Chapter - 3

Lexical Diversity and the Concepts of Semantic Differential and Componential Analysis
The chapter is going to deal with the analysis of the semantic ranges of various lexical items, the similarities and differences in their meanings, and other relations holding between them. For this purpose, the linguistic methods of componential analysis and semantic differential will be utilized.

The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section deals with componential analysis of diverse lexical items and the second section utilizes Osgood's method of semantic differential for analysis of message effects of various lexical items. The third section comes up with the conclusion of the chapter.

3.1. COMPONENTIAL ANALYSIS

Componential analysis is the method of breaking down a lexical item into its various components so that different shades of meaning of that lexical item get highlighted. Before going into the details, it will be pertinent to trace some history of the discipline of componential analysis.

3.1.1. Componential Analysis: An Introduction

Probably, the first thorough-going attempt at a systematic componential approach to meaning was that of the philosopher Leibniz. He hoped to express complex meanings in terms of even simpler meaning elements until he arrived at an inventory of unanalysable primitive semantic units. These, he thought, would constitute the 'alphabet' of
human thought.'

Leibniz's pioneering work was not taken up by any followers and it was not until the present century that interest in the problem revived. The first person to follow the work was the Danish linguist Hjemslev (1953). He started from the Saussurean picture of the linguistic sign as an arbitrary association between a meaning and a phonetic form. He postulated that since the phonetic form of the word could be analysed into simpler units (phonemes and ultimately distinctive features), the structure of language being essentially symmetrical, it must likewise be possible to analyse the meaning aspect of signs. Ultimately, Hjemslev introduced an inventory of 'content figurae' (elements of meaning) in terms of which the meanings of all vocabulary items in the language could be expressed.

Independently, in America, a componential approach to meaning was developed by certain anthropologists with a strong interest in kinship terminologies. A later more sophisticated version of componential theory was put forward by Katz and Fodor (1963). Most recently, Weirzbicka, taking inspiration directly from Leibniz, has suggested a radically new version of lexical decomposition, using only thirteen primitive notions.

It may be instructive to assess the use of the concept of
componential or feature analysis in linguistics and other related disciplines, as the notion of feature analysis serves as the basis of the view of semantic structure presented by Katz and Fodor's earlier treatment (1963) and Chomsky's later discussion (1965). It also finds its way indirectly into some aspects of later generative semanticists' views and branches out from the treatment of semantic categories in languages to the analysis of single words themselves. In fact, the analysis of meaning by semantic features is very similar to distinctive-feature analysis of speech sounds in generative phonology.

The earlier works by Goodenough (1956) and Lounsbury (1956) were very important for the later workers. Goodenough's study was fashioned to call attention to the problem of deriving signification from kinship terms and determining which of these forms go together in semantic systems. Meaning, in this respect, is to be considered as 'signification', completely distinct from connotation. Such an analysis teaches a person what he has to know about two persons to say that one is other's brother or cousin or aunt. It follows that individuals must possess certain criteria to judge, for example, that a given person is or is not another's cousin in the particular kinship system under consideration. Meaning in the signification sense is thus the particular set of criteria by which judgements like this are made.

Moreover, as Lounsbury (1956) points out, the categories need not
be overt but may be covert, though nevertheless real. For example, in comparing the following partial kinship sets, in English and Spanish,

uncle-aunt tio-tia  
son-daughter hijo-hija  
brother-sister hermano-hermana

One immediately notices that both language sets have distinct terms for the male kin term and the female kin term. That the male kin term is signalled in Spanish by an o-ending and female kin term by an a-ending does not in any way alter the fact that both languages differentiate between male and female kin terms in the kinship paradigm. The overt manifestation in Spanish is a feature of that language and can be considered an overt category, but the situation in English is no less real because it is not signalled overtly. Rather, it is a simple covert category. In addition to drawing this conclusion, we have extracted a single atom of meaning, male as opposed to female, with which we can define the differences between uncle, son and brother as a group as opposed to aunt, daughter and sister as a group.

This notion of feature analysis was sophisticated to deal with compact and tightly defined systems like kinship in which the boundaries of a given semantic field within a given language-culture setting can be defined by means of a small set of variable features. In this framework, each term such as kin terms are defined within that field by listing the
features that define it. Presumably, all kin terms in all languages can be 
defined in terms of components such as PARENT OF, SIBLING OF, 
CHILD OF, CONSANGUINEAL, AFFINAL, MALE, FEMALE and a 
few others, together with rules for combination and recursion. The 
common feature of kinship is what relates all the members of this 
particular semantic field and the notion of separate atom-like features of 
meaning enable us to define each term in relation to every other term 
such as both the similarities as well as differences within that field get 
pinpointed.

Such descriptions of meaning by feature analysis are clearly 
denotational enterprises, as opposed to the description of meaning by, 
say, the semantic differential. The starting point is the notion that 
components can be factored out as a set of defining features providing 
critical information about the attributes by which such terms are 
recognized within the field they inhabit.

Ethnolinguistic investigations have restricted the use of 
componential analysis to the areas of cultural experience like kinship, 
colour categories, ethnobotany, disease and so on. Generative 
grammatical theory's application of the concept is to a broader field, the 
semantics of natural languages.

In componential analysis, the meaning of individual word gets 
broken down into atoms of meaning. The atom-like units were termed as
semantic markers by Katz and Fodor. Such markers express a characteristic shared by an entire group of words and differentiate it from other groups of words which presumably are characterized by similar defining features. Examples include animate-inanimate, human-nonhuman, count-noncount, male-female and so on.

As is clear, componential analysis means the breakdown of the lexical items into their component shades of meaning. By this procedure, the meaning of a word can be established in terms of componential features. The componential analysis of a word may help in breaking the word into a list of components present in its meaning. The components of a word are selected in terms of semantic space structured by various semantic dimensions such as generation, shape, colour, etc. It is a binary opposition as under:

- adult — child
- male — female
- married — unmarried

The componential analysis of the words 'man' and 'woman' can be made in the following manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Woman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+human</td>
<td>-male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+adult</td>
<td>+adult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Such a description is known as componential description and each dimension of meaning is known as semantic opposition. The componential analysis describes the similarities and differences of meaning between a pair of words. In this analysis the '+' and '-' signs are very much in use. The plus sign indicates the presence of a feature while minus sign indicates the absence. The '+-' sign means that the feature may be present or may not be present.

The componential analysis is a suitable measure for disambiguating lexical items. Katz and Fodor (1963) proposed the semantic theory for explication of the different meanings possessed by ambiguous lexical items. In their analysis, they have classified the semantic components into two types, viz., semantic markers and semantic distinguishers.

In her article 'Semantics and Syntax', Ruqaya Hassan (1975) has described the 'semantic components' as, "the components of the semantic level may be characterized as that sub-set of meaningful abstractions and relations whose meaningfulness can be determined language-internally. Thus the lexical item 'smile', a symbol of the code English language, realizes a set of semantic components, which are themselves language-determined abstractions referring to the extralinguistic gesture of smile. They are not replications of an extra-linguistic process, object or state, etc., but have to be seen as theoretical constructs, with no concrete
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existence."

She has given the following representation of word 'Smile':

*Smile* [Process of reaction: ascribed to animate participant; limited to the ascribed participant: attitudinal modification;........]

All of these components are abstractions and none may be pointed out individually in the real world of experience.

As portrayed by Ruqaya, the set of semantic components of any item or category is partially ordered, i.e., the presence of some components may argue for that of the others. It can be explained through the component 'PROCESS' as found in 'smile'. It follows that the presence of component 'PROCESS' implies the presence of components specifying 'PARTICIPANT' and 'MODIFICATION', as in the case of 'smile'.

3.1.2. Katz and Fodor's Model

The breaking down of lexical items into components can be seen in Katz and Fodor's semantic theory also. The theory was the first published work on the treatment of semantics within generative grammar and was published under the title 'The Structure of a Semantic Theory' (1963). The theory has been modified and refined since. Katz and Fodor made two fundamental observations regarding the assignment of meaning to sentences. Firstly, the assignment of meaning to sentences must be
effected by recursive rules and, secondly, that the pairing of sentences with a meaning is not arbitrary but is mediated by the syntactic structure and lexical content of the sentence. Therefore, the task conceived is "that of (i) giving specifications of the meanings of lexical items and (ii) giving recursive rules operating over syntactic structures for building up meaning specifications for phrases and sentences out of meaning specifications for lexical items." (Fodor, 1982).

The lexical items and their pairing with meaning together constitute the 'dictionary' of the language. Each dictionary entry consists of one or more readings where each reading represents one sense of the lexical item. The readings for larger expressions are reached through the readings for their constituents through the recursive rules known as 'projection rules'. Projection rules project morpheme readings onto phrase and ultimately sentence readings.

The meanings of both lexical items and larger constituents are regarded as concepts. These concepts are considered as analyzable into simpler atomic concepts which are labelled as semantic markers and semantic distinguishers. The semantic markers and distinguishers thus constitute the vocabulary out of which all readings are composed. The distinction between markers and distinguishers was drawn by Katz and Fodor as under:
"Semantic markers are the elements in terms of which semantic relations are expressed in a theory .... the semantic markers assigned to a lexical item in a dictionary entry are intended to reflect whatever systematic relations hold between that item and the rest of the vocabulary of the language. On the other hand, the distinguishers assigned to a lexical item are intended to reflect what is idiosyncratic about the meaning of that item."

Hence, a dictionary entry can be regarded as a hierarchically structured complex of grammatical markers, semantic markers, distinguishers and selection restrictions. The best known example is dictionary entry given by Katz and Fodor for English word 'bachelor', which is reproduced in next page.

Also consider the word 'chair' for which Katz has given the following dictionary entry:

( Object ), ( Physical ), ( Non-living ), ( Artifact ), ( Furniture ), ( Portable ), ( Something with legs ), ( Something with a back ), ( Something with a seat ), ( Seat for one ).

In the backdrop of the above discussion, it is clear that the concepts or meanings of a lexical item are analyzable into smaller concepts, i.e., semantic markers and distinguishers which are "thus close relatives of the semantic components of traditional componential analysis." (Fodor, 1982).
The dictionary entry of word 'bachelor' as given by Katz and Fodor (72)
3.1.3. Componential Analysis of Lexical Items of Urdu News Media

After thoroughly going through the details of componential analysis, its importance and usefulness becomes automatically clear. In the case of lexical diversity, its usefulness becomes manifold.

In Urdu news media, a great variety of lexical diversity is evident and the news editors have exploited the rich diversity according to their own plans. Through the componential analysis of these words one can know the semantic ranges of these lexical items. These lexical items are used in somewhat synonymous context and it also demonstrates their collocational settings within a lexical set. "A lexical set may be defined at the primary level of delicacy as a grouping of items which have the potentiality of realising at least one semantic component in common." (R. Hassan, 1975). To indicate her point she has given the following lexical set: cap, button, clasp, cover, close, fold, wind, tie, etc. In the semantic description of the above lexical set, there must appear a component which may be formulated as, 'process of bringing together to form one body' and all items for the set will collocate with the items: material, clothing, parcel, string.

Now consider the following lexical items which also form a lexical set: JANGJU, ASKARYAT PASAND, DAHSHAT GARD, MILITANT, DAHSHAT PASAND, INTIHA PASAND, MUJAHID, SHIDDAT PASAND.
In this lexical set some sort of resemblance occurs which can be expressed through the component 'a quarrelsome person using a weapon to achieve his goal'. However, as mentioned earlier, the items of this set do not possess total synonymy and in some words aspects of antonymy are more evident. It can be highlighted by going through the componential analysis of these words, which is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JANGJU</td>
<td>Adj. (+contentious) (+quarrelsome) (+warrior)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASKARYAT PASAND</td>
<td>Adj. (+soldier) (+army person) (+warrior) (+terrorist) (+military) (+forces personnel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTIHA PASAND</td>
<td>Adj. (+extremist) (+terrorist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAHSHAT GARD</td>
<td>Adj. (+Horrible) (+frightening) (+terrorist) (+terror-striking) (+fear-producing) (+panick-creator) (+extremist) [+a person using weapons for destructive purposes]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUJAHID</td>
<td>Adj. (+warrior for faith) (+crusader) (+trying person) (+hero) [+fighter against infidels]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILITANT</td>
<td>Adj. (+warrior) (+extremist) (+quarrelsome) (+terrorist)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SHIDDAT PASAND : Adj. (+violence-loving) (+vehement) (+force-loving) (+force-using) (±terrorist)

It will not be out of place to mention a few words about the assignment of semantic components to these words. For the said purpose, some well known Urdu-English dictionaries, including Haq. Maulvi Abdul and Shakespear 1849. Dictionary : Hindustani and English and English and Hindustani (London), were brought to use. The semantic components of the words JANGJU"warrior" and MUJAHID"crusader" were easily traceable from these dictionaries. However, lexical items ASKARYAT PASAND"war loving", DAHSHAT GARD"terrorist", INTIHA PASAND"extremist" and SHIDDAT PASAND"extremist" could not be located in their entirety in these dictionaries. It owes to the fact that these lexical items were coined, mainly in this decade, following a spurt in global militancy. As such the news editors have framed these words for use in militancy-ridden places, using the suffix PASAND with roots like DAHSHAT"terror", SHIDDAT"severe, extreme", etc. These roots form the basic semantic core of these lexical items and their shades of meaning are well described in the dictionaries. Besides this, the timing and place of the coinage of above words, their collocational environments and their contextual uses provide sufficient grounds for spelling out the components of their meaning. Taking these factors into consideration, the componential analysis of these lexical items was
formulated.

In the above set, the lexical items MUJAHID"crusader" and DAHSHAT GARD"terrorist" stand poles apart in terms of their semantic features. It can be easily ascertained through a glimpse of their componential features. While a DAHSHAT GARD"terrorist" is a barbaric person bent upon destruction, arson, loot, etc. a MUJAHID"crusader" is a pious and justice-loving person fighting for a noble cause. The componential analysis of the two words portrays entirely different components of the two words with nothing in common. In contrast, their semantic features stand in full opposition to each other. The lexical item DAHSHAT GARD"terrorist" contains extremely negative and obnoxious features like (+terrorist), (+extremist) (+ dreadful ). etc., while MUJAHID"crusader" possesses the positive features of (+warrior for faith) (+crusader), etc. The componential analysis of these words certainly goes a long way in portraying the entirely opposite pictures of DAHSHAT GARD"terrorist" and MUJAHID"crusader". i.e., a negative one in the former and a positive one in the latter. Above all, the features (+crusader) (+fighter against infidels) and (+hero) are idiosyncratic only to MUJAHID"crusader".

The lexical items DAHSHAT PASAND"terrorist", INTIHA PASAND"extremist" and SHIDDAT PASAND"extremist" come in close approximation to DAHSHAT GARD"terrorist". All of them contain the
semantic features portraying the images of extremist, vehement and fear-producing persons with a terrorist colour. However, in case of terms SHIDDAT PASAND"extremist" and INTIHA PASAND"extremist", the features (+terrorist) is not obligatory as shown by a '±' sign. A person can be an extremist in his ideas and deeds but need not be a terrorist. It highlights the semantic range and semantic dimension of these two terms and clearly illustrates the difference between these two words and other words of the lexical set. Evidently, the items have more collocational dimensions than the terms DAHSHAT PASAND"terrorist" and DAHSHAT GARD"terrorist".

They are followed by the terms ASKARYAT PASAND"warrior", JANGJU"fighter" and MILITANT"militant". Out of them, the latter has been borrowed into Urdu news media from English language. As such, its components were formulated keeping in view its status in Urdu and not in English. The three words share the semantic feature (+Warrior). However, it differs from the semantic feature of MUJAHID"crusader" where it is (+warrior for the faith). The componential analysis of JANGJU"fighter" portrays the picture of a contentious and quarrelsome person. The features (+quarrelsome) and (+contentious) can be ascribed to any person, which lends the term JANGJU"fighter" a more neutral colour than other lexical items of this set, which portray negative image of a terrorist. Similarly, the semantic features of ASKARYAT
PASAND "warrior" show the inclination of a person towards weaponry and can be used for both army personnel and terrorists. It is also a mild word as compared to above mentioned words. It will not be out of place to mention that both these terms JANGJU "fighter" and ASKARYAT PASAND "warrior" are in frequent use in Urdu newspapers of Kashmir valley, which is sufficient to show the conditions they work in. It is clear that they choose to play safe by utilizing these mild and moderate words. Lastly, the analysis ends up in the word 'MILITANT' which is used for an extremist person. But as its features reveal, it is surely more mild than the word DAHSHAT GARD "terrorist". As such the word is also used very widely.

As is evident from the above discussion, the componential analysis is a useful method for establishing the resemblances and differences between pairs of words. The semantic resemblances and differences provide a fruitful yardstick to gauge the semantic ranges of these lexical items. Consider the following pairs of words and their componential analysis:

(a) GAMSAN : Adj. (+battle) (+crowd) (+engagement) (+full of arrogance) (+forceful)

ZORDAR : Adj. (+forceful) (+strong) (+powerful) (+robust)
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(b) AZAYIM

: Noun (+purpose) (+resolution)
   (+intention) (+will) (+desire)

IRADE

: Noun (+desire) (+intention)
   (+will) (+plan)

(c) SARKAR

: Noun (+government) (+lord)
   (+court) (+judiciary)
   (+dominion) [+A title showing respect to a person present or absent]

HAKUMAT

: Noun (+government)
   (+authority) (+sovereignty)
   (+dominion) (+power)
   (+choice) (+option)
   (+oppression) (+compulsion)

(d) TAYYARA

: Noun (+aeroplane) (+airship)

JAHAZ

: Noun (+ship) (+big boat)
   (+aeroplane) (+very big) (+very wide)
   (+Big ship used for carrying trade material and used for travel in sea)

(e) MAIYAR

: Noun (+standard)
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While going through the componential features of these terms, their semantic domains get clearly highlighted and the resemblances and differences between them come to the fore. To vindicate this claim, the pairs will be studied one by one.

(a). GAMSAN : ZORDAR

In this set, the items GAMSAN "severe" and ZORDAR "strong, powerful" come under scrutiny. As is clear from their componential analysis, the two words do not possess many features in common. It is the semantic feature (+forceful) which has lent them sort of synonymy.

The semantic features (+battle) (+crowd) (+engagement) (+full of arrogance) are lacking in the lexical item ZORDAR "strong, powerful". These features are sufficient to determine the semantic range of GAMSAN "severe". It becomes clear that the word GAMSAN "severe" is particularly used in the context of war or fighting. It has been rightly used by Qaumi Awaz (Nov. 2, 1995) in the following manner:

SRI LANKA MEN GAMSAN KI JANG HO RAHI HAI

"In Sri Lanka heavy fighting is going on".
It is clear from the above discussion that the word GAMSAN "severe" has a collocational affinity with the Urdu words for war, i.e., LADAYI "fight, war" or JANG "war, battle". Its semantic features clearly portray that the lexical item is used to sketch the intensity of war.

In contrast to this, the componential analysis of the word ZORDAR "strong, powerful" contains, in addition to (+forceful), the semantic features of (+strong), (+powerful) and (+robust). These features provide a clear picture of the semantic domain of the word ZORDAR "strong, powerful", which clearly is more wider and broader than that of the word GAMSAN "severe". Through the word ZORDAR "strong, powerful", the intensity and vigorousness of something gets highlighted, as can be shown through the way it has been used by HIND SAMACHAR in the following sentence:

SRI LANKA MEN ZORDAR LADAYI
"Heavy fighting in Sri Lanka".

(Hind Samachar, Nov. 2, 1995)

The word ZORDAR "strong, powerful" can collocate with a variety of words, serving as an adjective to indicate forcefulness, powerfulness, intensity and vigorousness of, for example, rain, kick, etc., as in:

ZORDAR BARISH (HO RAHI HAI) "heavy rain (is falling)"
ZORDAR MUKKA "powerful/forceful punch".
(b). AZAYIM and IRADE

Both the words under study are nouns and share many semantic features in common. The semantic features (+will), (+desire), (+intention), (+resolution) describe the semantic shades of the two items. It is indicative of the contextual and collocational affinity of the two items. Practically also, the two words are used almost in same sense such as:

NAPAK AZAYIM : NAPAK IRADE "bad intentions"
NEK AZAYIM : NEK IRADE "good intentions"

It follows that the two words possess synonymy to a great extent and have almost identical semantic ranges.

(c). SARKAR and HAKUMAT

In this set, the words SARKAR "government" and HAKUMAT "government" are encountered. The two words are mostly used interchangeably. However, the componential analysis of the two items reveals some interesting facts. It is the features (+government), (+dominion) and (+judiciary) which are shared by both lexical items and brings the two terms in the same lexical set. However, the other components demarcate the fields of the two words. In SARKAR "government", the feature of (+lord) indicates that it can be used for a high-status person like a king, minister, director, etc. The
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idiosyncratic feature of the word SARKAR "government", namely. [+A title showing respect to a person, present or absent] provides the proof in this regard. That is. the word is also used by the subordinates to refer to or address their superordinates. It means that it is a lexical marker of power-solidarity relationship.

In case of HAKUMAT "government", the semantic features (+government), (+authority), (+dominion) suffice to bring the word closer to the notion of (democratic) government in the present context. However, the features (+oppression) and (+compulsion), which are idiosyncratic to HAKUMAT "government" point towards the origin of the word, i.e., HUKUM "order".

The semantic features of both HAKUMAT "government" and SARKAR "government" trace the lexical and semantic fields of the two words, where both the items can be used in the same context:

MARKAZI HAKUMAT : MARKAZI SARKAR "central government"
RIYASTI HAKUMAT : RIYASTI SARKAR "state government"

However, the word SARKAR "government" can also be used as under:

SARKAR AAJ NAHIN AYE "Sir/Lord didn't come today"
NAHIN SARKAR "No, Sir"
while as *HAKUMAT AAJ NAHIN AYE*"the government didn't come today" and *NAHIN HAKUMAT*"no, government" will be ungrammatical.

(d). TAYYARA and JAHAZ

In this set the words TAYYARA"aeroplane" and JAHAZ"aeroplane, ship" have found place. A cursory glance at the semantic features of the two words is enough to visualize the resemblances and differences between these words. As is clear, the word 'TAYYARA' contains the features (+aeroplane) and (+airship) which depict what kind of ship it is. Naturally, the semantic range of the word appears very much narrow as compared to the word 'JAHAZ' which has, in addition to (+aeroplane), the features (+ship), (+big boat), etc., which clearly shows that it can be both an aeroplane or a ship. The semantic range of the lexical item has not been narrowed as compared to 'TAYYARA'. It is only the context 'JANGI JAHAZ' and 'JANGI TAYYARE' which has brought the two words in the same lexical set.

(e). MAIYAR and KASWATI

In the last set, the words MAIYAR"standard" and KASWATI"touchstone" are found. The semantic features of MAIYAR"standard" and KASWATI"touchstone" are almost identical. Both words possess almost the same range and are used in an identical manner.
The lexical diversity of Urdu news media owes much to synonymy. Urdu news media is full of synonymous lexical items where varying degrees of synonymy are involved. Componential analysis plays a crucial role in establishing the synonymous words and degrees of synonymy. Consider the following set of words with their componential analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Componential Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHADID</td>
<td>Adj. (+strong) (+difficult)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+vigorous) (+painful) (+grievous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+harsh) (+atrocious) (+violent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+vehement) (+intense)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZABARDAST</td>
<td>Adj. (+strong) (+powerful)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+vigorous) (+handsome) (+tyrant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+oppressor) (+very big) (+intense)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHOFNAK</td>
<td>Adj. (+frightful) (+terrifying)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+terrorful)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above lexical set, the first two items i.e. SHADID "severe" and ZABARDAST "powerful, dominant" possess more synonymy with each other than with the last word, namely, KHOFNAK "fearful". In SHADID "severe" and ZABARDAST "powerful", the semantic features (+strong), (+vigorous) and (+intense) lend the two items synonymy to some extent. However, the degree of synonymy being less, the two terms cannot be termed as total or absolute synonyms. It is under the looser
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interpretation of synonymy that the two words put up. However, the idiosyncratic features of the two lexical items, i.e., the features which are not shared by the two lexical items with each other set them apart on the scale of synonymy. Still, in the presence of the shared features the two words help themselves to be grouped under the label of 'cognitive synonyms'.

In contrast to ZABARDAST "powerful" and SHADID "severe", the lexical item KHOFNAK "fearful" does not share any semantic feature with any of the above two words. That is, it holds an extreme point and as such can't be grouped under the title of synonymy with any of the two words. However, the word KHOFNAK "fearful" has been rendered synonymous to the word ZABARDAST "powerful" due to its contextual use, as can be shown by the news items in which the two words have been used by news editors:

CONNAUGHT PLACE MEN ZABARDAST BAM DHAMAKA
"Powerful blast in Connaught Place".
(Qaumi Awaz. Nov. 22. 1995).

DILLI MEN KHOFNAK DHAMAKE SE TIS SE ZAYID AFRAD ZAKHMI
"More than thirty persons injured in a dreadful blast in Delhi".
(Hind Samachar. Nov. 22. 1995).
In case of the latter news item, the news editor has successfully exploited the emotive value of the term KHOFNAK "fearful". Compared to ZABARDAST "powerful", KHOFNAK "fearful" has more emotive value and is also capable of portraying the intensity of the bomb blast.

In contrast to the words of the above discussed set, the lexical items NAPAK "impure" and BURA "bad" possess more synonymy as can be seen from their semantic features:

NAPAK : Adj. (-pure) (+dirty) (+foul) (-decent) (+filthy)

BURA : Adj. (+bad) (+evil) (+ugly) (+worthless) (+foul)
       (+filthy) (+vicious) (+wicked)

The close degree of synonymy explains the approximation of the collocational setting of the two lexical items.

As is evident, the lexical items vary according to their degree of synonymy and in some cases the lexical items come too close to share total synonymy. The componential features of MAIYAR "standard" and KASWATI "touchstone" will illustrate the point:

MAIYAR : Noun (+standard) (+touchstone) (+test)
        (+syllabus) (+trial)

KASWATI : Noun (+touchstone) (+assay) (+criterion)
         (+test) (+trial)
The two lexical items share most of the features with each other and as such come to possess close shades of meaning, bringing them closer on the synonymy scale.

While analyzing the lexical diversity of Urdu news media one point was frequently noted. At many places, the Urdu news editors have used translation equivalents of Urdu words from English to convey their messages. The media is full of such examples as:

JANGJU : DAHSHAT GARD : MILITANT

IJLAS : SESSION

KHUD MUKHTARI : AUTONOMY

MORCHE : BUNKER

AWAZ : CALL, etc.

The news editors have utilized these translation equivalents to fulfil their communicative needs. However, it does not mean that the semantic description of these translation equivalents must necessarily be same as that of the original words of Urdu, as can be seen by going through the semantic features of below given sets:

(a) MILITANT : Noun (+warrior) (+extremist)
    (+quarrelsome) (+terrorist)

JANGJU : Adj. (+contentions) (+quarrelsome)
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(+warrior)

(b) SESSION : Noun (+meeting of court. parliament or council). (+activity period) (+academic term)

IJLAS : Noun (+meeting) (+assembly) (+session) (+court)

(c) CALL : Verb (+name) (+shout) (+visit) (+telephone) (+cry of an animal/bird) (+awaken) (+demand)

AWAZ : Noun (+sound) (+voice) (+ringing)

(d) MORCHA : Noun (+fortification) (+fence) (+moat) (+a kind of ditch)

BUNKER : Noun (+storage container) (+container) (+underground shelter) (+sandy hollow on a golf course).

However, in such cases, in Ruqaya Hassan's terms 'partial overlap of meaning is sufficient'.

It will not be out of place to mention that the rich variety of synonymy existing in Urdu news media owes to the fact that Urdu has borrowed heavily from different sources like Persian, Arabic, Sanskrit,
etc. Hence, for the same concept or referent, we may find different words owning their origin to different languages. For example, the word SARKAR "government" has Persian origin while HAKUMAT "government" has Arabic origin. Consider other examples:

BURA (Hindi) : NAPAK (Persian)
GAMSAN (Hindi) : Zordar (Persian)
KASWATI (Hindi) : MAIYAR (Arabic)

In present times also, the borrowing continues and words from English and Hindi, besides Persian and Arabic, regularly come into Urdu.

3.1.4. Conclusion

It follows from the whole discussion that componential analysis serves as crucial means in case of lexical diversity. It serves as a yardstick to establish synonymous words and goes a long way in establishing the degree of synonymy between diverse lexical items. It also pinpoints the emotive values of synonymous lexical items.

Through componential analysis the semantic ranges of lexical items get clearly demarcated. This feature provides the basis for use of lexical items in varying contexts. As found earlier, it is the semantic range of the words SARKAR "government" and
HAKUMAT "government" which allows and restricts the possible use and combination of these words in different environments. To make the point more clear, consider the following lexical items along with their semantic features:

TAZIYAT : Noun (+condolence) (+lamentation) (+sorrow) [+expression of sympathy with a bereaved family]

IZHAR-E-AFSOOS : Adv. (+expression of sorrow)

As is clear, both TAZIYAT "condolence" and IZHAR-E-AFSOOS "expression of sorrow" are words related to the expression of sorrow. However, as is evident from the componential analysis, the expression IZHAR-E-AFSOOS "expression of sorrow" possesses more range than the term TAZIYAT "condolence". In case of former, the feature (+expression of sorrow) leaves the lexical item wide open and it can be used in any context. As far as the idiosyncratic features of TAZIYAT "condolence", i.e., (+condolence) (+expression of sympathy with a bereaved family) are concerned, they portray the comparatively narrow semantic range of word TAZIYAT "condolence".

As follows, the componential analysis serves as a means of describing the similarities and differences between diverse lexical items. It helps in determining the semantic shades possessed by these lexical items.
items which are very crucial to the news editor.

It follows from the above discussion that news editors are very selective in the selection of lexical items for their news items. The news editor keenly ascertains the different shades of a lexical item, its semantic range and the collocational possibilities. It is only after thoroughly weighing the pros and cons of a lexical item that the news editors select it for their purpose.

In the backdrop of the above discussion, we can conclude that lexical items possess certain semantic ranges and their use is bound to affect the quality and potential of messages.

3.2. SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

This section deals with the analysis of word meaning through semantic differentials. It is an attempt to discover and locate the responses a lexical item creates in a receiver's mind and the attitude is measured on semantic differential scale, which will be dealt with in the following pages.

3.2.1. Semantic Differential: An Introduction

Osgood et al. (1957) define semantic differential as, "The semantic differential is essentially a combination of controlled association and scaling procedures. We provide the subject with a concept to be differentiated and a set of bipolar adjectival scales against
which to do it, his only task being to indicate, for each item (pairing of a concept with a scale), the direction of his association and its intensity on a seven-step scale. The crux of the method, of course, lies in selecting the sample of descriptive polar terms. Ideally, the sample should be as representative as possible of all the ways in which meaningful judgements can vary, and yet be small enough in size to be efficient in practice. In other words, from the myriad linguistic and non-linguistic behaviours mediated by symbolic processes, we select a small but carefully devised sample, a sample which we shall try to demonstrate is chiefly indicative of the ways that meanings vary, and largely insensitive to other sources of variation."

The semantic differential describes meaning in terms of a set of orthogonal factors. It is essentially a combination of controlled association and scaling procedures. The subject is provided with a concept and a set of bipolar adjectival scales. The concept is to be differentiated against these scales. It means that it involves pairing of a concept with a scale. The task for the subject is to indicate, for each item, the direction of his association and its intensity on a seven-step scale. A small but carefully devised sample is selected which is chiefly indicative of the ways in which meanings vary. Consider the following example:-
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FATHER

happy  --  --  X  --  --  --  --  --  sad

hard   --  --  X  --  --  --  --  --  soft

slow   --  --  --  --  X  --  --  --  fast, etc.

Here the concept of father has been elucidated using the semantic differential method. The 'cross' (X) signs represent the features the word or concept 'FATHER' creates in the mind of the subject.

Each judgement represents a selection among a set of given alternatives and it serves to localize the concept at a point in the semantic space. The larger the number of scales, the more validly does this point in the space represent the operational meaning of the concept. The semantic differentiation, therefore, means the allocation of a concept to a point in the multidimensional semantic space, by selection from among a set of given scaled semantic alternatives.

It was from Theodore Karwoski and Henry Odbert's research on 'Synthesia' at Dartmouth College from which the notion of using polar adjectives to define the termini of semantic dimensions grew. Synthesia has been defined by Warren in his 'Dictionary of Psychology' (1934) as "a phenomenon characterizing the experiences of certain individuals, in which certain sensations belonging to one sense or mode attach to certain sensations of another group and appear regularly whenever a stimulus of
the latter type occurs."

The series of researches by Karwoski, Odbert and their associates related synesthesia to thinking and language in general. Colour-music synesthesia was reported by Karwoski and Odbert (1938) as being regularly indulged in by as many as 13 percent of Dartmouth College students, often as a means of enriching their enjoyment of music. A much larger number reported that they had such experiences occasionally.

A more analytic research on the interrelationships among colour, mood and musical instruments was carried out by Odbert, Karwoski and Eckerson (1942). In this research, subjects first listened to ten short excerpts from classical selections and indicated their dominant moods by checking sets of adjectives arranged in a mood circle. On a second hearing they gave the names of colours that seemed appropriate to the music. The colours were found to follow the moods created by music. On this scale, Delius's 'On Hearing the First Cuckoo in Spring' was judged leisurely in mood and predominantly green in colour while a portion of Wagner's 'Rienzi Overture' was judged as exciting or vigorous in mood and predominantly red in colour. Another group of subjects was merely shown the mood adjectives without any musical stimulation and asked to select appropriate colours. It was found that more consistent relations between colours and moods appeared.
These results are indicative of the fact that several modalities, visual, auditory, emotional and verbal may have shared significances or meanings. Further experiments with even simpler stimuli by Karwoski, Odbert and Osgood (1942) indicated that such equivalences across modalities show continuity along dimensions of experience. In one study complex synesthetes drew pictures to represent what they visualized when simple melodic sequences were played by a single instrument. C.E. Osgood studied anthropological field reports on five widely separated primitive cultures — Aztec and Pueblo Indian, Australian Bushman, Siberian Aborigine, Negro (Uganda Protectorate) and Malayan — with the purpose of obtaining evidence on semantic parallelism. He found the generality of certain relationships quite striking. For example, 'good' things like (good) gods, places, social positions, etc., were almost always 'up' and 'light' (white) while as 'bad' things were down and dark (black).

Stagner and Osgood (1946) adopted this method for measuring social stereotypes and also made explicit the notion of a continuum between the polar terms, by using such terms to define the ends of seven-step scales. They devised a set of scales to determine the profiles of various social stereotypes, such as PACIFIST, RUSSIA, DICTATOR and NEUTRALITY. Many groups of people were tested throughout the period of United State's gradual involvement in World War II. The
method was used to record the changing structure of the social stereotypes. That is, they attempted to see into the changes in the meanings of these social signs in the period of war.

It was in 1950's that Osgood and his followers elaborated the research on above lines and devised the notion of semantic differential.

3.2.2. Osgood's Concept of Semantic Differential

Osgood and his colleagues present an excellent example of those who view meaning as an internal mediating process. In their words, ".......the meaning of a sign was identified as a representational mediation process — representational by virtue of comprising some portion of the total behaviour elicited by the significate and mediating because this process, as a kind of self-stimulation, serves to elicit overt behaviours, both linguistic and non-linguistic, that are appropriate to the things signified". (Osgood, et al., 1957). In their attempt to establish concrete ways of measuring such internal processes. Osgood and his colleagues developed a measuring device called the 'semantic differential'. Essentially, the semantic differential represents an approach to the investigation of the connotative aspects of meaning. Denotative meaning refers to the object or objects for which a word/sign stands for while as connotative meaning takes into account the attitudes and emotional reaction of speakers.
Osgood and his colleagues have themselves labelled the meaning which they analyzed as "a strictly phonological one : those cognitive states of human language users which are necessary antecedent conditions for selective encoding of lexical signs and necessary subsequent conditions in selective decoding of lexical signs in messages." (Osgood et. al., 1957).

The semantic differential is consistent with Osgood's efforts to answer objections to the learning theories which are behaviouristic in nature. The behaviourists, especially Skinner's functional analysis, categorically denounce any mentalistic considerations in dealing with meaning, for they do not fit in their model of stimulus - response relationships and the concepts of reinforcement, extinction and so on. On the contrary, Osgood admits mentalistic considerations and holds the view that meanings are the central mediating processes between the word and any possible external related behaviours. In such cases, the meaning of a given item is considered as an internalized subset of the total behaviour repertoire for that item. Thus, for Osgood, meaning is an acquired entity, and the way in which it is acquired is a reflection of the process of conditioning. However, this is not the conditioning as is encountered in behaviouristic models. It is a type of conditioning which is more like the unobservable response that a stimulus might elicit from the central nervous system — quiet and covert but nevertheless real and
present. **Meaning** thus serves as the breaking point between the stimulus itself, and the response behaviour it might have been associated with, in more classical terms. In this view, it is the partial response to the item or experience which is conditioned and this partial reaction is attached to and becomes the meaning of the word for the item or experience. Such reactions are thus the responses, yet they can become stimuli in their own right. As a result they act in two manners: as the reactions of the speakers to linguistic events and as a spur to other kinds of behaviour in response to the reaction aroused by the initial utterance of the word. Meaning is thus an intermediate stage or, in Osgood's terms 'the mediator'.

The mediating processes here are of a more subtle nature which take shape as the mental reaction that speakers have to the words they acquire. The problem here is individual-centred as it is the individual which acquires the words along with their internalized values. The dimensions of meaning which a word acquires also depend upon different kinds of experiences of the individual. To tap this load of meaning, Osgood et al. proposed a sample device, i.e., semantic differential.

The semantic differential is a convenient measuring device. It is objective and offers easy data-gathering methods, straightforward tabulation methods and the possibility of comparative profiles. It is a general way of getting at a certain type of information and is a highly
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Subjects are presented with a word or concept and asked to record their judgement of that item along a seven-point scale. The scales represent a number of continua that Osgood and his colleagues have found to be reliable indicators of such meaning approaches. The continua or factors are usually three in number. The first one is the evaluative dimension and consists of scales such as: good-bad, beautiful-ugly, sweet-sour, clean-dirty, valuable-worthless, kind-cruel, sweet-bitter, pleasant-unpleasant, happy-sad, fair-unfair, sacred-profane and so on. The scales in this dimension are purely evaluative.

The second dimension is known as the potency dimension and is shown by such oppositions as: large-small, strong-weak, heavy-light, hard-soft and many others. The third one is called the activity dimension which contains oppositions such as fast-slow, active-passive, sharp-dull, etc. The activity variable is related to physical sharpness or quickness. There are several possible dimensions and many scales can be
developed in consonance with the nature and purpose of the research work. However, it has been found that the three scales of evaluation, potency and activity are sufficient to account for the meanings of most of the words.

In the seven-step scales, two opposite and bipolar adjectives are selected on two poles. The seven steps are graded by using quantifiers like 'extremely', 'quite' and 'slightly'. In this way, three scales are used in positive responses with variation of degree and three are used to convey negative responses again with a comparative order. The middle one stands for neutrality. Consider the following scale using the adjectives good-bad:

\[
\text{good} - : - : - : - : - : - : - : \text{bad}.
\]

Thus, using the above-mentioned quantifiers, the subject has the following respective options (from left to right):


The seven steps are also sometimes represented in mathematical signs as 1, 2, 3, 4,............7

or -3, -2, -1, 0, +1, +2, +3.

In the selection of scales, certain points are to be taken care of. For
example, the scale being selected must be relevant to the concept being judged. For example, in judging a concept like CHIEF JUSTICE, an evaluative scale like beautiful-ugly may be comparatively irrelevant while another scale like fair-unfair may be highly relevant.

Using the procedure of semantic differential, subjects are requested to mark their impressions of a word or concept on the seven point scale. The marking on the scale depends upon the way subjects view the concept and the impressions and experiences regarding the concept in his mind. The subject has to select from the seven options on different scales of evaluation, potency and activity. In the semantic differential technique, each item (pairing of a specific concept with a specific scale) presents the following situation.

**CONCEPT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polar term A</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>Polar term B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In which the scale positions are already defined for the subject as:

(+3) and (1) extremely A  
(+2) and (2) quite A  
(+1) and (3) slightly A  
(0) and (4) neither A nor B: equally A and B  
(-3) and (7) extremely B  
(-2) and (6) quite B  
(-1) and (5) slightly B
Consider the word 'mother' along with various scales as under:

**MOTHER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>good</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>cruel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nice</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>awful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Taken from Kess. 1976)

Take, for instance, the evaluative scale of good-bad. Here, seven options lie in the hands of the subject. That is, he has to choose from extremely good, quite good, slightly good, neutral, slightly bad, quite bad, extremely bad. Now, it depends on the subject that how he views the concept 'mother' and, accordingly, he will mark on this and other scales.

It gives a clear picture of the usefulness of such a measuring device and its easy applicability to a variety of situations to elicit the attitudes and responses of receivers/subjects regarding different concepts. Once the oppositions get tabulated, one can easily locate the particular meaning of a specific word, concept or experience on a semantic space, determined by the three dimensions of evaluation, potency and activity.
The method can also be used to find out reactions of different groups to different words, which can serve as an indication of their attitude towards the particular concept. It can also be used in measuring evaluative use of different dialect varieties - that is, the assessment of the differences between one group's reactions and another's.

Since the appearance of semantic differential technique in the early 1950's, it has been used in a variety of situations and for a variety of purposes. Here, it will be used to analyze the message effectiveness of diverse lexical items used in Urdu news media.

3.2.3. Semantic Differential Analysis of Selected Lexical Items of Urdu News Media

It follows from the earlier discussions that semantic differential is a useful method of eliciting the responses of the subjects regarding a word or a concept. Through this method one comes to know about their attitudes regarding a particular concept.

The semantic differential method has been applied in a variety of fields. In the pages to follow, it will be employed in tracing out the responses of subjects regarding certain words, which have been selected from Urdu news media.

The semantic differential is proposed as an index of certain aspects of meaning, particularly, connotative aspects. In human communication, meaning is critically involved at both the initiation (the
intentions being encoded by the source) and the termination (the significances being received by the receiver) of any communicative act. Most often the researcher will be interested in the significances derived from messages by receivers, i.e., effect studies. In the present study also such effect studies will be taken care of. As is a known fact, the modern communication network, electronic as well as print, plays a vital role in the present day world. Media has been employed as an effective tool in serving the purposes and goals of the nations of the world. It has played a pivotal role in the foreign policies of the world nations. In nutshell, media is a highly manipulative device for effecting the changes in attitudes of its consumers.

In case of news media, language plays a prominent role in propagating a certain message and for this purpose news editors have to rely heavily on the lexical resources. The lexical items are carefully selected to suit the purpose of the news editors. In this selection, the news editors weigh the different pros and cons of the selected item. He thoroughly observes its semantic range and takes care of its connotative aspects.

In the current study, selected lexical items denoting certain concepts were used for analysis through the semantic differential approach so that the attitudes and reactions of the subjects come to the fore, which will help in gauging the effects of these items on news-
consumers in Urdu news media. A selected sample of lexical items was chosen to prevent the extra length of the current study.

The research work was conducted in the campus of Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh. It was a suitable place for such kind of research as it provided the requisite diversity (among students) needed for the study. In the campus, one can easily find students of different parts of the country, as also the world. For the present study, a sample of 200 students was selected which belonged to different regional and cultural backgrounds. On the educational basis subjects included students ranging from 10th class to Ph.D. class.

The subjects were provided with the selected lexical items along with the seven-step scales. Different scales were selected according to the evaluative, potency and activity dimensions. The seven steps were framed using the quantifiers 'extremely', 'quite' and 'slightly' on a bipolar adjectival scale. The subjects were asked to mark steps of their choice. (For details see Appendix-I).

3.2.3.1. Discussion and Results

In this experiment, subjects were provided with various lexical sets. In the first instance, subjects were furnished the lexical set comprising of the words: MUJAHID "crusader", DAHSHAT GARD "terrorist" and JANGJU "fighter". Here, the subjects were asked to
mark on anyone of the seven steps on the semantic differential scale. Various scales were set up for the above mentioned lexical set. The responses of the subjects were later on compared and scrutinized which revealed interesting results, the description of which follows.

The responses received in case of the word MUJAHID "crusader" are tabulated in Table 3.1.

Description of the Table

The figures of the above table portrays the evaluation of the word MUJAHID "warrior" by the respondents. As is evident from the table, majority of respondents have evaluated the word very positively. In most of the cases, the positive rating has been marked by using the quantifiers 'extremely' and 'quite'. It reveals the positive attitude of the respondents towards this word. On the adjectival scale 'good-bad', 80% respondents have treated it as 'extremely good', 10% respondents marked it as 'quite good' while as 4% respondents have ranked it as 'slightly good'. It means that 94% of the total respondents have treated the word MUJAHID "crusader" very positively on this scale. In case of the remaining 6% respondents, 4% respondents treat it as 'slightly bad' while as 2% responses are in neutral direction. It follows that a negligible number of responses go against it. Similarly, on the 'human-inhuman' bipolar scale, 16% respondents treat it as 'extremely human', 43.5% and
TABLE 3.1

Number and Percentage of the Responses elicited in case of the word MUJAHID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bipolar Adjectival Scale</th>
<th>good-bad</th>
<th>human-inhuman</th>
<th>just-unjust</th>
<th>honoured-hated</th>
<th>warrior-coward</th>
<th>peaceful-belligerent</th>
<th>non-extremist extremist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>160 80</td>
<td>32 16</td>
<td>89 44.5</td>
<td>60 30</td>
<td>20 10</td>
<td>12  6</td>
<td>38 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>20 10</td>
<td>87 43.5</td>
<td>83 41.5</td>
<td>50 25</td>
<td>110 55</td>
<td>85 42.5</td>
<td>94 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>8  4</td>
<td>28 14</td>
<td>16 8</td>
<td>60 30</td>
<td>30 15</td>
<td>40  20</td>
<td>33 16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantifiers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4  2</td>
<td>29 14.5</td>
<td>6  3</td>
<td>20 10</td>
<td>16  8</td>
<td>31 15.5</td>
<td>20  10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8  4</td>
<td>18 9</td>
<td>6  3</td>
<td>10  5</td>
<td>16  8</td>
<td>21 10.5</td>
<td>7  3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>6  3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-  -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200 100</td>
<td>200 100</td>
<td>200 100</td>
<td>200 100</td>
<td>200 100</td>
<td>200 100</td>
<td>200 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In case of all tabular representations the '+' and '-' signs, respectively indicate positive and negative responses, respectively, on the adjectival scale with integers devoting the quantifiers used, where 3 denotes 'extremely' and 2 and 1 stand for 'quite' and 'slightly', respectively.
Percentage of the Responses Elicited in Case of the Word MUJAHID
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14% respondents treat it as 'quite human' and 'slightly human', respectively. 12% responses treat the word negatively with 9% respondents ranking it as 'slightly inhuman' and 3% respondents treating it as 'quite inhuman'. The percentage of neutral responses, on this scale, is 14.5%. The 'just-unjust' bipolar adjectival scale has also elicited almost similar responses with 44.5% and 41.5% respondents ranking the word as 'extremely just' and 'quite just', respectively. 8% respondents have evaluated MUJAHID"crusader" as 'slightly just' while as 3% responses go each to 'neutral' and 'slightly unjust' scale. The responses on the 'honoured-hated' adjectival scale have got 30% respondents ranking the word on 'extremely honoured' variable and 25% and 30% respondents ranking it on 'quite honoured' and 'slightly honoured' variables, respectively. 10% respondents stood neutral on this scale while as 5% respondents treated it as 'slightly hated'. The 'warrior-coward' bipolar scale revealed that majority of the respondents ranked MUJAHID"crusader" positively as a warrior with 10%. 55% and 15% respondents using the quantifiers 'extremely', 'quite' and 'slightly', respectively. 8% respondents stood neutral on this scale. However, 8% and 4% respondents have treated the word on the variable 'coward' using the quantifiers 'slightly' and 'quite' respectively. It was found that on the 'peaceful-belligerent' scale, 6%, 42.5% and 20% respondents have ranked MUJAHID"crusader" as 'extremely peaceful'. 'quite peaceful'
and 'slightly peaceful', respectively. 15.5% respondents showed neutral responses while as 10.5% and 5.5% respondents evaluated MUJAHID"crusader" as 'slightly belligerent' and 'quite belligerent', respectively. Similarly, the figures of the 'non-extremist—extremist' scale indicate that 19% respondents have evaluated MUJAHID"crusader" on 'extremely non-extremist' variable. The 'quite non-extremist' and 'slightly non-extremist' variables have been marked by 47% and 16.5% respondents, respectively. 3.5% and 4% respondents have ranked it on the variables 'slightly extremist' and 'quite extremist', respectively, while as 10% respondents opted for neutral variable. The above facts and figures clearly illustrate that the word MUJAHID"crusader" has been ranked quite positively. In comparison to the positive responses, which the word has evoked, the negative responses do not stand anywhere.

In nutshell, it can be said that the responses and attitudes created by the word MUJAHID"crusader" are extremely positive. A MUJAHID"crusader" is viewed by subjects as a person who is extremely good, quite humane, extremely just and honoured. On the extremist—non-extremist scale, he is mostly regarded as a non-extremist. The negative responses do not point-out many weak points in a MUJAHID"crusader". It needs to be mentioned that not a single respondent has utilized the quantifier 'extremely' for a negative evaluation.
The second word provided in the first set was DAHSHAT GARD"terrorist". The responses for this word are given in Table 3.2.

Description of the Table

The facts and figures of the above table clearly indicate that the word DAHSHAT GARD"terrorist" has evoked negative responses in the subjects. Majority of the respondents have evaluated the word very negatively. On the scale 'good-bad', 68% respondents ranked it as 'extremely bad' while as 16% and 7% respondents ranked it as 'quite bad' and 'slightly bad', respectively. A negligible 4% respondents ranked it as 'slightly good' while as 5% respondents remained neutral in their evaluation. On the 'human-inhuman' scale, the 'extremely inhuman', 'quite inhuman' and 'slightly inhuman' variables have scored 64.5%, 20.5% and 10% responses, respectively. 1% and 4% respondents have ranked it on the 'slightly human' and 'neutral' variables, respectively. In case of the 'just—unjust' scale, DAHSHAT GARD"terrorist" has been regarded as 'extremely unjust', 'quite unjust' and 'slightly unjust' by 60%, 13% and 15% respondents, respectively. 7% respondents favoured the neutral scale while as 2% and 3% respondents evaluated the word on 'slightly just' and 'quite just' variables, respectively. The 'honoured-hated' scale has found 49%, 21% and 17% respondents ranking it on the 'extremely hated', 'quite hated' and 'slightly hated' variables, respectively. 6% responses went to the neutral scale while as 5% and 2%
TABLE 3.2
Number and Percentage of the Responses elicited in case of the word DAHSHAT GARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bipolar Adjectival Scale</th>
<th>good-bad</th>
<th>human-inhuman</th>
<th>just-unjust</th>
<th>honoured-hated</th>
<th>warrior-coward</th>
<th>peaceful-belligerent</th>
<th>non-extremist—extremist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12964.5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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respondents ranked it on 'slightly honoured' and 'quite honoured' variables, respectively. On the 'warrior-coward' adjectival scale, majority of respondents evaluated the word negatively with 30% respondents marking the 'extremely coward' variable. The 'quite coward' and 'slightly coward' variables have been marked by 19% and 23% respondents, respectively. 14% subjects showed neutral response on the 'warrior-coward' scale. A positive evaluation of the word has found 9% and 5% respondents ranking the word on the variables of 'slightly warrior' and 'quite warrior', respectively. In case of 'peaceful-belligerent scale, the word DAHSHAT GARD"terrorist" has been rated as 'extremely belligerent', 'quite belligerent' and 'slightly belligerent' by 55%, 24% and 11% respondents, respectively. 8% respondents have voted on the neutral scale and a quite negligible 2% respondents have favoured the 'slightly peaceful' variable. On the 'non-extremist-extremist' scale, an overwhelming majority of 73% respondents have ranked the word on 'extremely extremist' variable. 22% and 4% respondents have evaluated it on 'quite extremist' and 'slightly extremist' variables. A minor 1% responses went to the neutral variable.

From the above facts and figures, it follows that a DAHSHAT GARD"terrorist" is regarded as extremely bad, inhuman, extremist and hated person.
The other member of the set, i.e., JANGJU"fighter" got diverse responses which are presented in Table 3.3.

Description of the Table

As the table reveals, the word JANGJU"fighter" has received mixed-up responses. Here we find that the word has evoked both positive and negative responses on the differential scales. It is clear that the attitudes of the respondents are in a balanced direction with equal weightage on both positive and negative scales. On the 'good-bad' scale, almost equal responses are seen on the variables of 'good' and 'bad' with 48.5% respondents rating the word as 'good'. In this case, 5% respondents have used the quantifier 'extremely' while as 21% and 22.5% respondents have used the quantifiers 'quite' and 'slightly', respectively. In the negative direction, 2% respondents have evaluated the word as 'extremely bad' and 16.5% and 23% respondents have ranked it as 'quite bad' and 'slightly bad', respectively. That is, a total of 41.5% respondents have ranked JANGJU"fighter" in the negative direction. 10% respondents have shown neutral response. In case of 'human-inhuman' adjectival scale, the balance is tilted towards the negative direction, with 53% respondents evaluating the word negatively. Among these, 13% respondents regard JANGJU"fighter" as 'extremely inhuman' and 17% and 23% respondents view it as 'quite inhuman' and 'slightly inhuman', respectively. 14% responses expressed neutrality of opinion. In the
### TABLE 3.3
Number and Percentage of the Responses elicited in case of the word JANGJU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bipolar Adjectival Scale</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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positive direction, 24% respondents recorded their responses on 'slightly human' variable while as 5% and 4% respondents expressed their responses on 'quite human' and extremely human variables, respectively. The 'just-unjust' scale has received 19%, 27% and 17% responses on the 'extremely unjust', 'quite unjust', and 'slightly unjust' variables, respectively. On the same scale, 18% respondents assess JANGJU"fighter" as 'slightly just' while as 13% and 1% respondents mark the variables 'quite just' and 'extremely just', respectively. 5% respondents have been neutral on this scale. On the 'honoured-hated' scale, the 'extremely hated', 'quite hated' and 'slightly hated' variables have been marked by 16%, 23% and 23% respondents, respectively, with 10.5% respondents opting for the 'neutral' variable. The variables, namely, 'slightly honoured', 'quite honoured' and 'extremely honoured' have been marked by 16%, 5.5% and 6% respondents, respectively. It is evident that, on this scale a total of 62% respondents evaluate the word negatively while as 27.5% rank it positively. The 'warrior-coward' scale has received 54% responses on the positive side and 41% and 5% responses on the negative and neutral direction. In the positive direction, the variables, namely, 'extremely warrior', 'quite warrior' and 'slightly warrior' have scored 13%, 23% and 18% responses, respectively. In the negative direction, 11% respondents ranked the word on 'slightly coward' variable while as 19% and 11% respondents have evaluated it on 'quite
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coward' and 'extremely coward' variables, respectively. On the 'peaceful-belligerent' scale, majority of respondents, i.e., 75% respondents evaluated the word JANGJU"fighter" negatively with 19.5% and 29% respondents viewing it as 'extremely belligerent' and 'quite belligerent', respectively. Another 26.5% respondents have regarded it as 'slightly belligerent'. 13% respondents remained neutral while as a very less proportion of 7% and 5% respondents have ranked JANGJU"fighter" as 'slightly peaceful' and 'quite peaceful', respectively. Almost similar responses are found on the 'extremist—non-extremist' scale, in which case 21.5% respondents rank JANGJU"fighter" on the 'extremely extremist' variable. 34% and 29% respondents have ranked it on quite extremist' and 'slightly extremist' variables, respectively. It means that a majority of 84.5% respondents have assessed it negatively on this scale while as a minor 8% respondents ranked it positively. A negligible 7.5% respondents were neutral. It follows from the above facts and figures that JANGJU"fighter" has received moderate responses in comparison to the word DAHSHAT GARD"terrorist". It is clear that the word has evoked both positive and negative images in the respondents.

In the backdrop of the above discussions, it follows that the words of the first set, i.e., MUJAHID"crusader", DAHSHAT GARD"terrorist" and JANGJU"fighter" create diverse responses in the subjects. Although the words have almost the same referent, yet the
connotations associated with them have induced the subjects to evaluate them on different lines. The result is an eye-opener to throw light on the potentiality of lexical items in creating particular images in the audience. The words MUJAHID "crudader" and DAHSHAT GARD "terrorist" lie poles apart in terms of the responses of the subjects. The former succeeds in creating positive images while as the latter has a total negative image. The position of JANGJU "fighter" lies in the middle of these terms.

The other set of lexical items which was provided to the subjects consisted of the words: GATHGOD and MILLIBAGAT meaning "Coalition or tie-up". The scales, for this set, were framed keeping in view the collocational and contextual aspects of the items. In case of the word GATHGOD "coalition. tie-up". the elicited responses are produced in Table - 3.4.

Description of the Table

The chart demonstrates the responses of the subjects on the diverse scales. In case of 'good-bad' adjectival scale. the responses are found both in positive and negative directions. The 'extremely good', 'quite good' and 'slightly good' variables have been marked by 2.5%, 15% and 33.5% respondents, respectively. Similarly, the 'extremely bad', 'quite bad' and 'slightly bad' variables have recorded 3%, 11% and 21.5% responses, respectively. On this scale, 13.5% responses have gone to the 'neutral' column. In case of the 'sincere-expedient' scale, majority of
TABLE 3.4

Number and Percentage of the Responses elicited in case of the word GATHJOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bipolar Adjective Scale</th>
<th>good—bad</th>
<th>sincere—expedient</th>
<th>fair—unfair</th>
<th>graceful—awkward</th>
<th>strong—weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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respondents have treated GATHGOD"coalition, tie-up" as expedient with 17% respondents rating it as 'extremely expedient'. Besides, 29% and 15% respondents have rated this lexical item as 'quite expedient' and slightly expedient', respectively. On the other hand, 4% respondents treated GATHGOD"coalition, tie-up" as 'extremely sincere' while as 9% and 19% subjects regarded it as 'quite sincere' and 'slightly sincere', respectively. On this scale, 7% neutral responses were also reported. Almost similar responses are found on the other scales. On the 'fair-unfair' scale, 12.5% respondents have graded GATHGOD"coalition, tie-up" as 'extremely unfair' while as 31% and 16.5% respondents graded it as 'quite unfair' and 'slightly unfair', respectively. However, 17% respondents ranked it as 'slightly fair' and 7% and 5% respondents rated it as 'quite fair' and 'extremely fair', respectively. On this scale, 11% respondents expressed neutral responses. The 'graceful-awkward' scale recorded 14.5%, 33% and 21% responses on 'extremely awkward', 'quite awkward' and 'slightly awkward' variables, respectively. 10.5% neutral responses were reported on this scale while as 14% and 7% responses were found on the variables 'slightly graceful' and 'quite graceful', respectively. On the 'strong-weak' scale, 11% respondents treated GATHGOD"coalition, tie-up" as 'extremely weak' while as 27% and 23% respondents regarded it as 'quite weak' and 'slightly weak', respectively. However, 16% respondents regarded GATHGOD"coalition, tie-up" as
'slightly strong' while as 6% and 4% respondents perceived it as 'quite strong' and 'extremely strong', respectively. A sizeable 13% responses showed neutrality of opinion. It is clear from the above facts and figures that GATHGOD "coalition, tie-up" has been rated mostly in a negative direction with majority of respondents treating it as expedient, awkward and unfair. However, a sizeable number of responses have also gone in its favour.

The responses elicited in case of the other member of this set, i.e., MILLIBAGAT "coalition, tie-up" are presented in Table - 3.5.

Description of the Table

It is clear from the table that the word MILLIBAGAT "coalition, tie-up" has elicited diverse responses from the informants. The word has evoked negative as well as positive responses. On the 'good-bad' scale, almost similar number of responses have been elicited by the two polar terms. The word MILLIBAGAT "coalition, tie-up" has been treated as extremely bad by 3% respondents while 16% and 21% respondents rated it as 'quite bad' and 'slightly bad', respectively. In the positive direction 25% and 19% respondents rated this term as 'slightly good' and 'quite good', respectively. 2% respondents treated MILLIBAGAT "coalition, tie-up" as 'extremely good' while as 14% respondents expressed neutral responses for this term. In case of 'sincere-expedient' scale, the 'extremely expedient', 'quite expedient' and 'slightly expedient' variables
**TABLE 3.5**

Number and Percentage of the Responses elicited in case of the word MILLIBAGAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bipolar Adjectival Scale</th>
<th>good—bad</th>
<th>sincere—exhastent</th>
<th>fair—unfair</th>
<th>graceful—ackward</th>
<th>strong—weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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have received 19%, 35.5% and 17% responses, respectively. 8% responses went to the 'neutral' variable. On the same scale, 'quite sincere' and 'slightly sincere' variables have been marked by 6% and 14.5% respondents, respectively. Almost similar responses are found on the 'fair-unfair' scale, in which 15% respondents have evaluated MILLIBAGAT"coalition, tie-up" on 'extremely unfair' variable. The word has been evaluated as 'quite unfair' and 'slightly unfair' by 31% and 17% respondents, respectively. 8% respondents have evaluated the given word on 'neutral' variable while as 14% and 11% respondents have expressed their responses on 'slightly fair' and 'quite fair' variables, respectively. 4% respondents have treated MILLIBAGAT"coalition, tie-up" as 'extremely fair'. On the 'graceful-awkward' bipolar scale, majority of respondents have ranked MILLIBAGAT"coalition, tie-up" on the polar term 'awkward' with the quantifiers 'extremely', 'quite' and 'slightly' being used by 12.5%, 29% and 14.5% respondents, respectively. In case of the polar term 'graceful', the three quantifiers, i.e., 'extremely', 'quite' and 'slightly' have been used by 5.5%, 10.5% and 17% respondents, respectively. On this scale, 11% respondents have opted for neutral variable. The figures of the 'strong-weak' scale indicate that MILLIBAGAT"coalition, tie-up" has been rated as 'extremely weak', 'quite weak' and 'slightly weak' by 9%, 23% and 24% respondents, respectively. On the other hand, it has been ranked as 'extremely strong',
'quite strong' and 'slightly strong' by 6%, 9% and 18% respondents, respectively. The neutral response has been expressed by 11% subjects.

The facts and figures of the words GATHGOD "coalition, tie-up" and MILLIBAGAT "coalition, tie-up" reveal that the two words have elicited almost identical responses. However, the word MILLIBAGAT "coalition, tie-up" has been given slightly more negative ratings than GATHGOD "coalition, tie-up".

Another lexical set which was utilized in the analysis was NARAZ : BAGI. The lexical items NARAZ "angry" and BAGI "rebel" were taken from two news items published in QAUMI AWAZ and HIND SAMACHAR in which the two lexical items were used in an identical manner and in the same collocational environment. The two news items are given below:

(i) CONGRESS KE NARAZ RAHNUMAWON NE UMID ZAHIR KI HAI KI IS SE MULK KO DOORRAS FAWAYID PAHUNCHEN GE.

"The angry leaders of Congress expressed the hope that it will provide durable benefits to the country".

(Qaumi Awaz: Nov. 12. 1995)

(ii) CONGRESS-I KE BAGI LIDRON NE IS UMID KA IZHAR KIYA KI IS FAISLE SE AKHIRKAR DESH KO FAYIDA PAHUNCHE GA.
"The rebel leaders of Congress-I hoped that the decision will ultimately benefit the country".

(Hind Samachar: Nov. 12, 1995)

It needs to be mentioned that subjects were provided the words only and not the news items in which they were used. The responses elicited in case of the word NARAZ "angry" are reproduced in Table-3.6.

**Description of the Table**

The above given figures indicate the responses which the word NARAZ "angry" has evoked in the informants. On the 'innocent-guilty' scale, the responses got distributed in both positive and negative directions. On this scale, the variables, namely, 'extremely innocent', 'quite innocent' and 'slightly innocent' have got 11.5%, 17% and 19% responses, respectively. The other variables, viz., 'extremely guilty', 'quite guilty' and 'slightly guilty' have been marked by 3%, 6% and 21% respondents, respectively. However, it is the 'neutral' variable of this scale which has secured highest responses, i.e., 22.5%. In case of 'good-bad' scale, the balance is tilted slightly towards the polar term 'good' with the quantifiers, namely, 'extremely', 'quite' and 'slightly' being marked by 5%, 19% and 23% informants, respectively. On the polar term 'bad', the 'extremely bad', 'quite bad' and 'slightly bad' variables have secured 3%, 13% and 19% responses, respectively. 18% responses have gone to
### TABLE 3.6

Number and Percentage of the Responses elicited in case of the word NARAZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bipolar Adjectival Scale</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantifiers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innocent—guilty</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good—bad</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civilized—savage</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peaceful—belligerent</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-extremist—extremist</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of the Responses Elicited in Case of the Word NARAZ
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**Figure - 3.6**
the 'neutral column'. In case of the 'civilized-savage' scale, the positive responses are slightly ahead of the negative responses. The variables 'extremely civilized', 'quite civilized' and 'slightly civilized' have been marked by 8%, 16% and 21% responses, respectively. On the same scale, 5% respondents have ranked the word NARAZ"angry" on the 'extremely savage' variable while as 15% and 18% respondents have expressed their opinion on the 'quite savage' and 'slightly savage' variables, respectively. 17% responses have gone in favour of the neutral variable. In case of the 'peaceful belligerent' scale, the negative responses outnumber the positive ones. The 'extremely belligerent', 'quite belligerent' and 'slightly belligerent' variables have scored 18%, 22% and 23% responses, respectively. On the other hand, 2% respondents have treated the lexical item NARAZ"angry" on the 'extremely peaceful' variable while as 10% and 16% respondents have ranked it on the 'quite peaceful' and 'slightly peaceful' variables, respectively. The 'neutral' variable has scored 9% responses. In case of 'non-extremist—extremist' scale, the positive responses completely outnumber the negative ones. Out of 69% positive responses, 27% responses have been found on the 'extremely non-extremist' variable. Besides this, 25% and 17% responses have been found on the 'quite non-extremist' and 'slightly non-extremist' variables. In comparison to the positive responses, only 20% responses have gone in the negative direction while as 11% responses have gone in favour of
the neutral variable. It is clear that the word NARAZ"angry" has been rated in a moderate manner with both positive and negative responses going its way.

The responses of the other member of this set, i.e., BAGI"rebel" are represented in Table-3.7.

Description of the Table

The figures of the table clearly illustrate that the word BAGI"rebel" has mostly elicited negative responses on different scales. In majority of the negative evaluations, the quantifiers 'extremely', 'quite' and 'slightly' have been utilized.

In almost every scale, more than 50% responses have gone in the negative direction. The given lexical item, viz., BAGI"rebel" has been rated as 'extremely guilty' by 20% respondents while as 28% and 19% respondents have treated it as 'quite guilty' and 'slightly guilty', respectively. In the positive direction, a sizeable representation is found for the 'slightly innocent' variable. On the 'extremely innocent' and 'quite innocent' variables, only 2% and 4% respondents have been found. 11% respondents have expressed neutral responses. Similar is the case with other scales. In case of the scale 'good-bad', 15% respondents have treated BAGI"rebel" as 'extremely bad' while as 21% and 19% respondents have treated it as 'quite bad' and 'slightly bad', respectively.
## TABLE - 3.7
Number and Percentage of the Responses elicited in case of the word BAGI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bipolar Adjectival Scale</th>
<th>innocent—guilty</th>
<th>good—bad</th>
<th>civilized—savage</th>
<th>peaceful—belligerent</th>
<th>non-extremist extremist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of the Responses Elicited in Case of the Word BAGI

Quantifiers

- innocent-guilty
- good-bad
- civilized-savage
- peaceful-belligerent
- non-extrem.-extrem.
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15% respondents have shown negative responses while as 17% and 8% respondents have ranked the word on 'slightly good' and 'quite good' variables, respectively. 5% respondents have rated it as 'extremely good'. The 'extremely savage', 'quite savage' and 'slightly savage' variables of the 'civilized-savage' scale have received 19%, 26% and 18.5% responses, respectively. It means that a total of 63.5% have evaluated BAGI"rebel" quite negatively. A sizeable number, i.e., 17% have gone to the neutral variable. In the positive direction, 15.5% and 4% respondents have ranked the word on 'slightly civilized' and 'quite civilized' variables, respectively. On the 'peaceful-belligerent' adjectival scale, majority of respondents, i.e., 61% have evaluated BAGI"rebel" negatively with 17% respondents treating it as 'extremely belligerent' and 23% and 21% respondents treating it as 'quite belligerent' and 'slightly belligerent', respectively. A sizeable number of 19% respondents have evaluated BAGI"rebel" as 'slightly peaceful' with a small ratio of 4% and 2% respondents ranking it as 'quite peaceful' and 'extremely peaceful', respectively. In case of the 'non-extremist—extremist' scale, an overwhelming majority of 70% respondents evaluates the word on the 'extremist' variable. In this case, 23% respondents have ranked BAGI"rebel" on the 'extremely extremist' scale while as 28% and 19% respondents have graded it as 'quite extremist' and 'slightly extremist', respectively. Only 17% respondents have given the word a positive
evaluation. Out of these, 13% respondents treat it as 'slightly non-extremist' and a small number of 4% respondents have rated it as 'quite non-extremist', respectively. 13% responses have gone in favour of neutral variable. From the above figures, it becomes clear that the word BAGI"rebel" has mostly evoked a negative image in the informants.

In the backdrop of the above discussions, it becomes clear that the words NARAZ"angry" and BAGI"rebel" create different attitudes and images in the respondents. The results clearly indicate that the word BAGI"rebel" has been rated quite negatively in comparison to the word NARAZ"angry". It perhaps owes to its usage in Urdu news media, as the word is quite often used in Urdu news media to refer to militants and extremists in different parts of the world. The analysis suffices to portray the message potentials of the two words.

The subjects were also provided with the semantically related words JANG"war. fight" and LADAYI"fight, quarrel". The words JANG"war. fight" and LADAYI"fight, quarrel" are often used in similar contexts in Urdu news media. As such, the responses elicited by these lexical items, on the semantic differential scale, are bound to assist in our endeavour to study the message effects.

The responses elicited in case of JANG"war. fight" are given in Table-3.8.
TABLE - 3.8

Number and Percentage of the Responses elicited in case of the word JANG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bipolar Adjectival Scale</th>
<th>good—bad</th>
<th>constructive—destructive</th>
<th>beneficial—harmful</th>
<th>small-scale—large scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of the Responses Elicited in 
Case of the Word JANG
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Description of the Table

The figures of the above table clearly indicate that the word JANG "war, fight" has evoked a dominantly negative image in the informants. In most of the negative responses, the quantifiers 'extremely' and 'quite' have been utilized. In almost all cases more than 65% responses evaluate the lexical item negatively. On the 'good-bad' scale, 75.5% informants gave negative evaluation in which the quantifiers 'extremely', 'quite' and 'slightly' have been utilized by 34%, 26.5% and 15% respondents, respectively. Only a small 20.5% respondents gave positive evaluation of the word, out of which 15.5% respondents used the quantifier 'slightly'. The 'extremely destructive', 'quite destructive' and 'slightly destructive' variables of the 'constructive-destructive' scale have scored 37%, 25% and 18% responses, respectively. 16% respondents favoured the 'slightly constructive' variable while as a negligible 1% and 3% respondents voted for 'quite constructive' and 'neutral' variables, respectively. The other two scales also witnessed almost the same responses. In case of the 'beneficial-harmful' scale, 36.5% responses were in favour of 'extremely harmful' variable, while as 27.5% and 19% respondents regarded JANG "war, fight" as 'quite harmful' and 'slightly harmful', respectively. A small proportion of 13% and 1% respondents evaluated JANG "war, fight" as 'slightly beneficial' and 'quite beneficial', respectively. On the 'small-scale' polar term of the last scale, i.e., 'small-
scale—large scale", 4% respondents perceived JANG"war. fight" as extremely 'small-scale' while as 12% and 11% respondents considered it as 'quite small-scale' and 'slightly small-scale', respectively. In comparison to this, 27% respondents have regarded JANG"war. fight" as 'extremely large-scale' while as 23% and 18% respondents perceived it as 'quite large-scale' and 'slightly large-scale' activity, respectively. In nutshell, we can say that the word JANG"war. fight" has evoked a dominantly negative picture.

The responses elicited in case of the other lexical item, i.e., LADAYI"war, quarrel" are given in Table-3.9.

**Description of the Table**

It is clearly indicated by the figures of the above table that the word LADAYI"war, quarrel" also got more responses in the negative direction. In case of 'good-bad' scale, the word LADAYI"war. quarrel" has been treated as 'extremely bad', 'quite bad' and 'slightly bad' by 29%, 25% and 21% respondents, respectively. On the 'constructive—destructive' scale, 27% respondents consider LADAYI"war. quarrel" as 'extremely destructive' while as 26% and 23% respondents regard it as 'quite destructive' and 'slightly destructive', respectively. 15% respondents have regarded LADAYI"war. quarrel" as 'slightly constructive' while as a small number of respondents, i.e., 5% and 1% perceive it as 'quite constructive' and 'extremely constructive'.
**TABLE - 3.9**

Number and Percentage of the Responses elicited in case of the word LADAYI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bipolar Adjectival Scale</th>
<th>good—bad</th>
<th>constructive—destructive</th>
<th>beneficial—harmful</th>
<th>small-scale—large scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of the Responses Elicited in Case of the Word LADAYI

Quantifiers
- good - bad
- beneficial - harmful
- const - destructive
- s scale - l scale
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respectively. In case of the beneficial-harmful' scale, the 'extremely harmful', 'quite harmful' and 'slightly harmful' variables have secured 27%, 22% and 29% responses, respectively. 3% responses went to the 'neutral' column while as 16% and 3% responses have found place on the 'slightly beneficial' and 'quite beneficial' variables, respectively. On the final scale, LADAYI"war, quarrel" has been rated as 'extremely large-scale', 'quite large-scale' and 'slightly large-scale' by 19%, 21% and 23% respondents, respectively. 4.5% respondents have given neutral responses while as 17% and 11.5% respondents have rated LADAYI"war, quarrel" as 'slightly small-scale' activity, respectively. A small ratio of 4% respondents have rated it as 'extremely small-scale' activity. In nutshell, we can say that LADAYI"war, quarrel" has received mostly negative responses. However, the negative responses are more severe in case of JANG"war, fight" in which the negative responses have been mostly demonstrated by using the quantifiers 'extremely' and 'quite'.

The responses elicited for the two words of this set are indicative of the semantic ranges of the two words. It is clear that the word JANG"war, fight" is not looked upon with honour in an educated society. Same is the case with the word LADAYI"war, quarrel". However, its message effect is very mild as compared to JANG"war, fight".
3.2.4. Concluding Remarks

As is illustrated through the analysis, semantic differential is a useful tool in measuring different aspects of meaning found in a lexical item. The technique has been used in a variety of ways for diverse purposes. As such, its utility in case of mass communication and also in the present study cannot be ignored. In psycholinguistic research works, the technique has been utilized time and often. In fact, the technique in itself is a psycholinguistic instrument.

In the news media, lexical items are selected consciously to convey the messages news editors want to convey. They are utilized for the purpose of propaganda. In decoding these lexical items, cognitive processes play a pivotal role. It is through the context of their usage that lexical items get loaded with different connotative aspects. As such, the lexical item does not remain a mere sign. It carries with it a message, a connotation and a purpose. That is why media persons are so selective and careful in their selection of lexical items.

It can be well illustrated by the examples MUJAHID "crusader", JANGJU "fighter" and DAHSHAT GARD "terrorist" cited earlier. As was revealed by their differential analysis, the lexical items are not only denotative words but they also possess certain emotive values which are highly significant in news media. The emotive values of these lexical
items help in framing the attitudes and behaviours of news-consumers. As such, the emotive values of these lexical items are often exploited in the process of propaganda. It is due to this fact that Radio Pakistan frequently uses the words MUJAHID"crusader" and HURRIYAT PASAND"revolutionary" while as the national media uses words like DAHSHAT GARD"terrorist". DAHSHAT PASAND"terrorist" and INTIHA PASAND"extremist" to refer to militants of Kashmir valley. It is illustrative of the crucial role which lexical items play in framing of ideas.

The findings of the above analysis are sufficient to reveal that lexical items are capable of generating certain concepts and attitudes in decoders' minds. It follows that lexical items here a say in effectiveness of messages. Two words, although having same referent or possessing semantic relatedness, do vary in their message potential. The message potential of lexical items plays a cardinal role in changing the attitudes of the audience. In nutshell, we can conclude that lexical items have diverse semantic ranges which have the potential to affect the messages.

3.3. CONCLUSION

The discussions carried out in this chapter are sufficient to throw light on various aspects of lexical diversity and its role in message effectivity. The choice of lexical items has a say in the communicative process and in view of the tremendous value and importance of the
communication network, the news editors are squarely cautious in utilizing their available resources. The methods of componential analysis and semantic differential have played a significant role in linguistic traditions and their use in analyzing the diverse lexical items of Urdu news media proved very useful and innovative throughout the analysis. The methods not only established the different dimensions of word meanings but also proved helpful in determining the attitudes of the message consumers.

Through componential analysis, one can easily trace out the different dimensions of meaning that a word possesses. After establishing these dimensions, the selection of lexical items from a lexical set proves very easy and the news editors can utilize the method while selecting the items which fit their networks and fulfil their purposes. Through the componential analysis the degree of synonymy between words is also checked. The componential analysis of diverse lexical items proved that total synonymy is a very rare phenomenon.

The semantic differential technique and componential analysis proved very helpful in establishing the emotive value of words. Besides the denotative value, every lexical item possesses various connotative and emotive dimensions. Since the news media is a medium of propagation and propaganda, the lexical items used there are loaded with various connotative and emotive values. It can be viewed in case of
words: AGENT and SURRENDER JANGJU "surrendered militant" which have been used to refer to the same referent in two different newspapers. The captions go like this:

(A) ........IS KHOFNAK DHAMAKE SE FORCES AUR UN KE KAYI AGENT MOKA PAR HI HALAK HO GAYE.

"Many force personnel and their agents died in this blast".

(Srinagar Times: Aug. 10, 1996)

(B) ........IS KARWAYI MEN DO SURRENDER JANGJU BI MARE GAYE.

"Two surrendered militants were also killed in this action".

(Al-Safa. Aug. 10, 1996)

As is evident, the news editors utilized the two words to refer to the same persons killed in a militant action. However, the emotive and connotative values of both the terms stand poles apart. Utilizing the denotative meaning of the term AGENT, the news editor has innovatively manipulated the word to refer to the surrendered militants. The reference to the surrendered militants through the word AGENT has charged the word with many connotations. In comparison to it, the word SURRENDER JANGJU "surrendered militant" used by the second newspaper is lacking in this connotative dimension. It is due to this fact
that different news agencies and news editors select lexical items of their choice to create desired images and attitudes in the news-consumers. Owing to this fact, words like JANGJU"fighter", MUJAHID"crusader", DAHSHAT GARD"terrorist", etc., are used very selectively by different people. As portrayed by the example SARKAR Vs. HAKUMAT (Cf. Section I of this chapter), the lexical items have certain idiosyncratic features which make their use context bound.

The above discussions clearly reveal that lexical items are not mere signs but are loaded with various emotive and connotative values. These emotive and connotative dimensions have a say in message effects. As such, we can conclude that lexical items and message effects are deeply interlinked with each other.