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The purposes of this research are divided into two parts. The first purpose of this research is to describe the textual and pragmatic equivalence in the Freedom Writers movie. The second is to find out the most dominant of textual and pragmatic equivalence in the Freedom Writers movie. This research applied descriptive qualitative method, it is means that it does not need statistic approach to explore the material. Qualitative research is a research of which the data written or oral words are descriptive analyzed. The data is collected by documentation. The primary data is taken from Freedom Writers movie script. The secondary data is taken from many literary books and some relevant materials to support and complete the primary data source. The procedure of analyzing the data start by analyzing about textual equivalence and pragmatic equivalence based on Baker’s theory in her book In Other Words. Then find the dominant of textual and pragmatic equivalence in the Freedom Writers movie. From the analysis, the writer conclude that 74 cases was found in textual and pragmatic equivalence in the Freedom Writers movie script. The textual equivalence consist of 14 cases in personal reference, 6 cases in demonstrative reference, 5 cases in comparative reference, 2 cases in substitution, 2 cases in ellipsis, 8 cases in conjunction and 3 cases in lexical cohesion. The pragmatic equivalence consist of 4 cases in coherence, 9 cases in implicature (maxim of quality), 4 cases in implicature (maxim of quantity), 9 cases in implicature (maxim of manner) and 9 cases in implicature (maxim of relation). The most dominant is type of textual equivalence, personal reference.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

Translation is a kind of communication. Communication is closely related to the meaning. The aim of communication is to convey the message or information to another people. Whereas, translation also has similar aim with communication that is to communicate the aim of information to another people. The understanding of meaning or message is very important in translation, because all the contents must be conveyed to people of source language and people of target language.

Catford in a book of Translation and Language by Peter Fawcett (2003:54) states, “the central problem of translation practice is that of finding TL (Target Language) translation equivalents. A central task of translation theory is that of defining the nature and conditions of translation equivalence”. According to Nida and Charles R. Taber (1982:12), “translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message. First, in term of meaning and secondly in terms of style”. Similar with Catford, Nida also emphasizes the notion of translation on the equivalent.

Translation is an effort to find equivalence of meaning between source language and target language. Equivalence of meaning greatly is emphasized since the object in translation is the meaning which is conveyed from the source language into the target language. It means that meaning is a central aspect in translating. There is no perfect equivalence because every word has different meaning. Meaning appears from language structure form or because has lexical meaning.
From the statement above, it is clear that equivalence is very important in translating. The translator should try to find equivalence between source language and target language. Remembering the importance of this concept in translation, equivalence will be described is about textual equivalence and pragmatic equivalence.

According to Catford (1965:27) textual equivalence is that the portion of a TL text which is changed when and only when a given portion of the SL text is changed. When the clause elements of a TL text is changed, it must has same portion with the clause elements of the SL text. Mona Baker (2011:133) states that a clause consists of two segments. The first segment is called the theme. The theme is what the clause is about. At clause level, a speaker announces the topic of his or her message by thematizing it, that is, by putting in initial position. The second segment of clause is called the rheme. The rheme is what the speaker says about the theme. It is a goal of discourse. As such, it is the most important element in the structure of the clause as a message because it represents the very information that the speaker wants to convey to the hearer. This basically means that every clause has the structure of a message: it says something (the rheme) about something (the theme).

Like thematic structure, information structure is a feature of the context rather than of the language system as such. One can only decide what part of a message is a new and what apart is given within a linguistic or situational context (Baker, 2011:156). Thematic structure is speaker-oriented and information structure is hearer-oriented.

Textual equivalence started from clause. Clause as a message can be analyzed in terms of two types of structure are thematic structure and information structure. There are two main approaches to the analysis of clause as a message. After that, the cohesion of the source text can be analysed. According to Baker (2011:190) cohesion is the network of lexical, grammatical, an other relations which provide links between various
These relations or ties organize and, to some extend to create a text, for instance by requiring the reader to interpret words and expressions by reference to other words and expression in the surrounding sentences and paragraphs. Cohesion is surface relation, it connects together the actual words and expressions that we can see or hear. Halliday and Hasan identify five main cohesive devices in English: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. Each device will be explained below in a brief description.

The first cohesive device will be explained is reference. Reference is traditionally used in semantics for the relationship which holds between a word and what it points to in the real world. The reference of *chair* would therefore be a particular chair that is being identified on a particular occasion (Baker, 2011:190). The second cohesive device is substitution. In substitution, an item (or items) is replaced by another item (or items). For example: “I like movies. And I do”, *do* is substitute for *like movies* (Baker, 2011:196). The third cohesive device is ellipsis. Ellipsis involves the omission of an item. In other words, in ellipsis, an item is replaced by nothing (Baker, 2011:196). The fourth cohesive device is conjunction. Conjunction involves the use of formal markers to relate sentences, clauses, and paragraphs to each other (Baker, 2011:200). The last one cohesive device is lexical cohesion. Lexical cohesion refers to the role played by selection of vocabulary in organizing relations within a text (Baker, 2011:210).

Example of textual equivalence from the movie script:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>00:03:58 - 00:04:00</th>
<th>00:03:58 - 00:04:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Margaret Campbell:</strong> Here’s your coffee.</td>
<td><strong>Margaret Campbell:</strong> Ini kopimu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Erin Gruwell:</strong> Thank you</td>
<td><strong>Erin Gruwell:</strong> Terimakasih</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kind of example of textual equivalence above is reference. ‘Here’ cohesive with the target language ‘ini’. Scale of proximity here is near. It is reference by means of location called demonstrative reference. Then, the type of reference of ‘your’ is personal reference that reference by means of function in the speech situation, through the category of person. ‘Your’ means ‘-mu’ as determiner.

Beside textual equivalence, it will be discussed about pragmatic equivalence. Pragmatic is the study of utterance meaning, sentences which are used in communication and also the study of meaning in language interaction between a speaker and hearer. Pragmatic Equivalence refers to words in both languages having the same effect on the readers in both languages. According to Baker (2011:230) from the variety of notions that are central to this particular area of language study, Baker haven chosen two which she believe to be particularly helpful in exploring the question “how a given text comes to ‘make a sense’ to a given readership and highlighting areas of difficulty in cross-cultural communication. These are coherence and implicature.

Coherence is a network of relations which organize and create a text: cohesion is the network of surface relations which link words and expressions to other words and expressions in a text, and coherence is the network of conceptual relations which underlie the surface text. Both concern the way stretches of language are connected each other. In the case of cohesion, stretches of language are connected to each other by virtue of lexical and grammatical dependencies. In the case of coherence, they are connected by virtue of conceptual or meaning dependencies as perceived by language users.

Baker (2011:235) said that Grice (1975) uses the term implicature to refer to what the speaker/writer means or implies rather than what he or she literally says. Implicature is not to be confused with non-literal meaning, for instance with idiomatic meaning. Idiomatic meaning is conventional, and its interpretation depends on a good mastery of
the linguistic system in question rather than on a successful interpretation of a particular speaker’s intended or implied meaning in a given context. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00:10:35 - 00:10:46</td>
<td>Erin Gruwell: Jamal Hill? (Erin checked the attendance) Jamal: Man what am I doing here? This whole ghetto-ass class has got people in here looking like a bad rerun of cops and shit. You know what I’m saying? It’s true.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Jamal meant is that he does not like Wonder Bread Land people (Erin) teaching in the class because they were different tribe or Jamal describe the situation of the class and it makes Erin guessing that he is Jamal or not.

Regarding to the explanation above, the writer conducts a research on “A TRANSLATION ANALYSIS OF TEXTUAL AND PRAGMATIC EQUIVALENCE IN FREEDOM WRITERS MOVIE AND ITS SCRIPT”.

B. Problems of the Study

Based on the statement, objective of the research focus on the following problems:

1. What are the textual and pragmatic equivalence in the Freedom Writers movie?
2. What is the most dominant textual and pragmatic equivalence in the Freedom Writers movie?

C. Purposes of the Study

Based on problem resource, the purposes of the resource are:

1. To describes the textual and pragmatic equivalence in the Freedom Writers movie.
2. To find out the most dominant of textual and pragmatic equivalence in the *Freedom Writers* movie.

**D. Benefits of the Study**

After implementing the research, the writer expects truly this research will be beneficial to:

1. **Academic Benefits:**
   a. The researcher can use this graduating paper as an additional source to develop translation study especially about textual and pragmatic equivalence.
   b. The readers are able to recognize the differences of textual and pragmatic equivalence.
   c. The readers are able to understanding the textual and pragmatic equivalence.

2. **Practical Benefits:**
   a. This research can be as English Department student’s additional information of textual and pragmatic equivalence from the movie entitled *Freedom Writers*.
   b. The reader can be able to improve their translation skill from the movie entitled *Freedom Writers*.

**E. Limitation of the Study**

Many kind problems of equivalence in translation can be analyzed and discussed. But, in this research is limited on the problem focus to analyzing textual and pragmatic equivalence in the *Freedom Writers* movie.

**F. Classifications of the Key terms**

Translation is a kind of communication that establish equivalence between the source text and the target text. Based on those definition, there were two key terms related to translation namely meaning and equivalent. Thus, it can be concluded that translation is a
process to deliver message or meaning accurately from the source language into target language by finding the equivalence.

Textual equivalence: cohesion, when referring to the equivalence between a SL text and a TL text in terms of information and cohesion. Cohesion is the network of lexical, grammatical and other relations which provide links between various parts of a text. Cohesion is a surface relation, it connects together the actual words and expressions that we can see or hear (Baker, 2011: 190). Halliday and Hasan in the book “Cohesion in English” identify five main cohesive devices in English: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion.

Pragmatic equivalence, when referring to implicatures and strategies of avoidance during the translation process. Implicature is not about what is explicitly said but what is implied. Therefore, the translator needs to work out implied meanings in translation in order to get the source text message across. The role of the translator is to recreate the speaker or author's intention in another culture in such a way that enables the target culture hearer or reader to understand it clearly.

The director and screenplay writer of Freedom Writers movie is Richard LaGravenese. Stars of this movie are Hilary Swank, Scott Glenn, Imelda Staunton, Patrick Dempsey, and Mario. Freedom Writers tells the true story of a young English teacher and her influence in the classroom.


G. Outline of The Paper

This research is divided into five chapters and each chapter explains differently according to the topics being discussed. Here are five chapters that will be discussed:
Chapter I is introduction presents the background of the study, problems of the study, purpose of the study, the benefits of the study, classifications of key term, and outline of the paper. Chapter II is theoretical review. This chapter presents the discussion some theories of textual equivalence, pragmatic equivalence, biography of the film director and the synopsis. Chapter III is research methodology and data presentation. Chapter IV is discussess data analysis which includes the textual equivalence and pragmatic equivalence on “Freedom Writers” manuscript, and analysis of textual equivalence and pragmatic equivalence on “Freedom Writers“ manuscript. Chapter V is closure, consist of conclusion and suggestions. The Last part is bibliography and appendix.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL REVIEW

In this chapter, the theoretical books and other relevant information will be discussed. They are so essential to be the basic theory of the textual and pragmatic equivalence that will be used to analyze the movie. Thus, the writer would like to discuss about the theoretical review of definition of translation, the concept of equivalence in translation, and explains textual (cohesion) and pragmatic equivalence in translation.

A. Definition of Translation

Generally, translation is a process of rendering meaning, ideas, or messages of a text from one language to other language. There are some considerations which follow this process, which mainly related to the accuracy, clarity and naturalness of the meaning, ideas, or messages of the translation. It means that it is an important thing to consider whether the readers of the target text accept equivalent information as the readers of the source text do. These considerations are clarified in some definition of translation stated by some experts.

One of the most prominent definitions of translation is stated by Newmark (1988: 5) who defines translation as “rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text”. This definition stresses on rendering meaning of the source language text into the target language text as what is intended by the author.

Hatim and Munday (2004: 6) define translation as “the process of transferring a written text from source language (SL) to target language (TL)”. In this definition they do not explicitly express that the object being transferred is meaning or message. They emphasis on translation as a process.
Nida and Taber (1982: 12), on the other hand, state that “translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message”. This definition is more comprehensive than the previous ones. Nida and Taber explicitly state that translation is closely related to the problems of languages, meaning, and equivalence.

From the definitions mentioned above, it is found that translation is a process which is intended to find meaning equivalence in the target text. Mona Baker (2011:9) underline the term meaning equivalence because it is the meaning which is transferred in the target language. In this case, translators are faced with text as unit of meaning in the form of sets of words or sentences. This means that language which is used is unit of meaning in discourse which can be understood by the participants of the communication.

So, the main problem in the process of translation is about meaning which will occur when the process is in progress, not translation as a product. Hatim and Munday (2004: 34) also suggest that “one of the key problems for the analyst was in actually determining whether the source text meaning had been transferred into the target text”. It is clear here that meaning is the key problem: whether meaning of the source language text is accurately transferred into the target language text.

B. The Concept of Equivalence in Translation

Something that we say in one language can have the same value (the same worth or function) when it is translated into another language. The relation between the source text and the translation is then one of equivalence (“equal value”), no matter whether the relation is at the level of form, function, or anything in between. Equivalence does not say that languages are the same; it just says that values can be the same (Pym, 2010: 6).

The concept of equivalence has been of particular concern to translation scholars since it has been inextricably linked with both definitional and practical
aspects of translating. Becoming an essential feature of translation theories in the 1960s and 1970s, equivalence was meant to indicate that source text (henceforth ST) and target text (henceforth TT) share some kind of “sameness”. The question was as to the kind and degree of sameness which gave birth to different kinds of equivalence. Despoina Panou (2013: 2-5) sums up Equivalence in Translation Theories in Theory and Practice in Language Studies Journal as below:

a. **Vinay and Darbelnet**

Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet distinguish between direct and oblique translation, the former referring to literal translation and the latter to free translation. Moreover, they propose seven procedures, the first three covered by direct translation and the remaining four by oblique translation. These procedures are: borrowing, calque, literal translation, transposition, modulation, equivalence and adaptation. In particular, it is argued that equivalence is viewed as a procedure in which the same situation is replicated as in the original but different wording is used. Hence, when dealing with proverbs, idioms and clichés, equivalence for them is sought at the level of sense and not image.

Furthermore, Vinay and Darbelnet consider as a necessary and sufficient condition for equivalent expressions between language pairs to be acceptable to be listed in a bilingual dictionary “as full equivalents”. Nevertheless, they realized the utopia of such a statement by admitting that glossaries and collections of idiomatic expressions are non-exhaustive. In other words, the rendering of an equivalent of an expression in the SL text in a dictionary or glossary does not suffice or guarantee a successful translation since the context surrounding the term in question plays an equally important role in determining the translation strategy employed. They conclude by stating that the situation is what determines
the need for creating equivalences. So translators are encouraged to firstly look in the situation of the ST in order to come up with a solution.

b. Jakobson

The structuralist Roman Jakobson maintains that there are three kinds of translation, that is, *intralingual* (rewording or paraphrasing within one language), *interlingual* (rewording or paraphrasing between two languages), and *intersemiotic* (rewording or paraphrasing between sign systems). It is *interlingual translation* that has been the focus of translation studies.

More specifically, when addressing the difficult problem of equivalence in meaning between words in different languages, he immediately stresses the fact that there can be no full equivalence between two words. He cites the example of *cheese* in English by saying that it is not identical to the Russian *syr*—the concept of cottage cheese not being included in the latter. Jakobson does not propose that translation is impossible but rather pinpoints the differences in the structure and terminology of languages.

c. Nida and Taber

With regard to equivalence, Nida maintains that there are two basic types of equivalence: (1) *formal equivalence* and (2) *dynamic equivalence*. In particular, Nida argues that in formal equivalence the TT resembles very much the ST in both form and content whereas in dynamic equivalence an effort is made to convey the ST message in the TT as naturally as possible. It could be argued that Nida is in favor of dynamic equivalence since he considers it to be a more effective translation procedure. This comes as no surprise given the fact that Nida was, at the time at which he proffered his views about equivalence, translating the Bible, and hence trying to produce the same impact on various different
audiences he was simultaneously addressing. Nida’s preference is more clearly stated in Nida and Taber’s edition since it is argued that dynamic equivalence in translation goes beyond correct communication of information.

d. Catford

Catford’s main contribution in the field of translation studies lies in the introduction of his idea of *types* and *shifts* of translation. *Shifts* refer to the changes that take place during the translation process. More specifically, Catford describes very broad types of translation according to three criteria. Firstly, *full translation* is contrasted with *partial translation* which differs according to the extent of translation. Secondly, *total translation* differs from *restricted translation* according to the levels of language involved in translation, and, thirdly, Catford distinguishes between *rank-bound translation* and *unbounded translation*, depending on the grammatical or phonological rank at which equivalence is established.

e. House

Adopting pragmatic theories of language use, House has come up with a translation model in which the basic requirement for equivalence of ST and TT is that original and translation should match one another in function. This function should be achieved by employing equivalent pragmatic means. The translation is only, therefore, considered to be adequate in quality if it matches the “textual” profile and function of the original.

In more detail, carrying out contrastive German-English discourse analyses, House has distinguished between two basic types of translation, namely, *overt translation* and *covert translation*. As the term itself denotes, an overt translation points to a TT that consists of elements that “betray” that it is a translation. On
the other hand, a covert translation is a TT that has the same function with the ST since the translator has made every possible effort to alleviate cultural differences. In conclusion, it could be argued that House’s theory seems more flexible than Catford’s since it incorporates the pragmatic aspect of translation by using authentic examples.

f. Koller

One of the most prominent German scholars working in the field of translation studies is Werner Koller who gives a detailed examination of the concept of equivalence and its linked term correspondence. In particular, correspondence involves the comparison of two language systems where differences and similarities are described contrastively, whereas equivalence deals with equivalent items in specific ST-TT pairs and contexts.

In an effort to answer the question of what is equivalent to what, Koller distinguishes five different types of equivalence: (a) denotative equivalence involving the extra linguistic content of a text, (b) connotative equivalence relating to lexical choices, (c) text-normative equivalence relating to text-types, (d) pragmatic equivalence involving the receiver of the text or message, and, finally, (e) formal equivalence relating to the form and aesthetics of the text.

g. Newmark

More specifically, Newmark replaces Nida’s terms of formal and dynamic equivalence with semantic and communicative translation respectively. The major difference between the two types of translation proposed by Newmark is that semantic translation focuses on meaning whereas communicative translation concentrates on effect. In other words, semantic translation looks back at the ST
and tries to retain its characteristics as much as possible. Its nature is more complex, detailed and there is also a tendency to over-translate.

On the other hand, communicative translation looks towards the needs of the addressees, thus trying to satisfy them as much as possible. In this respect, communicative translation tends to under-translate; to be smoother, more direct and easier to read. Hence, in semantic translation a great emphasis is placed on the author of the original text whereas communicative translation is meant to serve a larger readership. It should be pointed out that during the translation process, communicative translations need not be employed exclusively over semantic or vice versa. It may well be the case in a literary text that a particular sentence requires communicative translation whereas another sentence from the same text may require a semantic one. Hence, the two methods of translation may be used in parallel, with varying focuses where each is employed.

h. Baker

Mona Baker in her influential book *In Other Words* (2011) addresses the vexing issue of equivalence by adopting a more neutral approach when she argues that equivalence is a relative notion because it is influenced by a variety of linguistic and cultural factors (p. 6). In particular, the chapters of her book are structured around different kinds of equivalence, that is, at the level of word, phrase, grammar, text and pragmatics. Hence, terms such as grammatical, textual and pragmatic equivalence come up.

In more detail, a distinction is made between word-level and above-world-level equivalence. Adopting a bottom-up approach, Baker acknowledges the importance of individual words during the translation process, since the translator looks firstly at the words as single units in order to find their equivalent in the TL.
Baker goes on to provide a definition of the term word referring to its complex nature since a single word can sometimes be assigned different meanings in different languages. Consequently, parameters such as number, gender and tense should be taken into consideration when translating a word (p. 11-12).

i. Pym

Lastly, Pym makes his own contribution to the concept of equivalence by pointing out that there is no such thing as perfect equivalence between languages and it is always assumed equivalence. In particular, for Pym equivalence is a relation of “equal value” between an ST segment and a TT segment and can be established on any linguistic level from form to function. He goes on to distinguish between natural and directional equivalence. Natural equivalence exists between languages prior to the act of translating, and, secondly, it is not affected by directionality.

On the other hand, theories of directional equivalence give the translator the freedom to choose between several translations strategies which are not dictated by the ST. Although there are usually many ways of translating, the strategies for directional equivalence are reduced into two opposing poles; one adhering to SL norms and the other to TL norms. Perhaps, the most important assumption of directional equivalence is that it involves some kind of asymmetry since when translating one way and creating an equivalent does not imply the creation of the same equivalent when translating another way.

From all of the concepts of equivalence proposed by experts above, the writer chooses Mona Baker’s concept to analyze Inheritance Freedom Writers movie. They are textual (cohesion) equivalence and pragmatic equivalence.
C. **Textual Equivalence: Cohesion**

Cohesion is the network of lexical, grammatical and other relations which provide links between various parts of a text. These relations or ties organize and, to some extent, create a text, for instance by requiring the reader to interpret words and expressions by reference to other words and expressions in the surrounding sentences and paragraphs. Cohesion is a surface relation; it connects together the actual words and expressions that we can see or hear (Baker, 2011: 190).

Halliday and Hasan in the book “Cohesion in English” identify five main cohesive devices in English: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion.

1. **Reference**

The term reference is traditionally used in semantics for the relationship which holds between a word and what it points to in the real world. The reference of *chair* would therefore be a particular chair that is being identified on a particular occasion (Baker, 2011: 190). In Halliday and Hasan’s model of cohesion, reference is used in a similar but more restricted way. Instead of denoting a direct relationship between words and extralinguistic objects, reference is limited here to the relationship of identity which holds between two linguistic expressions. For example, in

*Mrs. Thatcher has resigned. She announced her decision this morning*

the pronoun *she* points to Mrs. Thatcher within the textual world itself. Reference, in the textual rather than the semantic sense, occurs when the reader has to retrieve the identity of what is being talked about by referring to another expression in the immediate context. The resulting cohesion ‘lies in the continuity of reference, whereby the same thing enters into the discourse a second time’ (Halliday and Hasan 1976:31). So, reference is a device which allows the reader/hearer to trace participants, entities, events, etc. in a text (Baker, 2011: 191).
There are three types of reference:

a. Personal reference

It is a reference by means of function in the speech situation, through the category of person.

**Table 2.7. Personal reference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic category</th>
<th>Existential</th>
<th>Possessive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammatical function</strong></td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Modifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class</strong></td>
<td>noun (pronoun)</td>
<td>determiner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>speaker (only)</td>
<td>I me</td>
<td>mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addressee(s), with/without other person(s)</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>yours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaker and other person(s)</td>
<td>we us</td>
<td>ours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other person, male</td>
<td>he him</td>
<td>our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other person, female</td>
<td>she her</td>
<td>his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other persons; objects</td>
<td>they them</td>
<td>hers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object; passage of text</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>theirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generalized person</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>her</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


b. Demonstrative reference

It is reference by means location, on a scale of proximity.

**Table 2.8. Demonstrative reference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic category</th>
<th>Selective</th>
<th>Non-selective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammatical function</strong></td>
<td>Modifier/Head</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class</strong></td>
<td>determiner</td>
<td>adverb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximity:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>near</td>
<td>this these</td>
<td>here [now]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>far</td>
<td>that those</td>
<td>there then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Comparative reference

It is indirect reference by means of identity or similarity.

**Table 2.9.** Comparative reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Grammarical function</th>
<th>Modifier: Deictic/Epithet (see below)</th>
<th>Submodifier/Adjunct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General comparison:</td>
<td>identity</td>
<td>same identical equal similar additional</td>
<td>identically similarly likewise so such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>general similarity</td>
<td>similar additional</td>
<td>similarly likewise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>difference (ie non-</td>
<td>other different else</td>
<td>differently otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identity or similarity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular comparison:</td>
<td>better, more etc</td>
<td>so more less equally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[comparative adjectives and quantifiers]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. Substitution and Ellipsis

Unlike reference, substitution and ellipsis are grammatical rather than semantic relationships. In substitution, an item (or items) is replaced by another item (or items):

I like movies.
And I do.

In the above example, do is a substitute for like movies. Items commonly used in substitution in English include *do, one,* and *the same* (Baker, 2011: 196).

Ellipsis involves the omission of an item. In other words, in ellipsis, an item is replaced by nothing. This is a case of leaving something unsaid which is nevertheless understood. It does not include every instance, in which the hearer or reader has to provide missing information, but only those cases where the
grammatical structure itself points to an item or items that can fill the slot in question (Baker, 2011: 196-197). Here are some examples of ellipsis:

a. Joan brought some carnations and Catherine some sweet peas.
   (ellipted item: brought in second clause)

b. Here are thirteen cards. Take any. Now give me any three.
   (ellipted items: card after any in second clause and cards after any three in third clause)

c. Have you been swimming? – Yes, I have.
   (ellipted items: been swimming in second clause) (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 143, 158, 167).

3. Conjunction

Conjunction involves the use of formal markers to relate sentences, clauses and paragraphs to each other. Unlike reference, substitution and ellipsis, the use of conjunction does not instruct the reader to supply missing information either by looking for it elsewhere in the text or by filling structural slots. Instead, conjunction signals the way the writer or speaker wants the reader or hearer to relate what is about to be said to what has been said before. Conjunction expresses one of a small number of general relations. The main relations are summarized below, with examples of conjunctions which can or typically realize each relation.

a. Additive: and, or, also, in addition, furthermore, besides, similarly, likewise, by contrast, for instance;

b. Adversative: but, yet, however, instead, on the other hand, nevertheless, at any rate, as a matter of fact;

c. Causal: so, consequently, it follows, for, because, under the circumstances, for this reason;
d. Temporal: then, next, after that, on another occasion, in conclusion, an hour later, finally, at last;

e. Continuatives (miscellaneous): now, of course, well, anyway, surely, after all (Baker, 2011: 200).

A number of points need to be borne in mind here. First, the same conjunction may be used to signal different relations, depending on the context. Second, these relations can be expressed by a variety of means; the use of a conjunction is not the only device for expressing a temporal or causal relation, for instance. In English, a temporal relation may be expressed by means of a verb such as *follow* or *precede*, and a causal relation is inherent in the meanings of verbs such as *cause* and *lead to*. In fact, a language user will often recognize a semantic relation such as time sequence even when no explicit signal of such a relationship exists in the text. Third, conjunctive relations do not just reflect relations between external phenomena, but may also be set up to reflect relations which are internal to the text or communicative situation. For instance, temporal relations are not restricted to sequence in real time; they may reflect stages in the unfolding text. A good example is the use of *first, second* and *third* in this paragraph (Baker, 2011: 200).

4. Lexical cohesion

Lexical cohesion refers to the role played by the selection of vocabulary in organizing relations within a text. A given lexical item cannot be said to have a cohesive function *per se* (cf. reference, conjunction), but any lexical item can enter into a cohesive relation with other items in a text. Halliday and Hasan (1976) divide lexical cohesion into two main categories: reiteration and collocation.
Reiteration, as the name suggests, involves repetition of lexical items. A reiterated item may be a repetition of an earlier item, a synonym or near synonym, a super ordinate, or a general word (Baker, 2011: 210-211). For example:

There’s a boy climbing that tree.
(a) The boy is going to fall if he doesn’t take care. (repetition)
(b) The lad’s going to fall if he doesn’t take care. (synonym)
(c) The child’s going to fall if he doesn’t take care. (superordinate)
(d) The idiot’s going to fall if he doesn’t take care. (general word)

Reiteration is not the same as reference, however, because it does not necessarily involve the same identity. If the above sentence is followed by a statement such as ‘Boys can be so silly’, the repetition of boy → boys would still be an instance of reiteration, even though the two items would not be referring to the same individual(s) (Baker, 2011: 211).

Collocation, as a sub-class of lexical cohesion in Halliday and Hasan’s model, covers any instance which involves a pair of lexical items that are associated with each other in the language in some way. Halliday and Hasan offer the following types of association as examples, but admit that there are other instances where the association between lexical items cannot readily be given a name but is nevertheless felt to exist. In the final analysis, they suggest, it does not matter what the relation is as long as we are aware of it and react to it as a cohesive device.

a. Various kinds of oppositeness of meaning: e.g. boy/girl; love/hate; order/obey.
b. Associations between pairs of words from the same ordered series: e.g. Tuesday/Thursday; August/December; dollar/cent.
c. Associations between pairs of words from unordered lexical sets: e.g. part–whole relations: car/brake; body/arm; bicycle/wheel;
   part–part relations: mouth/chin; verse/chorus;
   co-hyponymy: red/green (color); chair/table (furniture).
d. Associations based on a history of co-occurrence: e.g. rain, pouring, torrential, wet; hair, comb, curl, wave; etc. (Baker, 2011: 210).

D. Pragmatic Equivalence

Pragmatic is the study of utterance meaning, sentences which are used in communication and also the study of meaning in language interaction between a speaker and hearer. Pragmatic Equivalence refers to words in both languages having the same effect on the readers in both languages. According to Baker (2011:230) from the variety of notions that are central to this particular area of language study, Baker haven chosen two which she believe to be particularly helpful in exploring the question “how a given text comes to ‘make a sense’ to a given readership and highlighting areas of difficulty in cross-cultural communication. These are coherence and implicature.

Coherence is a network of relations which organize and create a text: cohesion is the network of surface relations which link words and expressions to other words and expressions in a text, and coherence is the network of conceptual relations which underlie the surface text. Both concern the way stretches of language are connected each other. In the case of cohesion, stretches of language are connected to each other by virtue of lexical and grammatical dependencies. In the case of coherence, they are connected by virtue of conceptual or meaning dependencies as perceived by language users.

The coherence of a text is a result of the interaction between knowledge presented in the text and the reader’s own knowledge and experience of the world, the latter being influenced by a variety of factors such as age, sex, race, nationality, education, occupation, and political and religious affiliations. Coherence is mostly receiver-centred. It depends on the ability of the hearer-reader to interpret a stretch of language on the basis of his/her expectation and experience of the world. Which in their turn are influenced by the society he/she lives in. For example:
“He looked like a Frodo coming down the mountain. The hobbit was walking slowly and singing to himself.”

One has to know that “Frodo” and “the hobbit” are the same person, which means that he/she must have read the novel Lord of the Rings, seen the movie drawn from it, or at least heard about one of the two. If a translation of the sentence were addressed to a public who is not likely to have done any of the above mentioned things, the translator would probably have to intervene and modify it, for instance in the following way:

“He looked like Frodo the hobbit coming down the mountain. He was walking slowly and singing to himself.”

Thus coherence is not really a property of text but of the event/situation and of the people and things involved in it. A dialogue can be coherent to one observer or participant and not coherent to another.

Baker (2011:235) said that Grice (1975) uses the term implicature to refer to what the speaker/writer means or implies rather than what he or she literally says. Implicature is not to be confused with non-literal meaning, for instance with idiomatic meaning. Idiomatic meaning is conventional, and its interpretation depends on a good mastery of the linguistic system in question rather than on a successful interpretation of a particular speaker’s intended or implied meaning in a given context. For instance in the following exchange:

A. Shall we go for a walk?
B. Could I take a rain check on that?

The interpretation depends on knowing the meaning of the expression “take a rain check” in American English, and will be “If you don’t mind, we’ll do it another time”.
While in the case of:

A. Shall we go for a walk?
B. It’s raining.

The answer could be interpreted as: “No, thanks, I don’t want to get wet”, or “Okay, but let’s take an umbrella”, etc.

According to Grice mentioned by Baker (2011: 236), who is mainly concerned with spoken language, a speaker can signal an implied meaning conventionally or non-conventionally. In the first case he/she will use textual resources such as conjunctions or grammatical structures. Implied meaning which is not signalled conventionally derives from the Cooperative Principle and its maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relevance and Manner:

1. Quantity
   - Make your contribution as informative as is required.
   - Do not make it more informative than is required.

2. Quality
   - Do not say what you believe is false.
   - Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

3. Relevance/Relation
   - Make your contribution relevant to the current exchange.

4. Manner
   - Avoid obscurity
   - Avoid ambiguity
   - Avoid prolixity
   - Be orderly
The maxims of the Cooperative Principle can be flouted for various reasons but, generally speaking, we assume that an utterance that follows a question provides an answer to that question. Therefore we will try to find an interpretation that suits the question.

Again, the inferences we draw will depend on our knowledge of the world, of the participants in the discourse and of the situation. Implicatures, then, are pragmatic inferences which allow us to understand a stretch of language beyond its literal meaning by taking into account the Cooperative Principle. This complicates the task of a translator who might knowingly or unknowingly eliminate certain possible interpretations of the original text (Baker, 2011:238).

Grice suggests a number of factors which can contribute to our success or failure to interpret implicatures, and they are:

1. The conventional meanings of the words and structures used (mastery of the language) and the recognition of any references involved.
2. The Cooperative Principle and its maxims.
3. The context of the utterance.
4. Other elements of background knowledge.
5. The fact that the above mentioned elements are available to both participants (Baker, 2011:238).

E. Biography of the Film Director

Online Film & Television Association award winner, Richard LaGravenese is a famous screenwriter and film director from United States and he is popular for being the writer of the book and comedy movie, The Fisher King. Born as Richard LaGravenese in Brooklyn, New York City, New York, United States of America to
taxi driver, Richard was raised in the humble background. He is an American and is of Italian descent.

Richard is a married man. He got married to his girlfriend, Ann Weiss long time ago. As a loving spouse they have already welcomed one child and they are happy to be with each other.

After his high school graduation, Richard joined New York University and majored in acting. He finally earned his bachelor of fine arts degree in 1980. After that he appeared in several Off-Off-Broadway productions and he wrote his first movie script in 1989 for the movie, Rude Awakening. He also made his directorial debut in 1998 movie, Living Out Loud.

Richard LaGravenese facts on time line:

- 1959, Born in Brooklyn, New York City, New York (30th of December)
  Born as Richard LaGravenese in Brooklyn, New York City, New York, United States of America to taxi driver, Richard was raised in the humble background. He is an American and is of Italian descent. He is a tall guy.

- 1980, Graduated from New York University
  After his high school graduation, Richard joined New York University. There, he studied acting in Tisch School of Arts. He finally earned his bachelor of fine arts degree in 1980. There, he excelled in writing and acting.

- 1989, First Professional Script
  After graduation from New York University, he appeared in several Off-Off-Broadway production and he wrote his first movie script in 1989 for the movie, Rude Awakening. He is also the screen writer of the 1991 movie, The Fisher King.
• 1991, Wrote The Fisher King

Richard LaGravenese is mainly known in the world for being the writer of the book, The Fisher King. This book has also been adopted in a movie and it was also released under the same name in 1991.

• 1998, Began His Directorial Career

Online Film & Television Association award winner, Richard LaGravenese is a famous screenwriter and film director from United States. He also made his directorial debut in 1998 movie, Living Out Loud and has been active in directing since that time on.

• 2000, Won Las Vegas Film Critics Society Awards

It seems like Las Vegas Film Critics Society Awards was the first major award he was awarded with. He won this award for first time in 2000 for best Screenplay, Original. That was also his one and only nomination in this award.

• 2007, Won Humanitas Prize

Humanitas Prize is also one of the prestigious awards. In 2007, he won this awards for the first time from the Feature Film Category. Recently in 2013, he got nominated Primetime Emmy Awards for Outstanding Writing for a Miniseries Movie.

• 2013, Won Online Film & Television Association

In 2013, he got nominated in Online Film & Television Association for the first time in his life and that was from his work in the movie, Behind the Candelabra. He won this award for Best Writing of a Motion Picture or Miniseries. It takes from http://frostsnow.com/richard-lagravenese.
F. Synopsis of the Freedom Writers

The storyline of the movie takes place between 1992-1995, beginning with scenes from the 1992 Los Angeles Riots. Hilary Swank plays the role of Erin Gruwell, a new, excited schoolteacher who leaves the safety of her hometown, Newport Beach, to teach at Woodrow Wilson High School in Long Beach, a formerly high achieving school which has recently had an integration program put in place.

The protagonist of this story is Ms. Gruwell or also known as Ms. G by the students. She is a daughter, a wife and a teacher. The story mostly took place at the classroom and the school. Ms Gruwell is a new teacher in the school, which have a racist problem among the students. Besides that, the senior teachers in that school was just ignored the students’ behaviors. They have not put an effort to change the students’ behaviors and their racist problems. They assumed that the students don’t really want to study and the students go to school just because they have been asked to do so by their family. Therefore, the senior teachers just teach the students only for the sake of teaching. However, things changed when Ms.Gruwell came and teach in the school. She has been teaching the students in the lowest grade. She has makes many improvements for the students and have slowly solved the racist problems among the students.

There are many things that can be seen from this story on the perspectives of a teacher. One of them is an interactive classroom. In this movie, Ms.Gruwell has tried to get her students’ attention by started to have an interaction with the students. She asked some questions about the students’ life to make them participate. As we know, an interactive classroom makes a better learning environment as the teacher encourage and make the students to participate as equal partners in an ongoing discovery process. Ms. Gruwell also makes an activity in the classroom which is a
game, started by the teacher asked few questions related to the students’ life. At the end of it, the activities that have been carried out facilitate learning interaction between the students. The teacher, Ms.Gruwell also has asked the students to write their own diaries, and they are free to write anything about their life. She also has asked the students to read a novel which can be related to their history life, their past life. These tasks have made the students to interact with the teachers and among them at one point of time. At the later part, Ms.Gruwell has brought her students for a trip to the museum, and has invited a few people of history to meet the students. These activities have also facilitated wider interaction for the students beyond the classroom where the students have chances to interact with the people of history.

The second thing that can be seen is classroom management. Ms. Gruwell was a bit shocked when at first time she entered the classroom, which the students were all noisy, keep talking with each other in their own gang and some of them busy doing their own stuff. They were ignored the existence of the teacher in the classroom. The students were sitting within their own gang or races. They don’t mix at all and one cannot touch and talked with the other who is in the other races or gang. This situation was complicated, even when the teacher started to tell something, the students just ignored it. It was not easy for a new teacher to cope with this situation. However, Ms.Gruwell has managed to solve this problem slowly. She has a very good classroom management skill. She has changed the sitting of the students, where the most aggressive students she asked to sit in front and vice versa. Other than that, the students have not pay attention while the teacher was teaching. One situation happened where a student has drew a picture of a person and past it over around the floor and they have laughed, until the teacher realized on what was happened. The teacher has managed to control the situation where she told the student who drew the
picture to make some drawings on the board because that student might have a good talent in drawings. This is how a teacher should do in order to make the students feel shame on what they did.

Last but not least, the other important thing is the students’ motivation. The students have very low motivation due to their background, the history of their life. They have no motivation to success, to be a good person and even they only told their self to take revenge on what they have gone through in their life. The teacher has instilled a motivation to the students slowly. She has motivated the students intrinsically. She motivates the students by talks to them about the history, and emphasis on the importance of each life and also the importance of being tolerate and have a peaceful life. Ms. Gruwell has also make the students discover the history and brought them to the museum, and they found that everyone need each other no matter who they are and what race they are. The teacher also has motivates the students by make them being visited by the people of history, a person who have give an impact in their life to improve their own self. The teacher has given each of the students a book for them to read which have being bought by the teacher’s own money. The activity of food sale for fund raising also make the students motivated to work and help each other to achieve what they want. By completely changed in students’ behaviors, the teacher has made a small party in class to appreciate and celebrate for their changed. This is the extrinsic motivation that the teacher gave to the students.

Basically, this movie covered how to cope with aggressive students, who have very low motivation and thus make them being a bad student. With all the skills and knowledge that we have, as a teacher, we can manage to cope with these kinds of situations. It can be said here that, as a teacher, we must have many skills to encounter many situations that we might face and we must make ourselves prepared for that. A
teacher not only teach, but must be an effective and excellent teacher, being loved by the students and being as an inspiration to the students. (http://FaBuLoUsMom.com)
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DATA PRESENTATIONS

In this chapter, the researcher will be gives some explanation about research method that the researcher use. This chapter will be consist of type of the research, object of the research, data source, technique of data collection, and method of data analysis.

A. Type of Research

To analyze textual equivalence and pragmatic equivalence that found in the movie “Freedom Writers” script, the researcher used descriptive qualitative research method. The researcher uses a qualitative research, which is defined as a research of which the data in the form of written or oral words that is descriptively analyzed. Moleong on Zuriah (2007: 92) says that a qualitative research deals with a kind of research which doesn’t use statistic procedures in analyzing the data. In a qualitative research, the researcher tends to prior in accurate explanation to analyze and present what have been found.

Qualitative research always has descriptive quality, it means that the data which are analyzed and the data analysis result have the form of phenomenon descriptive, not nominal form or coefficient about relationship among variable (Aminudin, 1999: 16). It can be inferred that qualitative research is systematic application of the problems and the data here can be oral or written.

Moleong (2002: 4) affirms that, qualitative research is a research of which the data is in the form of written or oral word is descriptive method. Descriptive is serving to describe or analogy something and it deals the meaning of thing and view of meaning is associate. Furthermore, Moleong (2002: 3) says that qualitative research is a search of
which data in the forms of written or oral word are descriptively analyzed, which does not include any calculation or numerating.

B. Object of the Research

The object of the research is textual equivalence and pragmatic equivalence which found in the movie entitled *Freedom Writers*. The movie published in 2007 by Paramount Pictures.

C. Data Sources

The researcher looks for the primary data from movie script of “Freedom Writers” which is taken from http://subscene.com/subtitles/freedom-writers/english/1258664 and http://subscene.com/subtitles/freedom-writers/indonesian/1116296 (accessed on Tuesday, September 01, 2015 at 11:03 a.m). Then, the secondary data were taken from books and websites.

D. Technique of Data Collection

In this research, the writer applied some techniques in collecting data documentation. It is finding the data about all variables in the notebooks, newspapers, magazines, and so on (Arikunto, 1993:202). The benefit of this method is getting the data needed. The steps are:

1. Finding Data

   The writer seeks the data from the movie entitled *Freedom Writers*. Then the writer finds the data which are analyzed.

2. Data Listing

   After finding data, the writer lists them based on script of the movie. This is done in order to easier in classifying data.

3. Data Classification
The writer uses the list data to classifying them based on form textual and pragmatic equivalence.

E. Method of Data Analysis

Based on Sudaryanto (1993:13-17) there are two kinds of methods in analyzing data of language; they are Padan method (Referential method) and Agih method (Distributional method). Agih method is used since the language itself becomes the determiner of the research. While Padan method is a method in which determiner is outside, unbound, and not a part of the relevant language. The writer used Agih method (Distributional method) to select textual equivalence and Padan method (Referential method) to select pragmatic equivalence in the Freedom Writers movie to classifying the data and to analyze the data. The interpretation of the text is content analysis. The steps are:

1. The writer watching and learning whole the movie supported by read all the movie script
2. The writer gives an underline of source language and target language which contains the textual and pragmatic equivalence.
3. The writer classification of textual and pragmatic equivalence.
4. The writer codification textual and pragmatic equivalence that found in the movie script.
5. The writer describing and analyzing textual and pragmatic equivalence that found in the movie script.
6. The writer making conclusion based on the data analysis.
### F. Data Presentation

Data presentation presents data collections. The table of data collection contains the information about classification types of textual and pragmatic equivalence, English and Indonesian quotation/dialogue based on the movie script, and code. The writer takes the data textual and pragmatic equivalence of the *Freedom Writers* movie script as follows:

#### 1. Textual Equivalence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Types of Textual Equivalence</th>
<th>Quotation/Dialogue</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Personal Reference</td>
<td>Eva: In America, a girl can be crowned a princess for her beauty and her grace. But an Aztec princess is chosen for her blood.</td>
<td>English: Eva: <em>Di Amerika, seorang gadis bisa dinobatkan menjadi putri karena keindahan dan keanggunannya.</em></td>
<td>00:01:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesian: Eva: <em>Di Amerika, seorang putri Aztec dipilih karena darahnya.</em></td>
<td>Indonesian: Eva: <em>Di Amerika, seorang putri Aztec dipilih karena darahnya.</em></td>
<td>00:02:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Personal Reference</td>
<td>Margaret: If I give your kids the books, I’ll never see them again. If I do they’ll be damaged.</td>
<td>English: Margaret: <em>Jika kuberi siswa-siswamu buku ini, aku takkan pernah melihat mereka lagi.</em></td>
<td>00:37:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesian: Margaret: <em>Jika kulakukan, mereka akan rusak.</em></td>
<td>Indonesian: Margaret: <em>Jika kuberi siswa-siswamu buku ini, aku takkan pernah melihat mereka lagi.</em></td>
<td>00:37:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Types of Textual Equivalence</td>
<td>Quotation/Dialogue</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Demonstrative Reference 1. Margaret: It’s too bad to you weren’t here even two years ago you know.</td>
<td>Margaret: Sayangnya anda tak di sini genap dua tahun yang lalu.</td>
<td>00:04:57</td>
<td>A 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Erin: I want you all</td>
<td>Erin: Aku ingin kalian</td>
<td>00:21:30</td>
<td>A 2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Erin: I am and I really want to be here.</td>
<td>Erin: Aku siap dan aku sungguh ingin bekerja di sini.</td>
<td>00:06:06</td>
<td>A 2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00:06:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Margaret: It’s too bad to you weren’t here even two years ago you know.</td>
<td>Margaret: Sayangnya anda tak di sini genap dua tahun yang lalu.</td>
<td>00:04:57</td>
<td>A 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Erin: I am and I really want to be here.</td>
<td>Erin: Aku siap dan aku sungguh ingin bekerja di sini.</td>
<td>00:06:06</td>
<td>A 2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Erin: I want you all</td>
<td>Erin: Aku ingin kalian</td>
<td>00:21:30</td>
<td>A 2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Types of Textual Equivalence</td>
<td>Quotation/Dialogue</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to move this side of the room. You in the back up here. Sindy and all of you move to the back.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>semua pidah ke sisi ruangan. Kau yang di belakang, di sini. Sindy dan kalian semua, pindah ke belakang.</td>
<td>00:21:36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Comparative Reference</td>
<td>Eva: ...thoes who say we are less than they are. Who say we are not equal in beauty and in blessing.</td>
<td>00:01:53</td>
<td>A 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eva: ...mereka yang berkata ‘kita lebih rendah dari mereka’. Yang berkata 'kita tak sebanding cantik dan berkah.’</td>
<td>00:01:59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret: ...We used to have one of the highest scholastic records in the district but since voluntary integration was suggested, we’ve lost over 75% of our strongest students.</td>
<td>00:05:01</td>
<td>A 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret: kami memiliki rekor nilai tertinggi di distrik, tapi sekjak integrasi sukarelawan disarankan kami kehilangan lebih dari 75% siswa terhebat kami.</td>
<td>00:05:14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Types of Textual Equivalence</td>
<td>Quotation/Dialogue</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ellipsis</td>
<td>Marcus: How many friends did you know that are dead now that got killed? Eva: Too many to count.</td>
<td>Marcus: Berapa banyak temanmu yang kau kenal mati dibunuh? Eva: Terlalu banyak untuk dihitung.</td>
<td>01:20:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Erin: I just want to stay with my kids next year.</td>
<td>Erin: Aku hanya ingin bersama anak-anakku tahun depan.</td>
<td>01:47:02</td>
<td>A 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Types of Textual Equivalence</td>
<td>Quotation/Dialogue</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indonesian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6. | Conjunction                  | **Brian G:** She can’t. I have the juniors.  
<p>|    |                              | <strong>Brian:</strong> Dia tidak bisa. Aku yang mengajar junior. |      |      |
| 1. | Eva: In America, a girl can be crowned a princess for her beauty and her grace. | <strong>Eva:</strong> Di Amerika, seorang gadis bisa dinobatkan menjadi seorang putri karena keindahan dan keanggunannya. | 00:01:30 | A 6.1 |
| 2. | Eva: They took my father for retaliation. He was innocent but they took him because he was respected by my people. | <strong>Eva:</strong> Mereka membawa ayahku karena dendam. Dia tak bersalah, tetapi mereka menangkapnya, karena dia dihormati oleh golonganku. | 00:02:29 | A 6.2 |
| 3. | Eva: They think they're winning by jumping me now but soon they’re all going down. | <strong>Eva:</strong> Mereka pikir mereka akan menang dengan menyerangku sekarang tapi mereka semua segera akan kalah. | 00:03:49 | A 6.3 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Types of Textual Equivalence</th>
<th>Quotation/Dialogue</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lexical Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Erin: Let’s go over the first name on the list Homer. Homer’s The Odyssey. Marcus: I know Homer the Simpson. Erin: No this Homer was an ancient Greek but maybe he was bald just like Homer Simpson.</td>
<td>Erin: Mari kita bahas nama pertama dalam daftar Homer. “Homer’s the Odyssey”. Marcus: Aku tahu Homer Simpson. Erin: Bukan, Homer ini Orang Yunani Kuno tapi mungkin dia botak seperti Homer Simpson.</td>
<td>00:14:19</td>
<td>A 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Marcus: Man-child in the promised land could’t afford many heroes. Moms was the only one there Pops was a no</td>
<td>Marcus: Seorang pria dewasa tak mampu membayar seorang pahlawan. Ibu hanya satu-satunya yang ada, ayah tak muncul. Dan tidak, kurasa kau tak tahu bahwa aku</td>
<td>00:20:28</td>
<td>A 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Types of Textual Equivalence</td>
<td>Quotation/Dialogue</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>show. And, no, I guess you didn’t know that I would grow to be strong. You looking kinda pale, was it the ale? Oh, pops was wrong?</td>
<td>akan tumbuh menjadi sangat kuat. Kau tampak agak pucat, apa itu birnya? Oh ayah apa yang terjadi?</td>
<td>00:37:42</td>
<td>A 7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Pragmatics Equivalence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Types of Pragmatic Equivalence</th>
<th>Quotation/DIALOGUE</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indonesian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erin: What?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eva: You know. Take him out.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erin: Eva, this is The Diary of Anne Frank not Die Hard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eva: Kapan Anne menembak Hitler?</td>
<td>01:19:23 – 01:19:34</td>
<td>B 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erin: Apa?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eva: Kau tahu. Membunuhnya?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erin: Eva, itu “The Diary of Anne Frank” bukann “Die Hard”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Implicature (Maxim of Quality)</td>
<td>Erin Gruwell: Jamal Hill?</td>
<td>00:10:37 – 00:10:46</td>
<td>B 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jamal: Man what am I doing here? This whole ghetto-ass class has got people in here looking like a bad rerun of cops and shit. You know what I’m saying? It’s true.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erin Gruwell: Jamal Hill?</td>
<td>00:10:37 – 00:10:46</td>
<td>B 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jamal: Bro apa yang aku lakukan di sini?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Types of Pragmatic Equivalence</td>
<td>Quotation/Dialogue</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Brian Gelford:</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>00:12:14 – 00:12:18</td>
<td>B 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>you saw a little action</em> today I hear</td>
<td><em>Gelford: Kudengar ada keributan di kelasmu hari ini.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Scott: Are you sure about this?</td>
<td><em>Scott: Kau yakin akan hal ini?</em></td>
<td>00:16:58 – 00:17:10</td>
<td>B 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erin: I don’t know it just does. I’m not used to</td>
<td><em>Erin: Aku tak tahu apa yang ia lakukan. Aku tak bisa</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Types of Pragmatic Equivalence</td>
<td>Quotation/Dialogue</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>disappointing him.</td>
<td>mengecewakannya.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eva: ...So I hate white people on shirt!</td>
<td>Eva: ...Jadi aku benci orang berkulit putih! Erin: Ben, ada yang mau kau katakan? Ben: Boleh aku pergi?</td>
<td>00:33:59 – 00:34:10</td>
<td>B 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erin: Ben, do you have anything to say?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ben: Can I please get out of here?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Types of Pragmatic Equivalence</td>
<td>Quotation/Dialogue</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Implicature (Maxim of Quantity)</td>
<td>Erin: I don’t know how to make them interested in reading with these. Margaret: You can’t make someone want an education. The best you can do is try to get them to obey to learn discipline. That would be a tremendous accomplishment for them.</td>
<td>00:38:48 – 00:39:02</td>
<td>B 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Implicature (Maxim of Manner)</td>
<td>Erin: What is this? Jamal: Just leave it alone.</td>
<td>00:29:17 – 00:29:20</td>
<td>B 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Types of Pragmatic Equivalence</td>
<td>Quotation/Dialogue</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Erin: Well, what’s going on at work? Scott: Nothing, I don’t want to talk about that either. I just want to hang out, I want to be home.</td>
<td>Erin: Apa yang terjadi di tempat kerja? Scott: Tidak ada, aku pun tak ingin membicarakan hal itu. Aku hanya ingin santai, aku ingin berada di rumah.</td>
<td>00:48:03 – 00:48:08</td>
<td>B 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Implicature</td>
<td>Brian Gelford: You <em>put your time</em> in a few years, you’ll be able to teach junior. They’re a pleasure. By then most of your kids will be gone anyway. Erin: What do you mean? Brian Gelford: well eventually</td>
<td>Brian G: Anda <em>habiskan waktu anda</em> di sini beberapa tahun, anda akan bisa mngajar kelas menengah ke atas. Saat itu sebagian besar anak-anak anda akan hilang pula. Erin: Apa maksud anda? Brian G: Pada akhirnya mereka akan</td>
<td>00:12:21 – 00:12:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Types of Pragmatic Equivalence</td>
<td>Quotation/Dialogue</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>they just stop coming.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Erin:</strong> I’m a teacher. It doesn’t matter what color I am.</td>
<td>00:33:17 - 00:33:30</td>
<td>B 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Eva:</strong> It’s about color. It’s about people deciding what you deserve about people wanting what they don’t deserve, about whites thinking they run this world no matter what.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Erin:</strong> Aku seorang guru. Tidak peduli apa warnaku. <strong>Eva:</strong> Ini semua tentang warna kulit. Ini tentang hal yang orang putuskan apa yang layak kau dapat. Tentang hal yang orang inginkan apa yang sepatutnya dapatkan. Tentang kulit putih yang berpikir mereka menjalankan dunia ini tak peduli apapun.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Erin:</strong> It’s been a little difficult getting their attention. Up until</td>
<td>00:56:24 – 00:56:32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Erin:</strong> Agak sulit mendapati perhatian mereka. Sekarang ini, satu-satunya hal yang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Types of Pragmatic Equivalence</td>
<td>Quotation/Dialogue</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>recently the only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>one thing they</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hated more than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>each other was me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dr. Cohn:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Well,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>you united them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and <strong>that’s a step.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>melebihi kebencian</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>mereka satu sama lain</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>adalah aku.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Dr. Cohn: Ya, anda</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>menyatukan mereka</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>dan itu kemajuan.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coding**

1. Code A = Textual Equivalence
   - A 1 = Personal Reference
   - A 2 = Demonstrative Reference
   - A 3 = Comparative Reference
   - A 4 = Subtitution
   - A 5 = Ellipsis
   - A 6 = Conjunction
   - A 7 = lexical cohesion

   Number after A 1, A 2, A 3, A 4, A 5, A 6, and A 7 is number of example or data from the movie script.

2. Code B = Pragmatic Equivalence
   - B 1 = Coherence
   - B 2 = Implicatures (Maxim of Quality)
- B 3 = Implicatures (Maxim of Quantity)
- B 4 = Implicatures (Maxim of Manner)
- B 5 = Implicatures (Maxim of Relation/Relevance)

  Number after B 1, B 2, B 3, B 4, and B 5 is number of example or data from the movie script.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS

In this chapter the writer will analyze what are textual and pragmatics equivalence in Freedom Writers movie script. In the data analysis it will be presented the result of analysis. Along with the findings, in the data analysis discusses to answer statement of the problems from the chapter one as follows:

A. Textual Equivalence

Cohesion is the network of lexical, grammatical and other relations which provide links between various parts of text. Baker choose the model of cohesion outlined by Halliday and Hasan in the book “Cohesion in English” identify five main cohesive devices in English: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion.

There are data analysis of five main cohesive devices in English according to Halliday and Hasan:

1. Reference
   a. Personal Reference
      1) 00:01:30 – 00:02:22

      "Eva: In America, a girl can be crowned a princess for her beauty and her grace. But an Aztec princess is chosen for her blood.”

      Translation: “Eva: Di Amerika, seorang gadis bisa dinobatkan menjadi seorang putri karena keindahan dan keanggunannya. Tapi seorang putri Aztec dipilih karena darahnya.”

      The quotation above includes personal reference because the pronoun her refers to princess and an Aztec princess. It is reference by means the category of person. The
The translation of this quotation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).

2) 00:37:38 – 00:37:46

**Margaret**: If I give your kids the books, I’ll never see them again. If I do they’ll be damaged.

**Erin**: What about these? Romeo and Juliet. That’s a great gang story.

Translation: “**Margaret**: Jika kuberi siswa-siswa kamu buku ini, aku takkan pernah melihat mereka lagi. Jika kulakukan, mereka akan rusak.


The quotation above includes personal reference because the pronoun you refers to Erin and they and them refers to the books. The conversation happened when Margaret talk to Erin in the library. It is reference by means the category of person. The translation of this quotation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).

3) 01:12:41 – 01:12:54

**A boy student**: Ms. G? Can I read something from my diary?

**Erin**: That’s be great.

**Jamal**: Who is he?

**Gloria**: Man, he’s been with us from freshman year, fool.

Translation:

**A boy student**: Ms. G? Bolehkah aku membaca sesuatu dari diari ku?

**Erin**: Itu akan hebat.
**Jamal** : Siapa dia?

**Gloria** : Bung, dia sudah bersama kita sejak tahun pertama, bodoh.

The conversation above includes personal reference because the pronoun he refers to a boy student and pronoun us refers to Gloria and Jamal, and also determiner my- refers to a boy student. It is reference by means the category of person. The translation of this conversation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).

b. Demonstrative Reference

1) 00:04:57 -00:05:00

**Margaret** : It’s too bad to you weren’t here even two years ago you know.

Translation: “**Margaret** : Sayangnya anda tak di sini genap dua tahun yang lalu.”

The quotation above includes demonstrative reference because adverb here refers to the school. It is reference by means location, the scale of proximity is near. The translation of this quotation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).

2) 00:06:06 -00:06:10

**Erin** : I am and I really want to be here

Translation: “**Erin** : Aku siap dan aku sungguh ingin bekerja di sini.”

The quotation above includes demonstrative reference because adverb here refers to the school where Erin works. It is reference by means location, the scale of proximity is near. The translation of this quotation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).
3) 00:21:30 – 00:21:36

**Erin** : I want you all to move this side of the room. You in the back up here. Sindy and all of you move to the back.


The quotation above includes demonstrative reference because scale of proximity of determiner (head) this is near and determiner as modifier the proximity is neutral refers to class room. Adverb here has scale of proximity near. It is reference by means location, on a scale of proximity. The translation of this quotation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).

c. Comparative Reference

1) 00:01:53 – 00:01:59

**Eva** : ...thoes who say we are less than they are. Who say we are not equal in beauty and in blessing.

Translation: “**Eva** : ...mereka yang berkata ‘kita lebih rendah dari mereka’. Yang berkata ‘kita tak sebanding cantik dan berkah’.”

The quotation above includes comparative reference because comparative adjective less than and not equal means that there is no similarity and refers to identity. It is indirect reference by means identity or similarity. The translation of this quotation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).
2) 00:05:01 – 00:05:14

**Margaret**: ...We used to have one of the highest scholastic records in the district but since voluntary integration was suggested, we’ve lost over 75% of our strongest students.

Translation: “**Margaret**: kami memiliki rekor nilai tertinggi di distrik, tapi sejak integrasi sukarelawan disarankan kami kehilangan lebih dari 75% siswa terhebat kami.”

The quotation above includes comparative reference because comparative adjective *the highest* and *strongest* refers to identity of the school and students. *The highest* means that there is comparison between before integration program in the school was suggested and after the program. *Strongest* means that there is many type of student. It is indirect reference by means identity or similarity. The translation of this quotation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).

3) 00:12:25 – 00:12:33

**Brian G**: ...by then most of your kids will gone anyway.

**Erin**: What do you mean?

Translation:

**Brian G**: ...saat itu kebanyakan muridmu akan hilang pula.

**Erin**: Apa maksud anda?

The quotation above includes comparative reference because comparative adjective *most of* means that there is comparison number of students and refers to identity. It is indirect reference by means identity or
similarity. The translation of this quotation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).

2. Substitution
   a. 00:10:57 – 00:11:00
      
      Jamal : Man say it to my face coz.
      Andre : I just did.

      Translation:

      Jamal : Bung, katakan saja dihadapanku.
      Andre : Aku baru saja mengatakannya.

      The conversation above includes subtitution because did is substitute for say it to Jamal’s face. The translation of this conversation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).

   b. 00:18:17 – 00:18:21
      
      Steve : You think this is good enough for her?
      Scott : Yeah I do.

      Translation:

      Steve : Kau pikir ini cukup baik untuknya?
      Scott : Ya.

      The conversation above includes subtitution because do is substitute for I think this is good enough for her. The translation of this conversation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).

3. Ellipsis
   a. 01:20:57 – 01:20:58
      
      Marcus : How many friends did you know that are dead now that got killed?
      Eva : Too many Ø to count.
Translation: “Marcus : Berapa banyak temen-temanmu yang kau kenal mati dibunuh?

Eva : Terlalu banyak untuk dihitung.”

The conversation above includes ellipsis because friends after many in second clause is ellipted. The sign of ellipsis Ø after too many means friends (too many Ø = too many friends). The translation of this conversation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).

b. 01:47:02 – 01:47:04

Erin : I just want to stay with my kids next year.

Brian G : She can’t Ø. I have the juniors


Brian: Dia tidak bisa. Aku yang mengajar junior.”

The conversation above includes ellipsis because stay with kids next year is ellipted in the second clause after can’t. The sign of ellipsis Ø after she can’t means stay with her kids (she can’t Ø = she can’t stay with her kids). The translation of this conversation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).

4. Conjunction

a. 00:01:30 – 00:01:46

Eva : In America, a girl can be crowned a princess for her beauty and her grace.

Translation: “Eva: Di Amerika, seorang gadis bisa dinobatkan menjadi seorang putri karena keindahan dan keanggunannya.”
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The quotation above includes conjunction because *for* means *causal* and *and* means *additive*. The translation of this quotation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).

b. 00:02:29 – 00:02:36

**Eva**: They took my father *for* retaliation. He was innocent *but* they took him *because* he was respected by my people.

Translation: “**Eva**: Mereka membawa ayahku *karena* dendam. Dia tak bersalah, *tetapi* mereka menangkapnya, *karena* dia dihormati oleh golonganku.”

The quotation above includes conjunction because *for* and *because* means *causal* and *but* means *adversative*. The translation of this quotation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).

c. 00:03:49 – 00:03:54

**Eva**: They think they’re winning by jumping me now *but* soon they’re all going down.

Translation: “**Eva**: Mereka pikir mereka akan menang dengan menyerangku *sekarang* *tapi* mereka semua segera akan kalah.”

The quotation above includes conjunction because *but* means *adversative*. The translation of this quotation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).

5. Lexical cohesion

a. 00:14:19 – 00:14:35

**Erin**: Let’s go over the first name on the list *Homer*. *Homer’s The Odyssey*.

**Marcus**: I know *Homer* the Simpson.
Erin: No this Homer was an ancient Greek but maybe he was bald just like Homer Simpson.

Translation: “Erin: Mari kita bahas nama pertama dalam daftar Homer. “Homer’s the Odyssey”.

Marcus: Aku tahu Homer Simpson.

Erin: Bukan, Homer ini Orang Yunani Kuno tapi mungkin dia botak seperti Homer Simpson.”

The conversation above includes lexical cohesion, reiteration (repetition) because the second and the next occurrence of Homer is related to the first. The translation of this conversation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).

b. 00:20:28 -00:20:39

Marcus: Man-child in the promised land couldn’t afford many heroes. Moms was the only one there Pops was a no show. And, no, I guess you didn’t know that I would grow to be strong. You looking kinda pale, was it the ale? Oh, pops was wrong?


The conversation above includes lexical cohesion, reiteration (repetition) because the second occurrence of pops is related to the first and man-child is synonym with pops. The translation of this conversation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).
c. 00:37:42 – 00:37:52

**Erin** : What about these? *Romeo and Juliet*. That’s a great gang story.

**Margaret** : No, not the *books*. This is what we give them. It is *Romeo and Juliet* but it’s a condensed version.


**Margaret**: Tidak, jangan *buku-buku* itu. Ini yang kita berikan pada mereka. Ini juga *Romeo & Juliet* tapi versi yang lebih ringan.”

The conversation above includes lexical cohesion, reiteration (superordinat) because *books* refers back to *Romeo and Juliet* and *books* is a superordinate of *Romeo and Juliet*. The translation of this conversation has equal value between source language (ST) and target language (TL).

B. Pragmatics Equivalence

Pragmatics is the study of utterance meaning in a communicative situation. Pragmatics equivalence refers to words in both language having the same effect on the readers/hearers in both language. There are coherence and implicature according to Baker in her book “In Other Words”.

There are data analysis of pragmatic equivalence:

1. Coherence

   a. 01:19:23 – 01:19:34

   **Eva** : When is *Anne* gonna smoke *Hitler*?

   **Erin** : What?

   **Eva** : You know. Take him out.
Erin : Eva, this is The Diary of Anne Frank not Die Hard.

Anne is the character in The Diary of Anne Frank and Hitler is the character in Die Hard. The hearer/reader must have to read books of The Diary of Anne Frank and Die Hard to know about Anne and Hitler. It is called coherence because it is mostly receiver-centred.

2. Implicature

a. Maxim of Quality

1) 00:10:37 – 00:10:46

Erin Gruwell : Jamal Hill?

Jamal : Man what am I doing here? This whole ghetto-ass class has got people in here looking like a bad rerun of cops and shit. You know what I’m saying? It’s true.

It happened when Erin checked the attendance in the class and mentioned Jamal’s name. Jamal is black people and Erin is white people. Jamal hate white people so he said that words when Erin mentioned his name. What Jamal said is true because he doesn’t like Erin as white people and the teacher in the class.

2) 00:12:14 – 00:12:18

Brian Gelford : You saw a little action today I hear.

Erin : Yeah. It happened so fast.

Erin saw bickering in the class. She felt so shock because it happened so fast and no one helped her. Erin is saying the truth to the Brian Gelford about the information.

3) 00:16:58 – 00:17:10

Scott : Are you sure about this?
Erin: Well, it’s not exactly I pictured it. Don’t tell my dad. Hopefully he hasn’t seen the news.

Scott convinced Erin about a little action happened in the class and Erin is telling the truth to Scott about her feeling. This conversation is in line maxim of quality because Erin tells the truth.

4) 00:18:37 – 00:18:43

Scott: So he doesn’t like your job. So what? Why do you let it get to you?

Erin: I don’t know it just does. I’m not used to disappointing him.

This conversation is in line maxim of quality because Erin will not make her father disappoint about what her choice.

5) 00:33:59 – 00:34:10

Eva: ...So I hate white people on shigt!

Erin: Ben, do you have anything to say?

Ben: Can I please get out of here?

This conversation is in line maxim of quality, because Eva said the truth that she hate white people. Erin knows that Ben is so scary with this situation and ask Ben to say something. Ben also said the truth that he wants to get out of the class because he scared to black people in the class.

6) 00:39:35 – 00:39:37

Erin: Are you making fun of me?

Brian G: Yeah.

This conversation is in line maxim of quality. Erin asked to Brian that Brian is making fun of her and Brian said that he is really making fun of her.
b. Maxim of Quantity

1) 00:38:48 – 00:39:02

**Erin** : I don’t know how to make them interested in reading with these.

**Margaret** : You can’t make someone want an education. The best you can do is try to get them to obey to learn discipline. That would be a tremendous accomplishment for them.

Margaret gave true information about how to make students interested in reading. So, this conversation deals with maxim of quantity because Margaret gave an information as informative as required.

c. Maxim of Manner

1) 00:29:17 – 00:29:20

**Erin** : What is this?

**Jamal** : Just leave it alone.

Erin asked what the meaning of the paper which Jamal read. Jamal answer briefly, therefore his utterance is including maxim of manner.

2) 00:48:03 – 00:48:08

**Erin** : Well, what’s going on at work?

**Scott** : Nothing, I don’t want to talk about that either. I just want to hang out, I want to be home.

This conversation is include maxim of manner because Scott talks to Erin clearly and briefly. Scott wants to talk another topic besides work.
d. Maxim of Relevance/Relation

1) 00:12:21 – 00:12:33

Brian Gelford : You put your time in in a few years, you’ll be able to teach junior. They’re a pleasure. By then most of your kids will be gone anyway.

Erin : What do you mean?

Brian Gelford : well eventually they just stop coming.

This conversation is in line maxim of relation because there is relevant between Brian and Erin’s talked about the students in the Erin class.

2) 00:33:17 - 00:33:30

Erin : I’m a teacher. It doesn’t matter what color I am.

Eva : It’s about color. It’s about people deciding what you deserve about people wanting what they don’t deserve, about whites thinking they run this world no matter what.

This conversation is in line maxim of relation because there is relevant between Erin and Eva’s talked about the color of people.

3) 00:37:28 – 00:37:32

Erin : What about this? We were discussing the Holocaust

Margaret : No, they won’t be able to read that.

This conversation is in line maxim of relation because there is relevant between Erin and Margaret’s talked about the Holocaust.

4) 00:56:24 – 00:56:32

Erin : It’s been a little difficult getting their attention. Up until recently the only one thing they hated more than each other was me.
Dr. Cohn : Well, you united them and that’s a step.

This conversation is in line maxim of relation because there is relevant between Erin and Dr. Cohn’s talked about the students in the Erin class.

C. The Dominant of Textual and Pragmatics Equivalence

After analysis the textual and pragmatics equivalence in Freedom Writers movie script the writer found there are 74 cases. The textual equivalence consist of 14 cases in personal reference, 6 cases in demonstrative reference, 5 cases in comparative reference, 2 cases in substitution, 2 cases in ellipsis, 8 cases in conjunction and 3 cases in lexical cohesion. The pragmatics equivalence consist of 4 cases in coherence, 9 cases in implicature (maxim of quality), 4 cases in implicature (maxim of quantity), 9 cases in implicature (maxim of manner) and 9 cases in implicature (maxim of relation).

From the result, the dominant cases of textual equivalence that found in Freedom Writers manuscript is reference, the type of reference is personal reference. The dominant cases of pragmatics equivalence is implicature, there is three types of maxim that dominant in the Freedom Writers manuscript are maxim of quality, maxim of manner, and maxim of relation. The most dominant is personal reference in textual equivalence.
CHAPTER V
CLOSURE

This chapter presents the conclusions from the findings and the discussion in the previous chapter. This chapter also offers some suggestions for further studies on the same issues about Textual and Pragmatic Equivalence in *Freedom Writers* Movie and its Script.

A. CONCLUSION

After analyzing the textual and pragmatic equivalence in *Freedom Writers* manuscript, the writer concludes based on the objective of the study. The writer finds the types of textual and pragmatic equivalence and finds the dominant types of textual and pragmatic in *Freedom Writers* manuscript as the following:

1. Types of Textual Equivalence: Cohesive

   There are five main cohesive devices in English according to Halliday and Hasan:

   a. Reference

   Reference is the relationship between a word and what it points to in the real world.

   1) Personal Reference

   This reference is by means of function in the speech situation, through the category of person. There are 13 cases of personal reference that found in *Freedom Writers* manuscript. There are: in the time (00:01:30 – 00:02:22), (00:02:29 – 00:02:40), (00:04:04 – 00:04:06), (00:04:10 – 00:04:21), (00:06:15 – 00:06:23), (00:12:08 – 00:12:11), (00:14:19 – 00:14:35), (00:15:05 – 00:15:10), (00:17:13 – 00:17:27), (00:18:22 – 00:18:30), (00:30:04 –
2) Demonstrative Reference

This reference is by means location, on a scale of proximity. There are 6 cases of demonstrative reference that found in *Freedom Writers* manuscript. There are: in the time (00:0:57 – 00:0:59), (00:06:06 – 00:06:10), (00:21:30 – 00:21:36), (00:32:03 - 00:32:11), (00:33:03 – 00:33:08), and (00:37:33 – 00:37:36).

3) Comparative Reference

This reference is by means of identity or similarity. There are 5 cases of comparative reference that found in *Freedom Writers* manuscript. There are: in the time (00:01:53 – 00:01:59), (00:05:01 – 00:05:14), (00:12:25 – 00:12:33), (00:30:41 -00:30:26), and (00:32:09 – 00:32:11).

b. Substitution

Substitution is an item (or items) is replaced by another item (or items). The item used in this substitution in *Freedom Writers* manuscript is *do*. There are 2 cases of substitution that found in Freedom Writers manuscript. There are: in the time (00:10:57 – 00:11:00) and (00:18:17 – 00:18:21).

c. Ellipsis

In ellipsis, an item is replaced by nothing. There are 2 cases of ellipsis that found in *Freedom Writers* manuscript. There are: in the time (01:20:57 – 01:20:58) and (01:47:02 – 01:47:04).

d. Conjunction

Conjunction involves the use of formal markers to relate sentences, clause and paragraph. There are 8 cases of conjunction that found in *Freedom Writers*
manuscript. There are: in the time (00:01:30 – 00:01:46), (00:02:29 – 00:02:36), (00:03:49 – 00:03:54), (00:04:28 – 00:04:38), (00:05:01 – 00:05:14), (00:06:03 – 00:06:10), (00:14:29 – 00:14:35), and (00:38:09 – 00:38:12).

e. Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion refers to the role played by the selection of vocabulary in organizing relations within a text. Types of lexical cohesion are reiteration (repetition, synonym or near-synonym, superordinate and general word) and collocation. There are 3 cases of lexical cohesion that found in Freedom Writers manuscript. There are: in the time (00:14:19 – 00:14:35), (00:20:28 – 00:20:39) and (00:37:42 – 00:37:52).

2. Types of Pragmatics Equivalence

a. Coherence

Coherence is mostly receiver-centred. It depends on ability of hearer/reader to interpret information on the basis of his/her expectations and experience of the world. There are 4 cases of coherence that found in Freedom Writers manuscript. There are: in the time (00:14:19– 00:14:35), (00:18:48 – 00:18:59), (00:20:03 – 00:20:11) and (01:19:23 – 01:19:34).

b. Implicature

1) Maxim of quality

Maxim of quality can be defined as truthful as required. There are 9 cases of maxim of quality that found in Freedom Writers manuscript. There are: in the time (00:06:15 -00:06:20), (00:10:37 – 00:10:46), (00:12:14 – 00:12:18), (00:16:58 – 00:17:10), (00:18:37 – 00:18:43), (00:33:59 – 00:34:10), (00:39:35 – 00:39:37), (00:43:25 – 00:43:39) and (00:47:34 – 00:47:39)
2) Maxim of quantity

Maxim of quantity as one of cooperative principle concerned in giving information as it is required and no more than it is required. There are 4 cases of maxim of quantity that found in *Freedom Writers* manuscript. There are: in the time (00:28:17 – 00:28:22), (00:38:07 – 00:38:12), (00:38:48 – 00:39:02) and (00:54:41 – 00:54:51).

3) Maxim of manner

Maxim of manner, be clear, be brief and be orderly in giving information. There are 9 cases of maxim of manner that found in *Freedom Writers* manuscript. There are: in the time (00:21:18 – 00:21:22), (00:29:17 – 00:29:20), (00:37:33 – 00:37:38), (00:39:50 – 00:39:55), (00:48:03 – 00:48:08), (00:55:11 – 00:55:14), (00:58:18 – 00:58:21), (01:40:06 – 01:40:10) and (01:40:10 – 01:40:17).

4) Maxim of relation

Maxim of relation or maxim of relevance means the utterance must be relevant with the topic that being discussed. There are 9 cases of maxim of relation that found in *Freedom Writers* manuscript. There are: in the time (00:12:21 – 00:12:33), (00:19:03 – 00:19:06), (00:33:17 – 00:33:30), (00:33:35 – 00:33:38), (00:35:47 – 00:36:19), (00:37:28 – 00:37:32), (00:37:42 – 00:37:55), (00:56:24 – 00:56:32) and (01:17:02 – 01:17:11).

3. The Dominant Textual and Pragmatics Equivalence

The finding of the analysis show that textual and pragmatics equivalence in *Freedom Writers* movie script found in 74 cases. The textual equivalence consist of 14 cases in personal reference, 6 cases in demonstrative reference, 5 cases in comparative reference, 2 cases in substitution, 2 cases in ellipsis, 8 cases in
conjunction and 3 cases in lexical cohesion. The pragmatics equivalence consist of 4 cases in coherence, 9 cases in implicature (maxim of quality), 4 cases in implicature (maxim of quantity), 9 cases in implicature (maxim of manner) and 9 cases in implicature (maxim of relation). The most dominant is type of textual equivalence, personal reference.

B. SUGGESTIONS

Based on the whole analysis in this graduating paper, the writer suggests follow:

1. The writer assumes that all people in the world like a movie. Usually watching a movie can give the comfortable, inspiration, suggestion, messages, and motivation of life. This is important for us to pay attention to the movie that we are watching. The writer hopes that moviegoers not only enjoying the movie but also can see the positive side and take it to apply in their life.

2. Reading the literature is not only for spending our free time, but we can get so many message from it, because in literary works the author wants convey something useful and valuable for the reader. Usually it consist of moral, education, religion, and soon.

3. In analyzing, the learner will get some explanation and new knowledge in doing research. They will get new idea doing observe as the writer done and they can possibly provide more book to have deeper analysis about that.
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