



LANGUAGE STYLES IN ZOOTOPIA 2: A SOCIOLINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF CHARACTER INTERACTION AND SOCIAL REPRESENTATION

M. Rismawan¹, Badri²

Universitas Terbuka¹, Universitas Primagraha²
badrikusmana2@gmail.com

Riwayat Artikel

Diterima

Februari 2026

Revisi

April 2025

Terbit

Mei 2026

Keywords:

literary criticism, war, tradition,
sociology of literature, marxism

ABSTRACT

This research explores language styles in Zootopia 2 as a representation of social interaction and identity formation in cinematic discourse. Film dialogue serves not just as a means of communication but also mirrors social relationships, power structures, and cultural values. The study aims to identify the various language styles used, analyze their roles in character interactions, and examine how they reflect social realities. It adopts a qualitative descriptive methodology within a sociolinguistic framework. The data include selected dialogues from main and supporting characters, gathered through observation and transcription. Using Martin Joos' classification, the analysis reveals all five styles are present, with casual style being most prevalent, indicating natural and close interpersonal communication. Formal and consultative styles occur in institutional settings, while the intimate style appears in emotionally charged interactions. The findings suggest that language styles in Zootopia 2 are essential for shaping character identity, guiding interactions, and portraying broader social issues within the storyline.



©2025 Universitas Bina Bangsa

How to cite (in APA Style): Rismawan, M. ., & Badri. Language styles in zootopia 2: a sociolinguistic analysis of character interaction and social representation. *Prakata: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia Serta Pembelajaran*, 3(1), 19–28. Retrieved from <https://ejournal.lppmbinabangsa.ac.id/index.php/prakata/article/view/359>



INTRODUCTION

Film, as an aspect of popular culture, serves not only as entertainment but also as a nuanced platform for social representation. Through its dialogue, film can depict different facets of social life, such as social relationships, identity formation, and power structures. In this regard, language is crucial, functioning not just to transmit information but also to shape character development, facilitate interpersonal negotiations, and communicate the values of a specific community.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, language can be understood as a socially situated practice shaped by several factors, including the interaction context, the relationship between participants, and the communicative purposes involved. Differences in language use, particularly in language style, often signal levels of formality, social distance, and the communicative strategies adopted by speakers. Within cinematic discourse, such variation is not accidental; rather, it is carefully designed to enhance realism while supporting character development and narrative progression.

As a sequel to the popular animated film *Zootopia*, *Zootopia 2* depicts a fictional society of various animal species, each with unique social backgrounds and behaviors. This diversity serves as an effective setting to study linguistic variation, evident in vocabulary, tone, and interaction styles among characters. The film's interactions provide a meaningful context to analyze how language mirrors social issues like prejudice, marginalization, and institutional power, similar to those in real-world societies.

Previous studies have shown that language in film is not neutral; it often conveys implicit social and ideological meanings. Variations in accent, dialect, and speech style are frequently used to reflect a character's social identity and role within the story. These linguistic features can either reinforce stereotypes or challenge them by offering alternative portrayals. Additionally, film dialogue typically mimics natural speech, though it is deliberately crafted to serve dramatic and narrative purposes. Consequently, cinematic language constitutes a distinctive

form of discourse that calls for thorough sociolinguistic analysis.

Language style has long been recognized as an important object of sociolinguistic inquiry because it reflects the relationship between linguistic choices and social context. Sociolinguistics emphasizes that language variation is not random but is influenced by factors such as social status, age, gender, occupation, institutional setting, and communicative purpose. According to Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015), speakers continuously adjust their language according to the social circumstances in which interaction occurs. These adjustments create recognizable patterns of language style that help participants negotiate meaning, establish relationships, and perform social identities.

Within audiovisual media, language style serves multiple functions beyond communication. It contributes to characterization, supports narrative progression, and provides audiences with information about social structures represented in fictional worlds. Characters are frequently distinguished through their manner of speaking, including their vocabulary choices, degree of formality, and interactional strategies. As a result, language style becomes an essential semiotic resource for constructing believable fictional realities. The sociolinguistic study of film dialogue therefore provides valuable insight into how language reflects and reproduces social meanings within mediated discourse.

Furthermore, language styles in animated films warrant particular attention, as animation often relies heavily on dialogue to compensate for the absence of real human actors. Through linguistic variation, animated characters can express personality traits, emotional states, and social positions. Previous studies have demonstrated that animated films frequently employ linguistic stereotypes and stylistic variation to facilitate audience understanding and character recognition. Consequently, examining language styles in animated films contributes not only to sociolinguistic theory but also to broader discussions concerning media representation and cultural communication.



The relevance of this topic becomes increasingly significant in contemporary media studies, where films function as influential cultural products consumed by global audiences. By analyzing language styles in *Zootopia 2*, it is possible to explore how linguistic practices contribute to the construction of social realities and the ideological messages embedded within popular culture.

Film dialogue is frequently regarded as a reflection of social reality because it reproduces patterns of communication that audiences recognize from everyday life. Although cinematic dialogue is carefully scripted and edited, it often incorporates linguistic features that resemble naturally occurring conversations. These features include turn-taking mechanisms, expressions of politeness, informal vocabulary, interruptions, and various strategies of interpersonal negotiation. Through these elements, film dialogue creates an impression of authenticity that allows viewers to relate fictional experiences to their own social environments. Consequently, the study of film language provides valuable opportunities to examine how social meanings are represented, constructed, and communicated through discourse.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, dialogue serves as a medium through which social identities are continually negotiated and performed. Speakers do not merely exchange information; they simultaneously communicate aspects of their social background, beliefs, values, and relationships. Linguistic choices such as levels of formality, vocabulary selection, and speech style contribute to how individuals are perceived by others. In cinematic narratives, these linguistic resources become especially important because they help audiences understand characters' motivations and social positions. As a result, language style functions as both a communicative tool and a representational mechanism that shapes audience interpretation.

The relationship between language and social identity has been extensively discussed within sociolinguistic scholarship. Researchers have argued that language variation often reflects broader social

categories such as class, ethnicity, gender, age, and institutional affiliation. However, contemporary sociolinguistic approaches emphasize that identity is not fixed but rather constructed through social interaction. Individuals actively use linguistic resources to position themselves within particular communities and social networks. This perspective is particularly relevant to film analysis because fictional characters are often designed to represent specific social identities through distinctive linguistic behaviors. Therefore, examining language styles can reveal how identity is constructed and communicated within cinematic discourse.

Another important dimension concerns the role of language in representing social relationships. Different forms of speech may indicate intimacy, distance, solidarity, authority, or conflict between participants. These relational meanings are often conveyed implicitly through stylistic choices rather than explicit statements. For example, informal language may suggest friendship and familiarity, whereas formal language may signal professionalism or hierarchical distance. Such distinctions are crucial for understanding how interpersonal dynamics are portrayed within narratives. By analyzing language styles, researchers can gain deeper insight into the ways films construct and represent social interaction.

In addition, language styles may reflect broader ideological perspectives embedded within media texts. The manner in which characters speak often influences audience perceptions of competence, credibility, morality, and social status. Certain linguistic forms may be associated with authority and legitimacy, while others may be linked to marginalization or resistance. Consequently, language choices contribute to the construction of social meanings that extend beyond individual interactions. The sociolinguistic analysis of film dialogue therefore provides an important framework for investigating how media texts participate in the production and circulation of cultural values.

Within the context of *Zootopia 2*, these considerations become particularly relevant because the



film presents a diverse society characterized by differences in species, occupations, and social backgrounds. Such diversity creates numerous opportunities for stylistic variation and interactional complexity. The language used by the characters reflects not only individual personality traits but also broader social structures operating within the fictional world. By examining language styles, it is possible to explore how the film constructs social identities, negotiates power relations, and represents issues of diversity and inclusion. Therefore, the study contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between language, media, and society.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a qualitative descriptive design to examine language styles in *Zootopia 2*. A qualitative approach is appropriate since the focus is on interpreting linguistic features within their social and contextual functions, rather than measuring language frequency. This aligns with sociolinguistic principles that see language as a socially embedded practice influenced by interaction and communication goals (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015; Leclercq, 2022).

The main data consists of spoken dialogues by both primary and supporting characters in the film. These were collected through careful observation and repeated viewings to guarantee accuracy and completeness. The selected utterances, which showcase variations in language—especially changes in formality and tone—were transcribed and compiled into the research corpus. This approach aligns with standard practices in discourse-based film analysis, where dialogue reflects a structured yet naturalistic style of language use (Freddi, n.d.; Androutsopoulos, 2012).

This study's population consists of all dialogues in the film, but the sample specifically includes utterances that clearly show variations in language style. Purposive sampling was used to select data relevant to the research aims, especially those demonstrating differences in social interaction, power dynamics, and communication strategies.

To analyze the data, the study uses Martin Joos's classification of language styles, which divides speech into five categories: frozen, formal, consultative, casual, and intimate. This model offers a systematic way to identify stylistic differences based on context and speaker relationships. Each dialogue was analyzed considering its linguistic form, situational context, and the social relationship between the speakers (Turnip, 2019; Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015).

The analytical framework employed in this study integrates sociolinguistic theory with principles of discourse analysis. Language styles were identified by examining lexical choices, grammatical structures, interactional patterns, and contextual information surrounding each dialogue segment. The classification process was guided by Martin Joos' five-style model, which provides clear criteria for distinguishing between varying levels of formality and social distance.

To ensure systematic analysis, each dialogue excerpt was examined through three interconnected dimensions. The first dimension involved identifying linguistic indicators associated with specific language styles. The second dimension focused on contextual factors, including setting, participant roles, and communicative objectives. The third dimension explored the social meanings generated by the linguistic choices observed in the dialogue. This multi-layered analytical procedure allows the study to move beyond simple classification and toward a deeper understanding of how language styles function within the narrative. By combining linguistic and contextual analyses, the research reveals the sociocultural significance of language variation in the film.

The analysis was conducted in several stages. First, the collected data were organized and categorized according to their relevance to language style variation. Second, each utterance was classified based on Joos' typology. Third, the identified language styles were interpreted in relation to character roles, interaction patterns, and narrative functions. Finally, the findings were analyzed to explore how language styles contribute to the



representation of broader social issues, including identity construction, stereotypes, and power dynamics in the film (Ruoyu, n.d.; McEnery, 2019).

To enhance the credibility of the findings, the analysis was conducted consistently, drawing on established sociolinguistic theories and paying close attention to contextual meanings within the dialogue. The interpretation was grounded in observable linguistic evidence from the film, thereby minimizing subjective bias and ensuring analytical rigor.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

1. Types and Distribution of Language Styles

Based on an analysis of selected dialogues in *Zootopia 2*, the characters employ five language styles proposed by Martin Joos: frozen, formal, consultative, casual, and intimate. These styles occur at different frequencies depending on the communicative context and the relationship between the speakers. Among them, the casual style is the most dominant, followed by the consultative and formal styles, while the intimate and frozen styles occur less frequently.

The dominance of casual style is evident in interactions among characters who share familiarity or close relationships. This style is characterized by the use of contractions, informal expressions, and humor, which create a more relaxed and spontaneous tone. This finding supports previous research indicating that casual style tends to dominate film dialogue because it reflects everyday communication patterns and helps create a sense of authenticity (Turnip, 2019).

The prevalence of casual style can also be explained by the communicative environment portrayed in the film. As an animated movie intended for broad audiences, *Zootopia 2* prioritizes accessibility and relatability in its dialogue. Casual language enables characters to communicate in ways that resemble everyday speech, making interactions more engaging and understandable for viewers. Moreover, the frequent use of informal expressions contributes to character realism by reflecting

spontaneous communication patterns commonly found in contemporary society. This stylistic preference demonstrates how cinematic discourse balances entertainment value with social authenticity. In addition, the dominance of a casual style suggests that interpersonal solidarity and cooperation are central themes in the film's narrative structure.

Another noteworthy aspect concerns the interaction between different language styles throughout the narrative. Characters often shift from one style to another depending on situational demands, indicating a high degree of communicative adaptability. For example, a character may employ casual language during informal conversations but switch to a more formal style when addressing authority figures or participating in institutional activities. Such stylistic shifts highlight the dynamic nature of language use and support sociolinguistic arguments that language choices are closely linked to contextual factors rather than fixed personal characteristics.

Formal and consultative styles are primarily found in institutional communication settings, such as interactions within the police department or in formal decision-making contexts. These styles are marked by more careful word choice, clearer sentence structure, and greater attention to politeness. In contrast, intimate style appears in emotionally charged interactions, where characters express personal feelings, trust, or vulnerability. Frozen style, although rarely used, is typically associated with ceremonial speech or fixed expressions that follow conventional patterns.

2. Linguistic Characteristics of Language Styles

Each language style identified in the film exhibits distinct linguistic features. The casual style is characterized by informal vocabulary, reduced grammatical forms, and expressive language, frequently accompanied by humor. These characteristics contribute to a natural-sounding dialogue and facilitate character interaction. The presence of these features indicates that film dialogue, although scripted, is designed to imitate spontaneous conversation and thereby enhance audience engagement. This



observation is consistent with Freddi's assertion that film language balances naturalness with narrative structure (Freddi, n.d.).

In contrast, the formal style is defined by complete grammatical constructions, the absence of slang, and precise articulation. The consultative style shares certain features with formal language but permits interaction and feedback between speakers. The intimate style is marked by emotional expressions and personal references, reflecting a close relationship between participants. The frozen style consists of fixed and ritualized expressions that are inflexible in form. Beyond lexical features, prosodic elements such as intonation, rhythm, and pacing play a significant role in conveying meaning. These prosodic features facilitate the expression of emotions and guide interpretation, thereby reinforcing the communicative effectiveness of each language style.

Beyond lexical and grammatical features, the linguistic characteristics observed in the film also reveal important sociocultural meanings. Informal vocabulary, contractions, and humorous expressions frequently function as markers of solidarity and group membership. These features help establish social bonds between characters and create a sense of familiarity that strengthens interpersonal relationships. Conversely, formal linguistic structures tend to emphasize professionalism, authority, and institutional legitimacy. The contrast between these styles demonstrates how language choices contribute to the construction of social identities within the narrative.

Furthermore, the film illustrates that language style is determined not solely by social status but also by communicative intentions. Speakers strategically select linguistic forms to achieve particular objectives, such as persuading others, expressing emotions, or maintaining social harmony. This observation supports pragmatic perspectives that view language as a resource for accomplishing social action. Consequently, linguistic variation in the film reflects both social structure and individual agency in communication.

Discussion

1. Language Styles and Social Interaction

The findings show that language styles in *Zootopia 2* serve as markers of social interactions and relationships. The frequent use of casual language indicates that the film focuses on cooperation and familiarity among characters, especially between partners. This informal style fosters a sense of closeness and makes character interactions appear more natural. Simultaneously, it highlights how cinematic dialogue tends to mimic real-life communication while still being structured to support the narrative (Androutsopoulos, 2012).

Conversely, employing formal and consultative styles emphasizes institutional authority and hierarchical relationships. These styles convey professionalism, maintain social distance, and reflect the gravity of situations. This variation demonstrates that language can serve as an indicator of social structure and power dynamics within discourse.

The interactional function of language styles can also be examined through the concept of accommodation. Characters frequently modify their linguistic behavior in response to their interlocutors, adjusting formality levels according to social circumstances. Such accommodation facilitates effective communication by reducing social distance and fostering mutual understanding. In scenes involving cooperation and teamwork, the use of casual language strengthens interpersonal solidarity and creates a more inclusive communicative environment. These findings suggest that language style serves not only as a reflection of social relationships but also as a mechanism for maintaining them.

Moreover, the flexibility of language use observed in the film reflects broader sociolinguistic realities. Individuals rarely employ a single language style consistently across all situations. Instead, they adapt their speech according to audience expectations, contextual demands, and communicative goals. The film successfully mirrors this phenomenon, thereby enhancing the realism of its dialogue and social representation.



2. Language Styles and Character Identity

An additional key insight from the findings is how language styles influence character identity. Characters are characterized not just by their actions but also by how they speak. Variations in vocabulary, tone, and communication style demonstrate differences in background, personality, and social status. This observation aligns with Valleriani's (2016) assertion that animated films often utilize linguistic variation to establish recognizable character identities. Characters who regularly use informal and humorous language are generally depicted as adaptable and socially lively, whereas those who speak more formally are linked to authority and official roles. Consequently, language plays a crucial role in shaping character development and storytelling.

The relationship between language style and identity becomes particularly evident when characters experience personal development throughout the narrative. Changes in communicative behavior often accompany shifts in confidence, social status, or interpersonal relationships. As characters evolve, their language choices may become more assertive, cooperative, or emotionally expressive. These linguistic developments contribute to audience perceptions of character growth and reinforce narrative progression.

In addition, language style functions as an important marker of individuality. Even when characters occupy similar social positions, differences in vocabulary choice, speech rhythm, and communicative preferences allow them to maintain distinctive identities. This observation demonstrates that linguistic variation is a powerful tool for characterization and supports sociolinguistic theories that emphasize the role of language in identity construction.

3. Language Styles and Social Representation

Beyond individual interactions, the film's language styles also reflect broader social issues, including power, prejudice, and inequality. Differences in speech patterns are closely connected to how characters are positioned within the film's social structure. Certain forms of language convey authority and

legitimacy, while others may indicate marginalization or resistance. This finding aligns with the view that film dialogue represents social reality, in which linguistic variation carries ideological meaning (Ruoyu, n.d.). Language in *Zootopia 2* is therefore not neutral; it actively contributes to the portrayal of social dynamics and tensions within the narrative.

The representation of social issues through language styles is particularly significant because audiences often interpret social meanings indirectly through dialogue. Linguistic variation can communicate assumptions about authority, competence, trustworthiness, and social belonging. Consequently, the language characters use influences how viewers perceive social groups and institutional structures within the narrative. The film therefore participates in broader cultural processes of meaning-making through its portrayal of linguistic diversity.

Additionally, the depiction of different language styles may encourage audiences to reflect on real-world social experiences. Issues such as discrimination, inclusion, and social mobility are frequently communicated through subtle linguistic cues rather than explicit statements. By incorporating these communicative patterns, the film creates a more nuanced representation of social reality and strengthens its sociological relevance.

4. Contextual and Pragmatic Dimensions

The variation in language styles observed in the film is highly context-dependent. Characters adjust their speech according to the situation, their communicative goals, and their relationship with others. This adaptability reflects the pragmatic nature of language, where meaning is constructed through interaction rather than through isolated linguistic forms.

These findings reinforce the idea that language use must be understood within its context, as emphasized by Leclercq (2022) and McEnery (2019). Furthermore, prosodic features like rhythm and intonation play a crucial role in interpreting meaning and enhancing communication effectiveness. Meyer (2021) points out that rhythm is a vital component of



spoken language, linking linguistic form with social interaction.

Contextual factors play a decisive role in determining language choice throughout the film. Changes in setting, emotional atmosphere, and participant relationships often result in noticeable stylistic variation. For instance, characters may adopt more formal language during official interactions while reverting to casual speech in personal conversations. Such variation illustrates the contextual sensitivity of language and reinforces the importance of analyzing discourse within its social environment.

From a pragmatic perspective, language styles also contribute to the interpretation of implied meanings. Speakers frequently rely on indirect expressions, humor, and contextual references to achieve communicative objectives. These pragmatic features enrich the dialogue and enable characters to convey complex meanings beyond the literal content of their utterances. As a result, language style functions as an integral component of both social interaction and narrative communication.

5. Implications, Limitations, and Future Direction

This study's findings influence sociolinguistic research, particularly in understanding how language styles function in audiovisual media. The results show that animated films serve as valuable data sources for analyzing language variation and its role in expressing social meaning.

This study has some limitations. The analysis focuses on selected dialogues and does not examine the entire film in detail. Moreover, the qualitative method is interpretative, which can introduce some subjectivity. Future research should consider larger datasets, comparative analyses of different films, or mixed-method approaches to gain a fuller understanding of language styles in media discourse. Overall, the results show that language styles in Zootopia 2 significantly influence character interactions and depict social realities. Language functions not just as a communication tool but also as a means to construct social meanings and identities.

In addition to its academic significance, the study offers practical implications for language education. The identification of different language styles in film dialogue can help students develop a deeper understanding of sociolinguistic variation and communicative appropriateness. Film-based materials provide authentic examples of language use across diverse social contexts, making abstract sociolinguistic concepts more accessible and engaging. Therefore, the findings may contribute to the development of pedagogical approaches that integrate media discourse into language learning.

The study emphasizes the significance of critical media literacy. Understanding how language styles influence character portrayal and social meanings helps audiences recognize the ideological aspects embedded in popular culture. This awareness is especially important in today's societies, where audiovisual media significantly influence public perceptions and cultural values.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that language styles in Zootopia 2 function as a central element in shaping character interaction and representing social meaning within the narrative. The findings show that all five categories of language styles, frozen, formal, consultative, casual, and intimate, are present and used systematically according to communicative context and interpersonal relationships. Among these, the casual style emerges as the most dominant, reflecting the film's effort to craft natural, relatable dialogue while maintaining narrative coherence. At the same time, formal and consultative styles are closely associated with institutional communication and hierarchical structures, indicating authority and social distance.

The analysis further reveals that language styles play a significant role in constructing character identity. Variations in speech patterns, vocabulary, and tone allow characters to express their social background, personality, and relational dynamics more clearly. In addition, the film's language variation reflects broader social issues, including power



relations, prejudice, and inequality, suggesting that dialogue is not merely communicative but also representational. The study also highlights the importance of contextual and pragmatic factors, as characters continuously adjust their language based on situation, purpose, and interactional roles.

The study also demonstrates that cinematic discourse can provide a valuable source of sociolinguistic data for understanding language variation in contemporary society. Through the systematic examination of language styles, researchers can gain insight into how media texts construct social identities, represent institutional relationships, and communicate cultural values. The findings further indicate that animated films are not merely entertainment products but also meaningful sites for examining the interaction between language and society.

Overall, the research confirms that language styles in cinematic discourse are closely linked to sociolinguistic principles, in which meaning is shaped through the interaction between linguistic form and social context. By examining language use in *Zootopia 2*, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of how animated films can serve as a meaningful source for analyzing the relationship between language, identity, and society and underscores the relevance of sociolinguistic analysis in interpreting contemporary media texts.

REFERENCES

- Al Hafiz, E. F. (2023). Investigating the figurative language of the novel entitled *Miles Morales: Spider-Man* by Jason Reynolds. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374850696_Investigating_the_Figurative_Language_of_the_Novel_Entitled_Miles_Morales_Spider-Man_by_Jason_Reynold
- Androutsopoulos, J. (2012). Language and society in cinematic discourse. Retrieved from <https://jannisandroutsopoulos.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/139-152-ja-introduction.pdf>
- Anderson, C. (n.d.). *Essentials of linguistics*. McMaster University.
- Freddi, M. (n.d.). A phraseological approach to film dialogue. Retrieved from <https://www.degruyterbrill.com/document/doi/10.1515/9783110236200.137/pdf?licenseType=open-access>
- Leclercq, B. (2022). *Linguistic knowledge and language use*. Cambridge University Press.
- McEnery, T. (2019). *Learner language, discourse and interaction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Meyer, L. (2021). *Rhythms of speech and language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ribó, I. (2019). *Prose fiction: An introduction to the semiotics of narrative*. Open Book Publishers.
- Ruoyu, C. (n.d.). A sociolinguistic analysis of film dialogue. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/6771/c5343c7a31b2c248d2b291999beb065cdd3d.pdf>
- Turnip, R. Y. (2019). An investigation to conversations to identify the language style in a movie: A study on sociolinguistics. Retrieved from <https://www.scipublications.com/journal/ujll/article/an-investigation-to-conversations-to-identify-the-language-style-in-a-movie-a-study-on-sociolinguistics-152>
- Valleriani, L. (2016). Accents and stereotypes in animated films: The case of *Zootopia*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/64114179/Accents_and_stereotypes_in_animated_films_The_case_of_Zootopia_2016
- Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (7th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell. Retrieved from https://mrdowportal.weebly.com/uploads/1/0/1/8/10183165/wardhaugh-fuller2015-an_introduction_to_sociolinguistics.pdf



