

Information Field in Malay Monolingual Dictionary

Chong Oi Chin (Corresponding author)

Department of Malay Language, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication

University Putra Malaysia, 43400 Selangor, Malaysia

E-mail: chongoichin@gmail.com

Vijayaletchumy A/P Subramaniam

Department of Malay Language, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication

University Putra Malaysia, 43400 Selangor, Malaysia

E-mail: letchumy@fbmk.upm.edu.my

Received: February 3, 2015 Accepted: February 25, 2015 Published: March 17, 2015

doi:10.5296/ijssr.v3i1.7042 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijssr.v3i1.7042>

Abstract

The study of lexicography compares the information field between two Malay monolingual dictionaries, namely Kamus Dewan (4th Edition) and Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (4th Edition) known to be credible in Malaysia and Indonesia. Information field is the term used to refer to types of information contained in a dictionary such as spelling, pronunciation, meaning, grammar, etymology, word usage, cross-reference and other important aspects by compilers which are useful for the users. The study data comprise of 1087 entries which were selected using the easy and systematic approaches. The study adopts the library and content analysis methods. Data were analyzed descriptively. The objective identifies the content of the information field in both these dictionaries based on the use of the general principles of lexicography. Various aspects contained in the field or category of information in a dictionary. There are only three aspects that will be discussed in this study and they are word usage, etymology and cross-referencing. The study outcome shows that there are some differences, similarities and shortcomings in the information field of both dictionaries. The advantage offered by the findings of this study is that the use of the information field in a Malay monolingual dictionary helps the compilers to produce a credible dictionary.

Keywords: comparison, information field, Malay monolingual dictionary, entry, lexicography

1. Introduction

Dictionary is perceived to be important as it has a direct relationship with language which is a tool of communication and a form of communication. The important role of language in every field of knowledge is irrefutable (Hishamudin & Norshimah, 2011). Quoting Asmah (1993), language is an instinct or an indicator to a particular culture. Language also portrays the thinking and mirrors the identity of the speakers. It also determines the formation of thought based on the forms and categories contained within.

A dictionary enables scholars to analyze and learn about a knowledge field and scope. Other than that, a dictionary serves as a reference book containing information on words; and users refer to the dictionary to obtain certain information like spelling, pronunciation and meaning. (Fadilah, 1994). One of the dictionary aspects or lexicography is the meta-language. The information category or field is one of the important aspects in the meta-language of a dictionary arrangement. Information field is a term used to refer to the type of information from a dictionary such as spelling, pronunciation, meaning, grammar, etymology, word usage and others useful for the compilers and users of the dictionary (Fadilah, 1994; Mohd. Rasdi, 2012). Thus, the use of information field serves as a pattern of arrangement covering the aspects of descriptions and presentation of an entry in a dictionary. Information field does not only have some linguistics information, but it also details the non-linguistics information. Gleason (in Ibrahim, 1994: 103) states that the field of dictionary-making serves as a meeting point of all linguistics and non-linguistics systems, but it has also been explained by Zgusta (in Ibrahim, 1991: 603) as follows:

“The theory of lexicography is connected with lexical system, semantics, lexicology, grammar, stylistics, morphology ... the dictionary ... the meeting place of all systems linguistic and non-linguistic”.

(Ibrahim Ahmad, 1991: 603)

Lawrence J. (1984) in his work entitled *“Some Foundation of Lexicography in SEA Englishes”*, he enlists only five categories that a dictionary should have and they are spelling, pronunciation, as well as morphological, etymological and illustrative information. For other researchers like Edgar Dale et al. (1971) they opine that in general, the information field of a monolingual dictionary covers 15 aspects. They involve the root word or entry, word form, spelling and speech, word type, synonym and antonym, context of word use, definition, notes of word use, illustrations of definitions, derivatives, word use examples, phrase, quotations, foreign words and cross-reference. In this study, the category or field of information that shall be analysed with regards to both KD4 and KBBI4 covers only three categories namely word usage, etymology and cross-referencing.

1.1 Problem Statement

The issue raised in this study is on the use of the information field in Malay monolingual dictionaries, or specifically Kamus Dewan (4th Edition) (or KD4) year 2010, published by Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka (DBP); and Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia Pusat Bahasa (4th Edition) (or KBBI4), year 2011, published PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama. The use of the

information field in an arrangement of the dictionary is the main element in the field of lexicography or dictionary-making. In general, there is a scarcity of lexicography studies done by researchers either in Indonesia or Malaysia. The study outcome on Yusof (1961), Teeuw (1964), Ibrahim (1992), and Noresah (1993) are only general and chronological descriptions on the method of compiling a dictionary and the history of Malay Language dictionary-making. Other than that, studies by Asmah (1987), Ibrahim (1991, 2004), and Noresah (1993, 2009) generally describe the criteria essential in entry arrangements of a dictionary and the importance of Kamus Dewan as a general point of reference for the mass. However, all these studies have not been sufficient as there is no in-depth description on the information field in Malay monolingual dictionaries. Their studies have not been accompanied with examples of entries in monolingual dictionary comparison. Additionally, KD4 and KBBI4 are two general monolingual dictionaries and known as credible dictionaries for reference of other countries (Noresah et al., 2009). It is also rare to find researchers drawing a comparison between both the dictionaries. Obviously there is a paucity of studies regarding Malay dictionary-making especially drawing a comparison between Malaysian and Indonesian monolingual dictionaries. Therefore, a study on the comparison of the use of information field in KD4 and KBBI4 needs to be conducted in detail by including examples of the entries.

1.2 Objective

- i. To identify the content of the information field in KD4 and KBBI4 arrangement based on the use of the general principles of lexicography.

1.3 The Importance of Study

In the context of this study, identifying the content of the information field in KD4 and KBBI4 is able to help the compilers to produce a monolingual dictionary and fulfil public needs especially the DBP (Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia) and Pustaka Utama (Jakarta, Indonesia). This is because both dictionaries are two great and general dictionaries of Malay Language that are the most authentic and serve as main reference to both native and non-native speakers. Therefore, this study is important to expose users or dictionary owners especially educators, students and academicians on the importance of information in a monolingual dictionary, that have all these while, left them in the dark on the importance of that kind of information. The outcome can also benefit the users on the rich knowledge contained in a dictionary and the criteria or characteristics that they need to know before they own a 'good' and 'comprehensive' dictionary.

2. Literature Review

From the literature, Asmah (1987) discusses on the production of a monolingual dictionary which clearly has its own intricacy, such as the complex interpretation or definition of an entry. Monolingual Malay dictionaries are still lacking in terms of putting forth their derivational words in terms of grammar, and also lacking the labeling to illustrate the social and pragmatic contexts in the discourse. For instance, Kamus Dewan does use the etymology label or word of origin like Arabic, Sanskrit, Javanese and so on. However, these labels are

not thorough, and are only provided following the existing knowledge of the compilers at the time.

According to the study of Ibrahim (1991), he has observed the comparison of the information field between Kamus Dewan with Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia. The aspects of information field compared comprise of the aspects of entry, word form, speech and spelling, word-type, synonym, wording level, definitions or descriptions of language, wording note, definition-type descriptions, word derivations, phrases, loan word, foreign words and cross-reference. He gives an example of the entry 'juang' for Kamus Dewan and 'adu' for Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia as the example of the analysis of the information field. Ibrahim (2004) also discusses the development of the Malay dictionary from the perspective of the dictionary typology based on the formal typology framework put forth by R. R. K. Hartmann. Several formal typology aspects have been elaborated in detail such as the aspects of the type of dictionary, coverage, format, medium, function, information category and language. Other than the linguistic information display, the descriptions of information in the dictionary cover diachronic or etymological information; synchronic involving spelling, pronunciation and grammar; meaning description or definition; paradigmatic information like synonyms, antonyms and homonyms; syntagmatic information namely the Example of use and collocation; and the diasystematic information.

For the article by Noresah (1993) it concentrates more on the aspect of the formation of Kamus Dewan and the elements inside, namely the corpus resources, the spelling system, the dictionary entry, word borrowing management, dialectical words, technical words and homonym words. Also included is her evaluation towards Kamus Dewan. She also links the dictionary entry involving the number of entry with the types of words forming the entries. Concerning the dialectical words in Kamus Dewan, she posits that there is an inconsistency in the distribution of dialectical words between one district and another. This is made evident through the statistics done, where it is found that the dialects of Kelantan, Kedah, and Terengganu have far exceeded other states in the distribution of dialects found in Kamus Dewan. Noresah (2009) also elaborates on 'Kamus Dewan' specifically with regards to the history of the arrangement of Kamus Dewan from the first edition in 1970 to its latest edition published in 2005. She explains the method in compiling Kamus Dewan, finding the materials and the corpus data used in the production of a credible dictionary for public reference. It is thought that a more comprehensive dictionary cannot come at a better time, today. With the new monolingual dictionary being published, this does not mean that Kamus Dewan will continue to be abandoned, but it needs to lean on the most authoritative dictionary existing, which is the Kamus Dewan itself. Apart from that, as long as there is yet to be published a Malay dictionary that can perform as well as Kamus Dewan, then Kamus Dewan will continue to be improved and updated in order to cater for the needs of the Malay Language users.

Also, the study of Fadilah (1994) elaborates on information category in the dictionary based on the DBP-published dictionary. Her writing is indeed, the pioneering piece on the tradition of the Malay meta-lexicography which touches on several important information categories in Malay dictionaries. The category of information includes the information on spelling,

pronunciation, meaning, etymology, grammar and word usage.

All these studies except for the work of Fadilah (1994) have focused on the importance of a dictionary especially Kamus Dewan as the main dictionary in Malaysia. Other than the importance of Kamus Dewan, other essential information in the elaboration of entries or metalanguage is also crucial in the production of a Malay monolingual dictionary. As there are some things that need to be explained, this study needs to be done to identify the use of the information field that can help in the publication of an invaluable Malay monolingual dictionary used for public reference.

3. Methodology

The framework of the study used is based on the use of the general principles of lexicography guided by the review done by Béjoint (1994). He proposes three general principles contained in the metalanguage. The first is the language used to describe all lexical details of the language of the object chosen as the entry of the dictionary or the language which describes the object language. The second lies in the way this language presents the linguistics and non-linguistics information of the object language or the way it talks about the object. Thirdly, the conventions of lexicography used to represent this information. This study is confined to the fact that the aim and objective of identifying the field or category of information in both these monolingual dictionaries are important aspects in the compilation of a quality and credible monolingual dictionary. The study data total 1087 entries from both dictionaries, where they were selected systematically and manually using the random sampling approach. The approach used in this study is the content analysis method and library method. The former is used to analyze three main aspects in information field or category namely word usage, etymology and cross-referencing in KD4 and KBBI4. The latter is used in this study as there are related books used as reference as to obtain some useful facts other than giving the impact to the study materials. Other than that, researcher also looked for some additional reference materials from journals, working papers, theses, and so on as to obtain some support contents. The study instrument comprises of two monolingual dictionaries, and they are KD4 (2010) published by the DBP, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia; and KBBI4 (2011) published by Balai Pustaka, Jakarta, Indonesia. The data obtained were analysed in both qualitative and quantitative manner.

4. Study Findings

4.1 Word Usage

This aspect refers to the suitability of a word used in certain contexts and situations (Fadilah, 1994: 6). Dictionary users can obtain word usage information by referring to the label guide used in an entry. The use of these labels gets to inform dictionary users if a word or a phrase can be used suitably in a certain context and situation. Both dictionaries place the word label information after the main entry and the limit of use marked by certain labels or symbols.

The analysis of findings shows that KD4 (2010) has two labels of *ragam bahasa* (language style) and *bidang* (field). There are six types of language style labels ark - arkaik, bp - *bahasa percakapan*, sl - *sastera lama*, bh - *bahasa halus*, bk - *bahasa kasar*, and sr - *seruan*. The

label of field comes in 12 types such as *Ubat - perubatan*, *Bio - biologi*, *Muz - seni muzik*, *Mat - matematik*, *Kim - kimia/sains nuklear*, *Lin - linguistik*, and so on. Meanwhile for KBBI4 (2011) there are labels of language style, field and word class. The label of language style comes in three types *ark- arkais*, *cak - ragam cakapan* and *kl - klasik*. There are 17 types for the label of field: *Kim - kimia*, *Isl - agama Islam*, *Ling - linguisitik*, *Lay - pelayaran*, *Dok - kedokteran dan fisiologi*, *Mus - Musik*, and so on. There are seven types of word class label which are *n - nomina*, *a - adjektiva*, *v - verba*, *adv - adverbialia*, *p - partikel*, *pron - pronominal*, and *num - numeralia*. From the analysis outcomes of KD4 and KBBI4 about the total entry in the label of word usage, researcher is able to conclude this in Table 1 which is by displaying types and total number of entry for the label of word usage in both KD4 and KBBI4:

Table 1. Types and number of entry of the label of word usage in KD4 and KBBI4

Name of Dict.	Type & No of entry of Usage Label	Name of Dict.	Type & No of entry of Usage Label
KD4 (2010)	a) Label Ragam Bahasa (117) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ark – arkaik (60) • bp - bahasa percakapan (27) • sl - sastra lama (25) • bk - bahasa kasar (3) • bh - bahasa halus (1) • sr – seruan (1) b) Label Bidang (45) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ubat – perubatan (11) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kim - kimia/sains nuklear (9) • Lin – linguistik (8) • Bio – biologi (4) • Fiz – fizik (3) • Muz - seni muzik (2) • Geo - geografi (2) • Mat – matematik (2) • Tks - tekstil (1) • Ast – astronomi (1) • Sej – sejarah (1) • ERT - ekonomi rumah tangga (1) 	KBBI4 (2011)	a) Label Ragam Bahasa (84) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ark – arkais (39) • cak – ragam cakapan (25) • kl – klasik (20) b) Label Bidang (51) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kim – kimia (11) • Isl - agama Islam (7) • Ling – linguistik (6) • Lay – pelayaran (4) • Dok – kedokteran dan fisiologi (4) • Mus – muzik (4) • Fis – fisika (2) • Geo - geografi dan geologi (2) • Mat – matematika (2) • Olr – olahraga (2) • Met – meteorologi (1) • Sas - sosiologi (1) • Bio – biologi (1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ek - ekonomi dan keuangan (1) • Pol - politik dan pemerintahan (1) • Zool – zoologi (1) • Bot – botani (1) c) Label Kelas Kata (994) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n – nomina (686) • a – adjektiva (153) • v – verba (132) • adv – adverbialia (12) • p - partikel (9) • pron – pronominal (1) • num – numeralia (1)

From the table above, as many as 117 entries have used the label of language style. Label *arkaik* (*ark*) makes up the most, which is 60 entries in this study. This label is commonly used as a reminder that the word concerned is seldom used. Other than that, its used is confined to a particular district or area, or if the word is orthodox or obsolete, or if it is disputed due to the fact that it may have been wrongly read, wrongly written, wrongly heard and so on (KD4, 2010: 1). The label of language style includes the language of speech which only covers 27 entries, old literature 25 entries, figurative language 3 entries and each entry for the label of exclamation and discreet language. The label of field in KD4 only shows 12 fields or 45 entries after being analysed by researcher. The label of field: *Ubat – perubatan* notes the highest number of entries which is 11 entries from the whole study data. 9 entries are from label *Kim - kimia/sains nuklear*; eight entries in *Lin – linguistik*; *Bio – biologi* 4 entries; *Fiz – fizik* 3 entries; *Muz - seni muzik*, *Mat - matematik* dan *Geo – geografi* each with two entries; and, *Tks – tekstil*, *Ast – astronomi*, *Sej – sejarah*, and *ERT - ekonomi rumah tangga* only one entry. Example 1 shows the label of language style ‘*ark – arkaik*’ after the root entry of “**dafnah**”. The label of ‘*Geog – geografi*’ applies for Example 2 “**doldrum**”.

Example 1

dafnah ark sj tumbuhan (pokok kecil) yg daunnya dibuat

mahkota pahlawan.

(KD4, 2010: 300)

Example 2

doldrum (Geog) zon angin tenang yg berhampiran dgn

khatulistiwa.

(KD4, 2011: 360)

For KBBI4, the language style label has 84 entries in three types of label namely *ark – arkaik* (39 entries), *cak - ragam cakapan* (25 entries) and, *kl – klasik* (20 entries). The field label has 17 types or in total 51 entries. Among them are *Kim – kimia* (11 entries); *Isl - agama Islam* (seven entries); *Ling – linguistik* (six entries); *Lay – pelayaran*, *Mus – musik* dan *Dok - kedokteran dan fisiologi* (four entries); *Fis – fisika* (two entries); *Geo - geografi dan geologi*, *Mat – matematika*, *Olr – olahraga* (two entries); *Met – meteorologi*, *Sas – sosiologi*, *Bio – biologi*, *Ek - ekonomi dan keuangan*, *Pol - politik dan pemerintahan*, *Zool – zoologi* and *Bot – botani* (one entry). For the label of word class, 994 entries are found in this study. Label *n – nomina* makes up the largest entries with 686 entries, then *a – adjektiva* 153 entries, *v – verba* 132 entries, *adv – adverbialia* (12 entries), *p – partikel* nine entries, *pron – pronominal* and *num – numeralia* one entry each. Example 3 “**ba.cut, ke.ba.cut**” includes the label of word class ‘*adv – adverbialia*’ first, and then ‘*cak – ragam cakapan*’ before the meaning is elaborated. As for example 4 the word class label ‘*n – nomina*’ is placed after the main entry “**ko.ba.la.min**” and the label of field, ‘*Kim – kimia*’ before the meaning elaboration of that entry.

Example 3

ba.cut, ke.ba.cut adv cak telanjur

(KBBI4, 2011: 110)

Example 4

ko.ba.la.min *n* Kim vitamin B₁₂, suatu senyawa

kompleks kobalt

(KBBI4, 2011: 710)

The finding has shown that the labels of language style and field exist in both dictionaries do exist in both the monolingual dictionaries. KBBI4 is less intensive in using the label of language style (84 entries) than KD4 (117 entries). For the label of field in KBBI4 (51 entries) the usage is more intensive compared to KD4 (45 entries). However, the shortcoming of KD4 is that it does not include important information which is word class label if compared with KBBI4. This causes the usage of word class to be very intensive for KBBI4 (994 entries). According to Ibrahim Ahmad (2006), the aspect of word usage label is diasystematic by nature. In the context of lexicography, the diasystematic information application is a comprehensive method which determines the limitation in using a word or phrase elaborated through the usage label.

4.2 Etymology

According to Fadilah Jasmani (1994: 5), etymology or the origin of the word revolves around the change of the form and/or the meaning of the word detected throughout the period of change, from the original language to the form and meaning of the target language. This aspect is included in the category of diachronic information (Hartmann & James, 1998: 74). The *Oxford English Dictionary* in 12 volumes first published in 1928 is a pioneering dictionary that makes the effort to include etymology or word origin in its every entry. Etymology descriptions or word origin are found to exist in both dictionaries of study and placed after the main entry or root entry. However, the explanation is limited and brief for instance a word originates from a dialect, or a foreign word using the label of abbreviation only.

Some 305 entries (28.06%) from the whole study data have this etymological aspect. From 305 entries, only 90 entries or 29.51% have etymologically original language in the same entry for both dictionaries. Next, 81 entries from the total of 90 entries have the same etymological descriptions and entries. Example 5 shows the same etymology for entry “**ajak II**,²**ajak**”. The explanation on this etymology is confined to the original language or word origin, or its abbreviation, placed after the main entry. The etymological original language of the Malay words in Example 5 comes from Minangkabau (Mn, *Mk*). The rest, or 9 entries with different etymological descriptions have the same entry, nonetheless. The data are displayed in Example 6. The entry for Example 6 “**bacak I**,¹**ba.cak**” feeds on the word origin or etymology with the label of abbreviation after the main entry. As an instance, Example 6 namely “**bacak I**” in KD4 originates from Jakarta with the abbreviation Jk. Meanwhile in KBBI4, the entry “¹**ba.cak**” in Example 6 comes from Minangkabau with the label *Mk*.

Example 5

ajak II Mn sama dgn, seakan-akan, seperti, ...

(KD4, 2010: 20)

²**ajak** *Mk* p serupa (dng); seperti; ...

(KBBI4, 2011: 22)

Example 6

bacak I Jk lunak kerana banyak airnya (tanaman dll), basah. (KD4, 2010: 100)

¹**ba.cak** Mk a berbintik-bintik (tt bulu): ayam -- (KBB14, 2011: 110)

The rest or 215 entries or 70.49% have their etymology but it is not contained in the same entry. Example 7 shows the entry “**ajab**” using an Arabic etymology with the label Ar after the root entry in KD4 (2010). However, the entry of “**a.jab**” in KBB14 does not place any etymology in the entry. Both entries are the same in KD4 and KBB14 but they do not have the same etymology. The entry in KD4 has etymology information but KBB14 does not place any label of etymology after its main entry.

Example 7

ajab Ar sl hairan (KD, 2010: 20)

a.jab a hairan (KBB14, 2011: 22)

The etymological explanation in KD4 is not thoroughly provided. It only goes on to state that the original language of a word has seeped into the Malay vocabulary, but its foreign characteristics are still felt, without insomuch considering the level or degree of permeation of the word among language users. This limited etymological information is hoped to be able to become the starting point of further studies on borrowing words. From the analysis of the study, the etymological information in KD4 can be referred in *usage guideline* and the total is 283 entries. Meanwhile, for KBB14 it can be referred in *adoption indicator* totalling 111 lemma (word entry). The etymological explanations in KD4 and KBB14 are shown in Table 2:

Table 2. Etymological Explanations in KD4 and KBB14

No.	Etymology (KD4)	Total.	Etymology (KBB14)	Total.
1.	Ar – Arab	59	Mk – Minangkabau	41
2.	Mn – Minangkabau	52	Jw - Jawa	24
3.	Jw – Jawa	49	Ar – Arab	20
4.	Jk – Jakarta	44	Jk - Melayu Jakarta	16
5.	IB - Indonesia Belanda	39	Cn – Cina	2
6.	Id – Indonesia	22	Sd – Sunda	2
7.	Kl – Kelantan	7	Brk – Berik	1
8.	C – Cina	7	Sp – Spanyol	1
9.	Ph – Pahang	1	Bk – Biak	1
10.	NS - Negeri Sembilan	1	Bt – Batak	1
11.	Pr – Perak	1	Plb – Palembang	1
12.	Kd – Kedah	1	Mal – Melayu Malaysia	1
	Total	283	Total	111

From this table, for KD4, the foreign language or Arabic makes up the most entries or 59 entries. This is followed by Minangkabau containing 52 entries and Javanese (49 entries). Next, we have 44 entries for Jakarta, Indonesian Dutch languages (39 entries), Indonesian (22 entries), Kelantanese (7 entries), Chinese (7 entries), and one entry each for languages of Pahang, Negeri Sembilan, Perak dan Kedah. The most is the Minangkabau Language in KBBI4 which is 41 lemma (word entry). The least is one entry in Berik, Spanish, Biak, Batak, Palembang and Malaysian Malay. The other lemma (word entry)s are Javanese (24 lemma (word entry)), Arabic (20 lemma (word entry)), Jakarta Malay (16 lemma (word entry)) and two entries in Sundanese and Chinese. All in all, KD4 uses more etymological information than KBBI4.

The explanation on the etymological information or the origin of words is apparent in both dictionaries. KD4 (283 entries) carries more entries as compared to KBBI4 (111 entries). Such information is substantial as a user cannot use a word effectively without knowing its root and origin. There are three purposes for having to have etymological information in dictionaries: to provide the information on the language history; to improve the understanding, either in the context of language in general and own language in particular; and to serve as a record of culture for one speaking in his or her own language other than providing evidence for the history of the culture and its relationships with others (Ibrahim Ahmad, 2006). The possibility is that etymological entries can contain anything either comprising of a brief statement from the closest sources to a complex essay tracing the history of a word from its original form in a language. Etymological information is crucial especially for native speakers who wish to know about the development of vocabulary over the years. This is why in any monolingual dictionary especially general dictionaries like *Oxford English Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, such piece of information is important for both non-native speakers and students.

4.3 Cross-Reference

Hartmann and James (1998: 74) in their study state that the cross-reference aspect is other information in the dictionary information category. Although cross-referencing is categorized as other information, it stands as one of the information that is important and essential in a dictionary, especially Malay monolingual dictionaries. This aspect gives notes of instruction or indicators to users so that they can refer to a section or other words. This seeks to further explain the meaning or perhaps, a given word that has the same meaning with the word in question. Actually, cross-referencing can be divided into two namely Explicit Cross-Reference and Implicit Cross-Reference. Thus, most dictionaries tend to use because the Explicit Cross-Reference as it is more accurate and that it can save up more space and word in a dictionary (Mohd. Rasdi, 2012: 13). The cross-reference symbol used in KD4 and KBBI4 is the same where it is in symbol form or arrow form (→).

In KD4, the symbol (→) *bermakna see* (KD4, 2010: xlix). The finding shows that only 63 entries (Refer to Attachment 1) in KD4 which use the cross-reference marks. The use of cross-referencing can be seen in two varying contexts. The first context is that users can find the meaning of an entry by directly cross-referencing to the root entry or termed Explicit

Cross-Reference. 27 entries use the first context. The description of the first context is exhibited in Example 8:

Example 8

dolim ark → **lalim**. (KD4, 2010: 360)

limbak → **lembak**. (KD4, 2010: 940)

In the context above, users can look up the meaning of the entry ‘**dolim**’ or ‘**limbak**’ by directly referring to the word ‘**lalim**’ or ‘**lembak**’. For the second context, the cross-referencing is included after meaning is given or termed Implicit Cross-Reference. In the total number of data in this study, only 36 entries use the second context. Example 9 shows the second context:

Example 9

bendar parit (di sawah dll), longkang; *menaikkan ~ sondai*

prb mempertahankan yg tidak mungkin dapat dipertahankan;

membendarkan mengalirkan sesuatu (air); *bagai ~ air ke bukit*

prb pekerjaan yg sia-sia; → **bandar II**.

(KD4, 2010: 160)

The example above enables the users to get the meaning ‘**bendar**’ or ‘parit (di sawah dll), longkang’ directly or enables them to refer to ‘**bandar II**’. Cross-reference is included after the description of meaning of an entry.

For KBBI4, the arrow (→) is also used as a marker for cross-referencing for unrecommended lemma (word entry), or for any lemma (word entry) variants which spelling is of a standard form (KBBI, 2011: xlii). KBBI4 has 74 entries (Refer to attachment 11) which use the cross-reference mark from the entire research data. All these entries use the first context where users can look up the meaning by directly making cross-reference to the root entry. Example 10 describes the information of the first context:

Example 10

¹**bacak** → **bacek** (KBBI4, 2011: 110)

¹**bacang** → **embacang** (KBBI4, 2011: 110)

The similarity with both dictionaries is that they contain the cross-reference information of the first context namely direct cross-reference or Explicit Cross-reference. The plus point for KD4 is including the second-context cross-reference or Implicit Cross-reference which is indirect cross-reference in 36 entries of the study. The cross-referencing adopted in both the dictionaries aims at helping the users know the official spelling of an entry in particular classic words or borrowing words (Mohd. Rasdi, 2012).

4. Conclusion

Having analysed both these monolingual dictionaries, it is found that both have fulfilled the most appropriate characteristics with their respective target users. Although there are only three aspects being studied, it is sufficient to expose the field or category of information in an entry covering both the linguistic or non-linguistic aspect in the Malay monolingual dictionaries. The study outcome demonstrates that there exist some differences, similarities and shortcomings in the information field of both dictionaries, KD4 (2010) and KBBI4 (2011). The dictionary makers have successfully included all basic information of an entry needed in the monolingual dictionary. It is found that both the dictionaries are able to serve as good and comprehensive points of reference for general use. Only the aspect of the arrangement or position is different in the information descriptions of an entry. In reality, there is yet to be an unflawed dictionary that can fulfill the needs of dictionary users. The strength of a dictionary can be seen in the field of information contained in the dictionary's own metalanguage. However, this heated dictionary practice to shift from one that is conventional (printed copy) to one that is electronic or in the form of digital copy will more or less influence the presentation and content of information of a dictionary entry (Tan Kim Hua & Woods, 2008). Therefore, this study would be useful to users especially educators, students and academicians on the exposure of the importance of information field or category in the arrangement of a Malay monolingual dictionary. This enables the users of the dictionary to not be influenced by the name and the physical image of the dictionary alone. But they have the right and are able to evaluate information categories contained in a "good" dictionary. A good dictionary is the one with its arrangement method well-tailored to the needs of the target market (Rahim Mat Leh, 2000). Indirectly speaking, the Malay monolingual dictionary deemed as 'good' and 'comprehensive' will definitely enrich the knowledge of users in the Malay Language and continue to popularize the language in the international domain.

References

- Asmah, H. O. (1987). *Perkamusan Melayu: Satu Penilaian*. Kuala Lumpur: Perpustakaan Universiti Malaya.
- Asmah, H. O. (1993). *Bahasa dan Alam Pemikiran Melayu*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Dale, E. et al. (1971). *Techniques of Teaching Vocabulary*. California: Field Educational Publications, Inc.
- Fadilah, J. (1994). Kategori Maklumat dalam Kamus. *Kertas Kerja Seminar Perkamusan Melayu*. 20-21 Disember. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Harimurti, K. (1993). *Kamus Linguistik*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Hartmann, R. R. K., & Gregory, J. (1998). *Dictionary of Lexicography*. London: Routledge. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203159040>

- Hishamudin, I., & Norshimah, M. A. (2011). Analisis Berasaskan Korpus Dalam Menstruktur Semula Kedudukan Makna Teras Leksikal Setia. *GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies*, 11(1), 143-158.
- Ibrahim, A. (1991). Information field Perkamusan Melayu: Suatu Penilaian terhadap Kamus Dewan dan Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia. *Jurnal Dewan Bahasa.*, 35 (7), 600-607.
- Ibrahim, A. (1992). Kosa Kata Perkamusan Melayu. *Pelita Bahasa*. August, 14-16.
- Ibrahim, A. (1994). *Perkamusan Melayu: Suatu Pengenalan*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa Pustaka.
- Ibrahim, A. (2004). *Perkamusan Melayu: Teori dan Amali*. Kuala Lumpur: Universiti Malaya.
- Ibrahim, A. (2006). Metabahasa Kamus untuk Penutur Asli dan Golongan Pelajar: Suatu Perbandingan. Dlm. Zubaidah Ibrahim, Abdul Rahim Mat Yassim & Supramani a/l Shoniah (pnyt.), *Kajian Bahasa dan Terjemahan*. Kuala Lumpur: Universiti Malaya Publisher.
- Lawrence, J. (1984). Some of Lexicography in SEA Englishes. *Kertas Berkala*. Singapura: Regional English Language Centre (RELC).
- Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia Edisi Keempat*. (2011). Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Kamus Dewan Edisi Keempat*. (2010). Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Mohd. Rasdi, S. (1994). Kamus Dewan dan Kamus Besar: Perbandingan Aspek Kandungan Information field. Retrieved from http://jpmipgmtaa.webs.com/Penulisan/KamusDewan_vs_KamusBesar_Jurnal_.pdf
- Noresah, B. (1993). Kamus Dewan. *Jurnal Dewan Bahasa*, 37(12), 1120-1127.
- Noresah, B. et al. (2009). *Kamus dan Perkamusan Melayu*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Rahim, M. L. (2000). *Kamus Mukhtahir Bahasa Melayu: Satu Tinjauan Dari Segi Linguistik*. Master Thesis in Arts. Serdang, Selangor: Universiti Putra Malaysia.
- Tan, K. H., & Woods, P. C. (2008). Media-related or generic-related features in electronic dictionaries: Learners' perception and preferences. *GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies*, 8(2), 1-17.
- Teeuw, A. (1964). Tentang Kamus dan Perkamusan Melayu. *Jurnal Dewan Bahasa*, 8(9), 388-397.
- Yusof, H. (1961). Kamus Melayu Sejak 1511. *Jurnal Dewan Bahasa*, 5(4), 151-161.

Attachment I

The Use of Direct and Indirect Cross-Reference in Entry KD4 2010

No.	Direct Cross-Reference Entry	Pg.	Indirect Cross-Reference Entry	Pg.
1.	cincang I → cencang I	280	bendar → bandar II	160
2.	cingah → cingangah	280	bibit II → bimbit	180
3.	dolim → lalim	360	cambah → kecambah	240
4.	jelepak → jelepok	620	dadap II → dedap	300
5.	jubung → jerubung	640	daduh → dadung	300
6.	karunia → kurnia	680	dadung → daduh	300
7.	kecipung → kecimpung	700	jelepak → lepak I	620
8.	keringsing → geringsing	760	kakok → kakap V	660
9.	kerinting I → keriting	760	kecuak → kecoak	700
10.	kuya I → keria I	860	kelintang → kelentang	720
11.	lawar I → lawa I	900	kerip → kerit I	760
12.	lencet → lecet	920	kudidi → kedidi	840
13.	limbak → lembak	940	kutu II → sekutu	860
14.	luasa → leluasa	960	lenci I → laici	920
15.	menjelai → enjelai; jelai	1020	lenda → landa II	920
16.	mensiu → mesiu	1020	marut I → carut	1000
17.	menta → meta I	1020	mengok → mengot	1020
18.	pegawai → peguam	1160	menjak → semenjak	1020
19.	puyuh III → puyu I	1260	menjana → semenjana	1020
20.	sambur → sabur	1380	menjelis → majlis II	1020
21.	sawo II → sawa I	1400	pohon II → mohon	1220
22.	Selan → sailan	1420	recak I → bercak	1300
23.	semilir → silir	1440	renyang → renyah II	1320
24.	sowan → soang	1520	renyeh I → ronyeh I	1320
25.	sowang → soang	1520	selampek → selampai I	1420
26.	tungkik → tukang II	1740	seminau → sinau	1440
27.	tungkul II → tongkol	1740	setenggar → istinggar	1480
28.			sulur II → suluh I	1540
29.			sulut → sundut III	1540
30.			syurah → syarah II	1560
31.			talang V → petalangan	1580
32.			tanggul I → anggul	1600
33.			tawarikh → tarikh	1620
34.			tembarau → teberau	1640
35.			tembera → tembera II	1640
36.			titir III → ketitir	1700

Attachment II

The Use of Direct Cross-Reference in Lemma (word entry) KBBI4 2011

No.	Entry	Pg.	No.	Entry	Pg.
1.	² alu → elu	45	38.	menjelis → majelis	901
2.	² bacak → bacek	110	39.	mensiu → mesiu	901
3.	¹ bacang → embacang	110	40.	menta → meta	901
4.	¹ bada → ¹ bakda	110	41.	mustak → musytak	944
5.	bendar → ¹ bandar	169	42.	mustami → mustamik	944
6.	bendel → ¹ bundel	169	43.	musykil → muskil	944
7.	¹ bendari → bendahari	169	44.	padi → pemadi	1005
8.	cingah → cingangah	268	45.	pegawam → peguam	1037
9.	² deras → daras	317	46.	podak → pandan	1086
10.	dolat → daulat	339	47.	¹ puyu → ³ puyuh	1125
11.	dolim → zalim	339	48.	¹ renyai → rinai	1166
12.	ekopraksia → ekofraksia	355	49.	sambur → sabar limbur	1215
13.	gadah → kadah	403	50.	selampek → ¹ selampai	1248
14.	jelentik → selentik	575	51.	Selan → Sailan	1248
15.	jelepak → jelepok	575	52.	semilir → ¹ silir	1263
16.	jubung → jerubung	590	53.	sepekuk → spekuk	1279
17.	kecindan → kecandan	645	54.	sepet → sipit	1280
18.	kecipung → kecimpung	645	55.	seteker → steker	1294
19.	kecuak → kecoak	645	56.	² singgung → ² sigung	1313
20.	kendak → gendak	667	57.	singkak → singkap	1313
21.	keringsing → ¹ geringsing	680	58.	sotor → sotoh	1333
22.	khabar → khabar	692	59.	sowan → soang	1333
23.	¹ kobak → kubak	710	60.	sowang → soang	1333
24.	kudidi → kedidi	750	61.	span → ¹ sepan	1333
25.	kudi → kodi	750	62.	spatbor → sepatbor	1333
26.	kudil → kudis	750	63.	syurah → ² syarah	1369
27.	² lanca → lancia	781	64.	syurga → surga	1369
28.	lencet → lecet	812	65.	talai → lalai	1383
29.	lenga → bijan	812	66.	talak → talk	1383
30.	luasa → leluasa	844	67.	tawarikh → tarikh	1413
31.	marwah → muruah	881	68.	¹ tembel → timbil	1430
32.	marzipan → marsepen	881	69.	² tembel → tambal	1430
33.	mengok → mengot	900	70.	tembera → tambera	1431
34.	menila → manila	900	71.	³ titir → ketitir	1474
35.	menjak → semenjak	901	72.	tungkik → ² tukik	1505
36.	menjana → semenjana	901	73.	² tungkul → ¹ tongkol	1505
37.	menjelai → enjelai; jelai	901	74.	war → uar	1556

Copyright Disclaimer

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).