

MODUL BASIC READING

(PBI 163)

Materi 9

References

Disusun Oleh

Prayogo Hadi Sulistio, M.Pd

UNIVERSITAS ESA UNGGUL

2018

References

1. **Introduction**

This module becomes a part of Basic Reading Subject in English Education Department. References is the ninth topics being discussed of this subject. It discusses about how Referents are objects that are *referred to* in the text. The module starts with the explanation of the essence of References in reading activities. It also discusses about the way its work and how to comprehend it steps by steps. After that, the module gives practices as well as the explanation so the student can practice by themselves. The last part are strategies of how you applied References through reading a text.

In the end, students can apply this technique to comprehend the text that they read as well as how to comprehend the meaning from different perspective.

This module can be used as reference for the students who would like to learn about References. The students may practice to use it from reading paragraph so that make students easier to understand the text.

1. Basic Competence

Understanding References to comprehend the text

1. Kemampuan Akhir yang Diharapkan

* The students will be able to identify referring expression to subject
* The students will be able to identify referring expression to predicate
* The students will be able to referring expression to object
* The students will be able to create definite and indefinite reference in the text.

1. Learning Activities 1

**References**

**Reference** is a relation between objects in which one object designates, or acts as a means by which to connect to or link to, another object. The first object in this relation is said to *refer to* the second object. It is called a [*name*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Name) for the second object. The second object, the one to which the first object refers, is called the [*referent*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Referent) of the first object. A name is usually a [phrase](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phrase) or expression, or some other [symbolic representation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Symbol). Its referent may be anything a material object, a person, an event, an activity, or an abstract concept.

The [philosopher](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophy" \o "Philosophy) [John Stuart Mill](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Stuart_Mill) was one of the earliest modern advocates of a direct reference theory beginning in 1843. In his *[A System of Logic](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_System_of_Logic" \o "A System of Logic)* Mill introduced a distinction between what he called "connotation" and "denotation." Connotation is a relation between a name (singular or general) and one or more attributes.

For example, ‘widow’ denotes widows and connotes the attributes of being female, and of having been married to someone now dead. If a name is connotative, it denotes what it denotes in virtue of object or objects having the attributes the name connotes. Connotation thus determines denotation. The same object can, on the other hand, be denoted with several names with different connotations. A name can have connotation but no denotation. Connotation of a name, if it has one, can be taken to be its meaning in Mill.

According to Mill, most individual concrete names are connotative, but some, namely proper names, are not. In other words, proper names do not have meaning. All general terms, on the other hand, are according to Mill connotative. In sum, Mill’s overall picture resembles very much the description theory of reference, though his take on proper names is an exception.

[Saul Kripke](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saul_Kripke) defended direct reference theory when applied to proper names. Kripke claims that proper names do not have any "senses" at all, because senses only offer contingent facts about things. [Ruth Barcan Marcus](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ruth_Barcan_Marcus) advanced a theory of direct reference for proper names at a symposium in which [Quine](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Willard_Van_Orman_Quine" \o "Willard Van Orman Quine) and Kripke were participants: published in *[Synthese](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Synthese" \o "Synthese)*, 1961 with Discussion in *Synthese* 1962. She called directly referring proper names "tags" (see [tag theory of names](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tag_theory_of_names" \o "Tag theory of names)). Kripke urged such a theory in 1971 and thereafter. He called such directly referring proper names "[rigid designators](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rigid_designator" \o "Rigid designator)".

Kripke articulated this view using the formal apparatus of [possible worlds](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Possible_worlds" \o "Possible worlds). The possible worlds thought-experiment first takes the subject, and then tries to imagine the subject in other possible worlds. Taking George W. Bush, for example.

* First (1) the thought-experiment must state that the name "George W. Bush" is the name used to describe the particular individual man that is typically meant.
* Second (2), the experimenter must imagine the possible states of affairs that reality could have been - where Bush was not president, or went into a different career, was never born at all, etc.

When this is done, it becomes obvious that the phrase "President of the United States in 2004" does not necessarily describe George W. Bush, because it is not [necessarily true](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Logical_truth" \o "Logical truth) in all possible worlds; it only contingently describes him. By contrast, for instance, the word "apple" will always describe the same things across all possible worlds, because of premise (1). So use of the word "apple" to describe apples is true in all possible worlds.

Terms that are true across all possible worlds in this way are called "[rigid designators](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rigid_designator" \o "Rigid designator)".

References can take on many forms, including: a thought, a sensory perception that is [audible](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hearing_(sense)" \o "Hearing (sense)) ([onomatopoeia](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Onomatopoeia)), [visual](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Visual_perception) (text), [olfactory](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Olfaction), or tactile, [emotional state](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emotions), relationship with other, [spacetime](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spacetime) coordinate, [symbolic](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Symbolic_system) or [alpha-numeric](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alpha-numeric_grid), a physical object or an energy projection. In some cases, methods are used that intentionally hide the reference from some observers, as in [cryptography](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cryptography).

References feature in many spheres of human activity and knowledge, and the term adopts shades of meaning particular to the contexts in which it is used.

Consider the following simple sentence, where the referents have been underlined:

1. *John kissed Mary.*

In this sentence, both referents are people – concrete things in the world. While this simple example covers a large number of cases, they are far from the full story. First off, referents may or may not have physical existence. In the next example the second referent is an abstract object:

1. *John had an idea.*

Similarly, we can refer to things that don’t exist:

1. *If John had a car, it would be red.*

The car does not exist, and yet we still refer to it. This sentence also illustrates an important point, namely, that a single referent can be mentioned several times in a text. In (3), it is the car that is mentioned twice.

In this case, we say there is a single *referent* (the car), with two *referring expressions* (the phrases “a car” and “it”). These two referring expressions are called *co-referential* because they referto the same referent. As in (3), we will use numeral subscripts to indicate that the two referringexpressions co-refer.

An preliminary definition for referents is that *referents are things that have been picked out for special attention*. The trick, then, is to determine what ‘special attention’ means. In some sense, everythingmentioned in a text, be it an object, an event, a time, a place, or something else, has been picked out forspecial attention, because it’s being talked about rather than something else of the same kind from the setof all possible things in the world.

In (1), we might have marked “kissed” as a referent, since it issomething happening, and we chose to talk about that rather than something else. But if everythingmentioned is a referent, nearly everything in a text would be marked, which would be almost asuninformative as having nothing marked. What we are really interested in is *reification*, or, roughlyspeaking, items that find themselves the subjects or objects of verbs. To be more precise, if something isreferred to using a *noun phrase*, it should be marked as a referent. Thus we have rule:

#1: ***Mark noun******phrases as referring expressions.***

This definition has the convenient property of having us to mark events (such as “kissed” above) only when they are picked out further beyond their use as a verb. Consider the sentence:

1. *John drove Mary to the office.*

In (4) there are three noun phrases, and we do not mark the driving event as a referring expression, in accordance with our intuition. But if we appended a second sentence:

1. *John drove Mary to the office. It took forever.*

We are picking out the act of driving as something interesting to talk about above and beyond its mere mention in the story, and in so doing we used a noun phrase “it” to refer to the event of driving. This forces us to “retroactively” (so to speak) mark the co-references to the event. Thus the Rule #2:

“***Mark coreferences of marked referring expressions, even if they would not normally be marked.”***

**Pronouns and Numeric Expressions**

Also mark referential pronouns as referring expressions, including possessive and reflexive pronouns.

1. *John was a doctor. He paid for his studies by himself.*

In (6), different types of pronouns (possessive, reflexive) correspond to the same referent “John” and must be marked as co-references. Note that the phrase “his studies” contains two referring expressions: One to John’s studying (“his studies) and another to John himself (“his”).

Also make sure to mark numeric noun phrases as referring expressions.

In (7) there are three noun phrases containing numerals.

1. *In the 1950s the city had 50,000 inhabitants. In 30 years the population doubled.*

Keep in mind that numeric expressions which are not themselves noun phrases should not normally be marked, unless they co-refer with another referring expression:

1. The furrow was fourteen feet high.

In this example, we do not mark “fourteen feet” as a referring expression. Thus, the Rule #3:

***“Pronouns and numeric noun phrases should be marked as referring expressions****.”*

**Generics**

Noun phrases also might not refer to any object *in particular.* Take the following sentence:

1. *Lions are fierce.*

Here we are not referring to a *particular* lion, but rather to a class, the set of all lions. These should be marked as referring expressions, but are different from particular lions:

*(10) Lions are fierce. But Leo the Lion was the fiercest of all.*

This indicates why it is important to mark generics. In (10), we would like to indicate what Leo the Lion was the fiercest of – namely, “all Lions.” Despite this, we shouldn’t mark all generics, since almost everything is described as a member of some class of objects, e.g.:

*(11) Leo was a Lion.*

Thus generics, like events, should be marked only when they are directly referred to – in other words, when the author intends to pick out the class itself, rather than merely indicating an object is a member of that class. Thus Rule #4:

***“Mark generics as referring expressions only when they are referred to******directly.”***

**Referential Extent: Modifiers**

It is important to include in a referring expression not only the core noun or noun phrase that is doing the referring, but also to include any modifiers to the referring expression. This is because modifiers can substantially change the nature of the object being referred to. Compare the two following sentences:

*(12) Every morning John woke early.*

*(13) That morning John woke early.*

In (12), the noun phrase “every morning” refers to the set of all mornings, but (13) refers to a single morning with the phrase “that morning.” Similarly, you should include determiners (14), pronouns (15), adjectives (16), appositives (17), prepositional phrases (18), relative clauses (19), and other modifiers as part of the referring expression, as in the following examples:

*(14) The car was expensive.*

*(15) His car was expensive.*

*(16) The red car is expensive.*

*(17) The car, red as blood, was expensive.*

*(18) The car in the garage is expensive.*

*(19) The builder who erects very fine houses will make a large profit.*

Rule #5:

*“****Quantifiers, determiners, pronouns, adjectives, appositives, adjectival phrases, relative clauses, and other modifiers should be included as part of referring expressions****.”*

Take into account that modifiers can themselves contain referring expressions. In example (20), where “Kent cigarette” is a modifier of the whole referring expression “Kent cigarette filters”, but at the same time a referring expression itself. The whole referring expression has been underlined, and the nested referring expression has been bracketed.

*(20) [Kent cigarette] filters contained asbestos.*

Therefore, in example (20) you will mark two referring expressions: “Kent cigarette” and “Kent cigarette filters.” Sometimes these rules lead you to mark rather large portions of text as referring expressions, with multiple nesting referring expressions (only the largest referring expression has been underlined; the rest are bracketed):

*(21) Takuma Yamamoto, vice president of [[Fujitsu Motor]’s widgets and cogs division] since [June 1993], was fired yesterday.*

The underlined referring expression in (21) contains three internal referring expressions, namely, the car company, the car company’s division, and a date.

**Difficult Cases: Referring Expressions**

So far we have been considering some relatively straightforward referring expressions. Let us turn to a few more subtle cases, and techniques and conventions for handling them.

**Non‐Referential ‘It’**

English has a device called a non-referential, or dummy, ‘it’. A non-referential *it* is used when there is no available argument to use with a verb (or the argument is already understood or can’t be spoken of directly), but the verb nevertheless syntactically requires an argument. In these cases we use a dummy it,and these should not be marked as referring expressions.

*(22) It was raining.*

*(23) It was the fate of [the princess] to go to [the dragon].*

**Negation**

Negation often creates conceptually tricky decisions. Noun phrases can express that no one thing is being referred to, as in (24), or referring expression may contain negations as modifiers that invert or otherwise alter their referent, as in (26). When a negation is used as a modifier to a referring expression, it should be included as any other modifier is included. A referring expression that refers to nothing or no one (or other empty set) should also be treated as a normal referring expression:

*(24) No one is stronger than you.*

*(25) Nobody is stronger than you.*

*(26) He looked at nothing but himself.*

Be careful in cases of verbs such as *have* and *be*, where the negation can be separated from the rest of the referring expression. In the following examples, a dotted line indicates words that are not part of the referring expression:

*(27) I do not have any wine.*

*(28) He did not look at anything but himself.*

**Conjunctions and Sets**

Things that have been previously referred to individual in a text are often later agglomerated into larger sets and those sets are then referred to directly. For example:

*(29) Jack was a boy. Jill was a girl. They went up the hill.*

In these cases, all the underlined referring expressions should be marked. In other cases, there is ancimplied set:

*(30) [Jack] and [Jill] went up the hill.*

All three referring expressions here should be marked: “Jack,” “Jill,” and “Jack and Jill.” This is because Jack and Jill are being referred to individually, and the set is used as an argument to the verb. Treat “or” the same as “and.” More complicated situations are as follows:

*(31) [Jack], [Jill], and [Bill] went up the hill.*

*(32) [[Jack] and [Jill]] and [the Smith brothers] went up the hill.*

In the first case we mark the set as well as the three individuals. We do not mark the sets (Jack,Jill), (Jack,Bill), or (Jill,Bill), because these are not syntactically picked out as separate things. On the other hand, in (32), the writer has gone out of his way to express the set in a way that is straightforwardly decomposable into the whole set, the Smith brothers, Jack, Jill, and “Jack and Jill.”

**Articles and Possessive Pronouns**

Be careful about the attachment of articles and possessive pronouns. Consider the following examples:

*(33) The [dragon]’s lair*

*(34) [Her] [father] and [mother]*

In these two cases, the article “the” and the pronoun “her” attach to the outermost referring expression. They do not, syntactically, attach to the inner referring expressions (“dragon,” “mother,” “father”). Keep a careful eye on where these modifiers attach is important, because modifiers can radically change the nature of the object being referred to.

**‘Of’ Prepositional Phrases**

Another class of referring expressions that can be tricky for determining co-reference are those of the form “X of Y”, e.g.:

*(35) This has caused problems among a group of workers.*

Does the phrase “a group of workers” contain one referring expression or two (one to the group of workers, and another to the set of all workers)? Consider these similar examples:

*(36) Smoking has caused a high percentage of cancer deaths.*

*(37) Smoking has caused most cancer deaths.*

One way of testing this is to try substituting the ‘Y’ for the ‘X’, and seeing if the fundamental class of the referent changes. If the class does not change, we have only a single referring expression. For example, in (35), we substitute “workers” for “group of workers”, we will still be talking about people. Thus we have only a single referring expression. In (36) the overall referring expression is to a percentage, but the internal object of the “of” prepositional phrases are “cancer deaths.” These are clearly different fundamental kinds of objects, and so there are two different referring expressions. By contrast, in (36), “most cancer deaths” is the same basic type as “cancer deaths”, and so we have only a single referring expression again. Generics, or items that look like generics, also interact with *of* prepositional phrases in tricky ways:

*(38) Will you not eat of my cake of rye?*

*(39) Have a cake of wheat.*

*(40) She came upon a river of [milk]. “Drink of my milk with [pudding],” said the river.*

In these examples we do not mark “rye” or “wheat” because they do not refer to particular instances, but rather to general materials out of which the cakes are made. In (40), on the other hand, we do mark “milk” because it is later picked out in its own referring expression, and so we mark the other instances for co-reference purposes.

**Existential vs. Locative ‘There’**

Keep an eye out for the word “there” that is used in either an existential or locative sense. An existential use of *there* is shown in (41), and should not be marked as a referring expression, whereas a *there* that refers to a particular place is shown in (42).

*(41)* ***There*** *once was a man from Nantucket.*

*(42) John Lennon sat there.*

In some tricky cases it is not clear whether the *there* is existential or locative, such as:

*(43) “Look,* ***there*** *is my stove!”*

In these cases, it is up to the annotation team to discuss whether this is a locative or existential case, and mark it appropriately.

**Neighboring or Nested Repeated References**

Do not mark repeated references to the same object as separate referring expression. This includes cases where a modifying clause to a referring expression refers back to the referent itself, as with the word *himself* in (46).

**Difficult Cases: Co‐reference**

The rules elaborated above cover what to mark as a referring expression. Once you have determined that some set of tokens is a referring expression that should be marked, your second task to is to determine if the referring expression refers to a previously-introduced referent (it *co-refers* with already marked referring expressions), or if it introduces a new referent. We have already seen some unambiguous cases of co-reference. Let us consider more subtle cases.

**Quantification**

The first case is that of quantification:

*(47) Every day John woke early. One day he overslept.*

Are the two marked referring expressions here referring to the same day? The answer is no, as the phrase “every day” refers to a set of days (a fairly large set, in fact), and “one day” refers to a particular day. No problems here. But what about:

*(48) Every day the goose laid a golden egg. The woman could hardly wait for the egg.*

Are they the same egg? This is a bit trickier. It’s clear that there is more than one egg – in fact, one egg for every day. And it’s clear that the woman could hardly wait for each of them. But does “the golden egg” refer to the set of all the eggs? One technique for determining co-reference is to vary the quantification of the second referring expression and see if it changes the meaning:

*(49) Every day the goose laid a golden egg.* ***One day****, the woman could hardly wait for the egg.*

In (49) it is clear the second referring expression is to a particular egg and is not co-referential with the first referring expression since the phrase “one day” breaks us out of talking about the things that happened “every day.” This indicates the proper way to look at (20): the phrase “every day” introduces a special context in which an object (the golden egg) is introduced and referenced. The context, in this case, does not continue into the next sentence, so in (20) we conclude that the two referring expressions do **not** refer to the same referent. (Note that this context effect is much like in (3) above, where we introduce an imaginary car in an alternate possible world.) This leads us to rule #6:

***“With quantified******referring expressions, use variation of quantifiers to test co-reference.”***

**Plural Referring Expressions**

Plural referring expressions can present some special problems for co-reference. Consider these cases:

*(50) The three sons stared at one another.*

*(51) Each of the sons was strong but lazy.*

Although both “at one another” and “each of the sons” are referring to each singular son, at the same time they are referring to all of them. So both referring expressions should be considered as co-references of “the three sons”. Thus remember that some quantifiers can produce plural referring expressions even though they are referring to a set of singular referents at the same time.

**Copular Expressions**

Determining co-reference can be tricky in copular (“X is a Y”) expressions:

*(52) John was a scientist.*

*(53) John was the scientist.*

*(54) John was not the scientist.*

In (52) we know from the very syntax of the sentence that we are describing John as a generic scientist, and so we do not mark the phrase “a scientist.” In (53), we are describing John as a particular scientist (one perhaps we talked about earlier in the text), and so it is also co-referential. However, the introduction of “not” in (54) breaks the co-referentiality of the sentence, and we have referring expressions to two different things.

**Synecdoche and Metonymy**

Another common case is the use of synecdoche or metonymy, figures of speech in which a part of an object, or a closely related object, is used to refer to the whole object:

*(55) The White House announced a new economic stimulus plan today. The president and his staff argued that previous efforts had fallen short.*

In this case “The White House” is a closely-related object that is used to stand in for “The president and his staff.” Contrast, however:

*(56) The owner of the orchard often could be found pruning the old trees and propping up the young Ones.*

In this case, “the old trees” and “the young trees” are not the same as “the orchard” – they are a part of the orchard, but not the same as it. The easiest way to discover this is to substitute one for the other, and determining if the sentence is (a) still well formed, and (b) the meaning remains unaltered. Thus rule #7:

***“Use the substitution test to determine appropriate co-reference relations. Unknown Entities and WH‐Words”***

Phrases or words whose actual referent is unknown at the time of reading should be marked normally as referring expressions:

*(57) Whither did they go?*

*(58) Who here is a criminal?*

*(59) Prince Ivan set out to look for the woman he was to marry.*

Difficulties arise when determining co-reference. It will be our practice to mark these referring

expressions as co-referent with whatever referent is later determined to actually fill that role. Therefore:

*(60) “Whither did they go?”she asked. “Thither!” he said.*

*(61) Prince Ivan set out to look for the woman he was to marry. … Ivan took Maria to wife.*

This will not be a satisfactory solution for stories or texts in which the final identity of the referent is unclear. If you come across these cases, bring them up to your annotation team.

**Tips**

First of all, there are many types of references so how we try to remember all of them? You don’t need to remember all of them but what do you need to do is:

1. Understand what do you need to understand
2. Check and recheck the sentences
3. Know which of references that they refer to

**Additional Items**

***Sense and Reference:***

The two fundamental aspects of meaning

• Words are used in language in two basic ways:

1. to refer to things
2. to express the sense of things

e.g:

* I want a tree just like John’s tree.
* I want a tree, not a bush!

• Sense refers to general or category meaning and referent refers to a particular instance of that meaning:

* A dog barked (not a fox): general meaning
* The dog barked (a particular known dog)

• Most words have both sense and reference

* A dog barked (not a fox): although the general meaning is highlighted, there is still some particular dog which is barking
* The dog barked: although it is a known dog which is barking, that dog has the basic properties of all dogs

**Practice 1**

Directions: The five types of context clues are definition (synonym/restatement), contrast, examples, general sense of the sentence, and clue from another sentence. For each sentence below, use the context to help you determine the meaning of the italicized word.

1. Because there was so little precipitation this year, the crops dried up and died.

A) fertilizer

B) planting

C) rain

2. Although I was unable to understand all of the details of the presentation, I did get the gist of it.

A) humor

B) main point

C) notes

3. At a special ceremony, the police chief gave the officer a commendation for bravery.

A) an award for an outstanding achievement

B) an object designed to bring good luck

C) a lecture

4. One brother is an erudite professor; the other brother, however, has never shown any interest in books or learning.

A) old; elderly

B) well-educated; well-read

C) snobbish; stuck up

5. Night is the time when many animals forage, or search, for food.

A) come out at night

B) sleep

C) search for food

6. The waiter was so brusque that we left only a small tip. He was impolite and impatient, and seemed annoyed whenever we asked for something.

A) acting or speaking in a rude, abrupt manner

B) frightening looking

C) knowledgeable and skilled

7. The store specializes in cutlery, such as forks and knives, that has unique designs.

A) spices and seasonings

B) plates, bowls, and cups

C) silverware; eating utensils

8. My sister loathes broccoli, but she loves spinach.

A) dislikes intensely

B) eats eagerly

C) prepares and cooks

9. Psychologists have conducted research on altruism, which can be defined as "putting the needs and welfare of others above one's own needs and well-being."

A) psychologists who conduct research

B) research conducted by psychologists

C) putting the needs and welfare of others above one's own needs

**Practice 2**

1. The aging actor is fastidious about her appearance: her clothes are beautifully tailored, her hair and make-up are flawless, and she is always perfectly groomed.

A) careless, uncaring

B) unable to take care of

C) having a sense of humor about

D) extremely careful about

1. Paul is very macho: he loves contact sports, fast cars, and war movies. In contrast, his twin bother, Saul, enjoys chess, hiking, and astronomy.

A) having an exaggerated sense of masculinity

B) being competitive with one's brother or sister

C) insecure; lacking confidence

D) having a cheerful nature

1. The ballet dancer so lithe that she seemed to glide across the stage.

A) difficult to work with

B) tall

C) displaying effortless grace

D) having a snobbish or arrogant attitude

1. South African leader Nelson Mandela is a magnanimous man who is respected worldwide for his courageous, lifelong effort on behalf of human rights.

A) unsuccessful

B) noble in mind and heart

C) wealthy, affluent

D) bitter and angry

1. The captain of the pep squad is vivacious when she performs, but the rest of the time she is calm and low-key.

A) lively, high-spirited

B) relaxed and easygoing

C) sad, unhappy

D) bored

**Exercise**

Directions: This exercise features adjectives that can be used to describe people. Use the context clues in each item to help you determine the meaning of the word in bold print.

1. The president of the company felt so despondent over its bankruptcy that he went into a deep depression.

A) excited

B) surprised and delighted

C) sad and hopeless

D) exhausted and weary

1. My father is despotic. I never get my way! There's no arguing with him because whatever he says, goes.

A) behaving like a ruler with absolute power

B) cruel, hurtful, and abusive

C) behaving in a loud, angry manner

D) open to other people's opinions

1. The French ambassador is extremely suave, by which I mean that he has ability to handle any social situation graciously.

A) able to speak more than one language

B) handsomely stylish

C) energetic

D) agreeably smooth and courteous

1. My brother is absolutely tenacious. For example, when he sets a goal for himself, he doesn't let anything stop him from achieving it.

A) silly and unreasonable

B) stubborn; refusing to give up

C) well-liked by others

D) always seeking help from others

1. Their teammate proved so unreliable--undependable--that they never knew whether he would show up for practice.

A) competitive

B) well-coordinated

C) undependable

D) highly committed

* 1. Umpan Balik dan Tindak Lanjut

Please match your answers above with answer key of formative test 1 which is located in the end of the module. Measure your topic mastery of learning activity 1 with formula given below:

Level of mastery= (total of right answers: 5) x 100%

Vey good = 90-100%

Good = 80 - 89%

Fair = 70 – 79%

Poor = 0 – 69 %

If level of mastery of the topic is more than 80%, you can continue to learning activity 2 . If level of mastery is less than 80% you need to re-do learning activity 1 especially from you have not understood part.

1. **Kegiatan Belajar 2**
   1. Uraian dan contoh

text

* 1. Latihan

text

* 1. Rangkuman

text

* 1. Tes Formatif

text

* 1. Umpan Balik dan Tindak Lanjut

text

1. **Kegiatan Belajar 3**
   1. Uraian dan contoh

text

* 1. Latihan

text

* 1. Rangkuman

text

* 1. Tes Formatif

text

* 1. Umpan Balik dan Tindak Lanjut

text

1. **Kunci Jawaban**
   1. Tes formatif 1

1. C

2. A

3. D

4. B

5. C

* 1. Tes formatif 2

text

* 1. Tes formatif 3

Text

**Daftar Pustaka**

* Referring Expressions & Co-Reference Annotation Guide
* Severin Schroeder (2006), *Wittgenstein*, [p. 30](https://books.google.com/books?id=md-KV6HUueUC&pg=PA30): "This view that the meaning of a word has to be explained in terms of what it stands for, its reference, I shall call referentialism."
* Stainton, Robert J. (1996). *Philosophical Perspectives on Language*. Broadview Press. p. 61.