CHAPTER III

RESEARCH OBJECT AND METHOD

This chapter is concerned with the object of this research and the method applied in conducting this research. Here, the research method is divided into two parts, i.e. data collection and data analysis.

3.1 Research Object

The object of this research is the ambiguity of genitive *of-construction* which is related to the meanings in the form of proposition and implicit case and state roles. The data were collected from several data sources, such as novels and American corpus. The writer took several data sources since there were various data indicating the ambiguity of genitive *of-construction*.

3.2 Research Method

The method used in this research is analytic descriptive. According to Ratna (2006: 53):

> *Metode deskriptif analitik dilakukan dengan cara mendeskripsikan fakta-fakta-fakta yang kemudian disusul dengan analisis. Secara etimologis deskripsi dan analisis berarti menguraikan.*

Based on the above definition, the writer concluded that the analytic descriptive method is conducted by describing and analyzing the facts as research data. Thus, the descriptive method is an appropriate method since it describes the ambiguity of genitive *of-construction*. Meanwhile, the analytic method is applied

to analyze the semantic structure indicating the ambiguity of genitive *of-construction*. In conducting the research method, there are two ways which are done; they are data collection and data analysis.

3.2.1 Data Collection

To get valid data, data collection is an important way that has to be done in conducting the research. In this research, the writer conducted library research since it is an appropriate method to collect the valid data. By using library research, the writer could get many references to conduct this research.

The data of the ambiguity of genitive *of-construction* were collected from several data sources. The writer conducted several ways in collecting data. First, the writer chose the data source; in conducting the research, it is needed to choose the data source in order to get valid data. Based on previous explanation, it is stated that the writer took data from several novels, such as Wuthering Heights, Northanger Abbey, The Complete Sherlock Holmes, The Adventure of Tom Sawyer & Huckleberry Finn, Sense and Sensibility, Harry Potter and The Deathly Hallows, and The Prisoner of Azkaban. In addition, the data were also taken from American Corpus. Those several data sources were taken since there are various data indicating the ambiguity of genitive *of-construction*. Second, the writer read the data sources; in finding the data indicating the ambiguity of genitive *of-construction*, it is needed to read the data sources. Third, the writer found and marked the data; after reading the data sources, the writer got the data by finding the data indicating the ambiguity of genitive *of-construction*; then, marking the

data by underlining the cases of ambiguity of genitive *of-construction*. Fourth, the writer selected the data to be analyzed; here, the data were analyzed semantically.

3.2.2 Data Analysis

After collecting the data, the writer analyzed them by applying several ways. First, the writer interpreted the meanings of the data in the form of propositions; here, the writer analyzed the data semantically by interpreting the meanings of the data of genitive *of-construction* indicating ambiguity in the form of propositions; it was done in order to indicate the ambiguity. Second, the writer analyzed the data based on semantic structure; in this case, the writer analyzed the propositions semantically by analyzing them based on semantic structure; here, the writer analyzed the implicit case and state roles; the case roles can be classified as Agent, Action, Affected, Beneficiary, Accompaniment, Resultant, Instrument, Location, Goal, Time, Manner and Measure; the state roles can be classified as Topic, Comment and Relation; it was done since the writer wanted to prove that the data of genitive *of-construction* could indicate the ambiguity.

There are two examples of data analysis of the ambiguity of genitive *of-construction*:

Corpus 1

The talk of madman (WH: 175)

Semantically, the phrase *the talk of madman* is ambiguous since it can be interpreted into some ways. There are two meanings which the writer got from the above phrase; first, *madman talked about something*; second, *someone talked*

about madman. To make it clear that the phrase is ambiguous, the writer analyzed each meaning.

First meaning:

Madman	talked	about (something)
THING	**EVENT**	**THING**
as	**as**	**as**
Agent	**Action**	**Affected**

From the above meaning, there are some case roles involved in the meaning *madman talked about something*. In the meaning, *madman* is the THING which has a case role as an Agent since *madman* did an EVENT. The EVENT is talked which has a case role as an Action since it is done by an Agent (*madman*). Then, there is *something* which is affected by *madman* (Agent). Therefore, *something* is the THING which has a case role as an Affected. In this classification, the meaning *madman talked about something* is marked by implicit Affected since the phrase *the talk of madman* doesn't mention the word *something* which has a case role as an Affected in the meaning. The words *someone* is left implicit in order to make the genitive *of-construction the talk of madman*. But, the implicit case role causes some interpretation since there is implicit information in the phrase *the talk of madman*.

Second meaning:

Someone	talked	about	madman
THING	**EVENT**		**THING**
as	**as**		**as**
Agent	**Action**		**Affected**

As can be seen that the above meaning involves some case roles; they are Agent, Action and Affected. In the meaning, *someone* is the THING which is identified as an Agent since *someone* did an EVENT. The EVENT is *talked* which is identified as an Action since it is done by the Agent (*someone*). Then, *someone* (Agent) talked (Action) about something. In this case, something is *madman* which is identified as an Affected since it is affected by an Agent (*someone*). In this classification, the meaning of *someone talked about madman* is marked by implicit Agent since in the phrase *the talk of madman* doesn't mention the word *someone* which has a case role as an Agent in the meaning. The phrase *the talk of madman* just mention the word *talk* (Action) and *madman* (Affected). Therefore, the implicit word *someone* (Agent) causes some interpretation in the phrase *the talk of madman.* It means that there is implicit information which is caused by the implicit case role Agent (someone). The word *someone* (Agent) is left implicit in order to make the genitive *of-construction*.

However, the phrase *the talk of madman* is still ambiguous in the sentence, as follows:

"Mr. Heathcliff," said I, "this is <u>the talk of madman</u>".

The phrase *the talk of madman* is still ambiguous in the above sentence. There are no words or phrases which explain the phrase *the talk of madman*. Therefore, the phrase does not give a clear information whether *madman* or *someone* who talked.

Corpus 2

The disturbance of Catherine (WH: 61)

The phrase *the disturbance of Catherine* is ambiguous semantically since it can be interpreted into some meanings. There are two meanings which the writer got from the phrase; first, *Catherine disturbed someone*; second, *someone disturbed Catherine*. In this case, the writer analyzed the meanings one by one.

First meaning:

Catherine	disturbed	(someone)
THING	**EVENT**	**THING**
as	**as**	**as**
Agent	**Action**	**Affected**

As can be seen that the meaning *Catherine disturbed someone* involves some case roles; they are Agent, Action and Affected. In this case, *Catherine* is the THING which has a case role as an Agent since *Catherine* did an EVENT. The EVENT is disturbed which is done by *Catherine* (Agent). Thus, *disturbed* has a case role as an Action. Then, there is someone who is affected by an Action that the Agent did. Therefore, *someone* is the THING which has a case role as an Affected. In this classification, the meaning *Catherine disturbed someone* is marked by implicit Affected since the phrase *the disturbance of Catherine* doesn't

mention the word *someone* which has a case role as an Affected in the meaning. The words *someone* is left implicit in order to make the genitive *of-construction the disturbance of Catherine*. But, the implicit case roles cause some interpretation since there is implicit information in the phrase *the disturbance of Catherine*.

Second meaning:

(Someone)	disturbed	Catherine
THING	**EVENT**	**THING**
as	**as**	**as**
Agent	**Action**	**Affected**

The above meaning shows that there are some case roles involved in the meaning *someone disturbed Catherine*; they are Agent, Action and Affected. In the meaning, *someone* is identified as an Agent since it is the THING which did an EVENT. The EVENT is disturbed which is identified as an Action since it is done by an Agent (*someone*). Then, there is someone who is affected by the Action that the Agent did. In this case, someone is *Catherine* which is identified as an Affected. In this classification, the meaning *someone disturbed Catherine* is marked by implicit Agent and Action since the phrase *the disturbance of Catherine* doesn't mention the word *someone* which has a case role as an Agent and the word *disturbed* which has a case role as an Action in the meaning. The words *someone* and *disturbed* are left implicit in order to make the genitive *of-construction the disturbance of Catherine*. But, the implicit case roles cause some

interpretation since there is implicit information in the phrase *the disturbance of Catherine*.

Although the phrase is in the sentence, it still has ambiguous meanings.

With that he dashed head foremost out of the room, amid the merriment of the master and mistress, and to <u>the disturbance of Catherine</u>. (Wuthering Heights: 61)

In the sentence, the phrase is not explained by another words, phrases or clause which give clear information whether the disturbance is made by someone or Catherine.