity into several types. This research's finding is not in line with the researcher's findings. The researcher assumed this is due to the data source.

From the phenomenon above, the researchers hypothesize that the types of lexical ambiguity, absolute and polysemy, are a new finding.

3.4.2 Types of Structural Ambiguity

The results showed there were four types of structural ambiguity by Simatupang (2009), The researcher could not find the Type 3 (VP + NP + more...than + NP) due to the limited data. These conditions can be explained by Kurniasari (2017) which also used Simatupang (2009) theory. But the results that have been gotten have different cases because of the data source, so she found all of the types of structural ambiguity.

This research's finding is also not in line with Wakhidah (2018) because she divided the structural ambiguity into 2 types; surface structure ambiguity and deep structure ambiguity. Meanwhile, this research classified the structural ambiguity into 5 types by Simatupang (2009) and found 4 types.

3.4.3 The Causes of Ambiguity

The results showed there were three causes of structural ambiguity by Yang (2014), there are (1) caused by words' special syntactic function, (2) caused by the unclear characteristics of words, and (3) caused by the unclear relation of the modifier. Structural ambiguity type 5 is caused by words' special syntactic function. Structural ambiguity type 2 is caused by the unclear characteristics of words. Structural ambiguity type 1 and type 4 is caused by unclear relation of the modifier. The researcher did not find structural ambiguity caused by denial scope and improper abbreviation because of the lack of data. But in this case, this research raises new findings.

Relating to the findings above, the researcher makes sure that her research has new findings. The evidence of this statement can be proved by seeing the result in which this research succeeds to reveal lexical and structural ambiguity in the Emily In Paris movie series.

4. CLOSING

In the first research question, the researcher used the theory of Murphy (2010) to classify the types of lexical ambiguity. The research only focuses on two types of lexical ambiguity, they are; absolute and polysemy. Twenty-three ambiguous words and sentences containing absolutes were found in the Emily In Paris movie series. And fifteen ambiguous words and sentences that contain polysemy were found. From thirty eight data found, the dominant lexical ambiguity that was found in the Emily In Paris movie series is absolute.

The second research question is the types of structural ambiguity. The researcher used the Simatupang (2009) as the theory to classify the types of structural ambiguity. The researcher focuses on four types of structural ambiguity, meanwhile there are five types of structural ambiguity. The types are; Type 1 (VP

+ NP + PP), Type 2 (Gerund + VP), Type 4 (VP + NP + PP1 + PP2), and Type 5 (NP + Adj. Clause). From the Emily In Paris movie series, the researcher found twelve ambiguous sentences that contain structural ambiguity. Four ambiguous sentences containing Type 1 (VP + NP + PP) were found. Five ambiguous sentences containing Type 2 (Gerund + VP) were found. Two ambiguous sentences that contain Type 4 (VP + NP + PP1 + PP2) were found. And only one ambiguous sentence containing Type 5 (NP + Adj. Clause) were found. From the twelve data found, the dominant structural ambiguity that was found in the Emily In Paris movie series is Type 2 (Gerund + VP).

The third research question is the causes of structural ambiguity. The researcher used the theory of Yang (2014). The researcher found three causes from five causes of structural ambiguity. The Causes are by words' special syntactic function, by the unclear characteristics of words, and by the unclear relation of the modifier. There are one sentence that is caused by words' special syntactic function, five sentences that are caused by the unclear characteristics of words, and six sentences that are caused by the unclear relation of the modifier.

Based on the findings above, it can be concluded that the presence of ambiguity in language is perceived not only by academic researchers, but also the ordinary people that appear in everyday life. In order to understand the right meaning of lexical and structural ambiguity, the researcher described the interpretation of words/phrases/sentences and put them into the context of the sentences.

REFERENCES

- Alamoudi, K. (2017). Syntactic Ambiguity of Arabic Prepositional Phrase Attachment in Saudi Newspaper Headlines. *Arabic Language, Literature & Culture*, 2(1), 13-17. 10.11648/j.allc.20170201.14
- Aldaw, H.M. M. (2018). The Nature of Ambiguity across Languages. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research*, 6(12), 149-157. 10.31686/ijier.vol6.iss12.1259
- Alerechi, R.I. C. (2018). Ambiguity in Ikwere : An Exploration. *International Journal of Language, Literature and Gender Studies*, 7(2), 108-124. 10.4314/laligens.v7i2.10

- Charina, I. N. (2017). Lexical and Syntactic Ambiguity in Humor. *International Journal of Humanity Studies*, 1(1), 120-131. 10.24071/ijhs.2017.010113
- Demir, C. (2020). Lexical and Structural Ambiguities in Student Writing : An Assessment and Evaluation of Results. *African Educational Research Journal*, 8(3), 100-108. 10.30918/AERJ.8S3.20.077
- Hurford, J., & Heasley, B. (1983). *Semantics: A Course Book*. Cambridge University : Cambridge.
- Jha, S. K. (2017). Exploring Ambiguous Structure in English. *Global Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, 6(3), 1-4. 10.24105/gjiss.6.3.1701
- Khoskhabar, S. G., & Iraj, M. (2015). The Study of Ambiguity in Social Context of Iranian Newspaper. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 3(8), 1020 - 1027. (ISSN. 2320-5407)
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis, A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage Publication : Massachusetts.
- Murphy, M. L. (2010). *Lexical Meaning*. Cambridge University Press : New York.
- Nwala, M. A., & Nwaduwa, B. P. (2017, April). Examining Ambiguities in Film Titles : The Nigerian Situation. *International Journal of Arts and Humanities (IJAH)*, 6(2), 15-27. 10.4314/ijah.v6i2.2
- Nwala, M. A., & Umukuro, B. A. (2017). Investigating the Meaning of Newspaper Headlines : The Issue of Ambiguity. *African Research Review*, 11(3), 87-96. 10.4314/afrev.v11i3.9
- Nordquist, R. (2019, June). *Definition and Examples of Ambiguity*. thoughtco. Retrieved September, 2021, from <https://www.thoughtco.com/ambiguity-language-1692388>
- Nordquist, R. (2019). *Lexical Ambiguity Definition and Examples*. ThoughtCo. Retrieved September, 2021, from <https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-lexical-ambiguity-1691226>
- Nordquist, R. (2019). *Syntactic Ambiguity*. ThoughtCo. Retrieved September, 2021, from <https://www.thoughtco.com/syntactic-ambiguity-grammar-1692179>
- Simatupang, M. S. (2009). How Ambiguous Is The Structural Ambiguity. *Lingua Cultura*, 1(2), 99-104. 10.21512/lc.v1i2.315
- Wakhidah, N.J. I. (2018). A Study of Ambiguity Found in the Students' English Workbook of Vocational High School. *I*(1), 1-15. 10.1016/s0378-2166(97)00014-3
- Yang, L. (n.d.). The Disambiguation and Application of the English Syntactic Ambiguity. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Education, Language, Art and Intercultural Communication*, 329-333. 10.2991/icelaic-14.2014.83