CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a general description of this research. It covers background to the study, research questions, goals and objectives, significance to knowledge, and the framework of theories.

1.1 Background to the study

The concept of negation is universal. Every language uses this concept to deny, to reject, and to state disagreement of an idea. However, each language has various ways to express the concept of negation. In some languages, for example, negation is often marked by the existence of negative marker as the syntactic features. For instances:

Bahasa *: Dia tidak suka bermain gitar.*

English : She does not like playing guitar.

In both languages, the existence of *'tidak'* and 'not' stands as the negative marker to express the concept of negation.

In English, specifically, the common negative markers are *no, not, none, never,* and *neither*. However, a question arises, "Do they have the same distribution in conducting negation?" Negative 'no' and 'not', especially, are sometimes confusing in their usage. They seem like having the same distribution and conveying the similar meaning in negation.

For instance:

(i) That was *not* an accident

(ii) That was *no* accident.

In both constructions, ‘not’ and ‘no’ have the same distribution in stating negation. However, further, ‘not’ gives more distribution, in which it negates the whole clause through *verb negation*. Meanwhile, ‘no’ has less distribution since in this case, it only negates a part of the clause, complement. This different distribution also causes different entailment of each construction. Where (i) may entail that it was something which has been planned, and (ii) may entail nothing was happened. In other words, the negative ‘no’ and ‘not’ can conduct the similar form of negation although it encodes different entailments. The similar construction of negation as the example above is common known as *negative equivalent*.

In the cases above, there are still other possibilities of the entailments that may appear, depending on the scope and focus of negation. Additionally, by examining the semantic entailments based on the scope and focus of the negation, it can be used to analyze the case and state roles involved in the clause. That is why, it is needed to be analyzed since it can help the readers to get the right meaning of negative statement the writer wants to deliver, and also to avoid misunderstanding caused by the negative ‘no’ and ‘not’.

To limit the topic under the study, this research will be focused on examining the negative equivalent construction ’no’ and ‘not’ including the

syntactic features and constructions, scope and focus of negation, semantic entailments, and case and state roles involved.

In relation to this research, there are two previous researches about negation that have been conducted. The first research is entitled *Struktur Kalimat Negatif dalam Bahasa Inggris* written by Ypsi Soeria Soemantri (2011) UNPAD. The case examined in this research is about negative marker used in the sentence, and it only focuses on the function of the negative markers, to which word class the negative marker can attach, and the meanings caused by negative marker. The second research is entitled 'A Comparison between English and Indonesian Negation Marker' written by Ria Rakhmania (2011) University of Gunadharma. This research is focused on syntactical categories of negative marker and the comparison between negation marker in English and Indonesian syntactically and semantically.

However, both researchers did not analyze about negative equivalent construction 'no' and 'not' including scope and focus of negation, semantic entailments, and case and state roles involved in negative equivalent. Therefore, this research, entitled *'Negative Equivalent Constructions 'no' and 'not' in The Jakarta Post's October 13th 2011',* is conducted to complete the previous research about negation and to give a clear explanation about negative equivalent.

1.2 Research Questions

In relation to the explanation, this research is performed as an attempt to analyze negative equivalent construction ‘no’ and ‘not’ found in The Jakarta Post’s October 13th 2011. The problems found in the data are as follows:

1. What are negative constructions of ‘no’ and ‘not’ that have negative equivalent?
2. What syntactic features may expose the existence of negative equivalent?
3. What semantic entailments occur in negative equivalent?
4. What case and state roles involve in negative equivalent?

1.3 Objectives

Based on the problems formulated in the research questions, the aims of this research are as follows:

1. To describe negative constructions of ‘no’ and ‘not’ that have negative equivalent
2. To describe syntactic features which may expose the existence of negative equivalent
3. To describe semantic entailments occur in negative equivalent
4. To describe case and state roles involve in negative equivalent

1.4 Significance to knowledge

This research explains about the using of negative constructions ‘no’ and ‘not’. This research describes the syntactic features of the clause that are productive to have negative equivalent or not. Thus, it will help the readers to predict the possibilities of negative equivalent that can be formed. In addition, this research shows how the construction of negative ‘no’ and ‘not’ may cause different meaning. This research describes how the role of scope and focus of negation may influence the semantic entailments that may occur in negative equivalent construction. Further, this research also performs the importance of relation between negative construction, scope and focus of negation, and semantic entailment to examine the case and state roles involved.

By seeing the relation between construction (syntactic features) and meaning (semantic features) as mentioned above, this research is expected to give a contribution in the development of the similar studies in the future. Additionally, this research is proposed to give lighter and clearer explanation about the study of negative equivalent. Thus, hopefully, this research will be helpful for the readers, especially for students of English Department in learning negative construction.

1.5 Framework of the Theory

In this research, the theories used to analyze negative construction ‘no’ and ‘not’ are mainly taken from the theories of syntax and semantics. Quirk (1990: 778) defines ‘no’ and ‘not’ as the negative marker to negate the clause. He, additionally, states that to conduct negative statement can be not only through

verb negation using ‘not’, but also through negation of other element (non-verb negation) using ‘no’ or ‘not’. However, the using of verbal and non-verbal negation in negating a clause will arise some similar constructions with similar meaning called as *negative equivalent*.

However, the similarity among negative equivalents is often considered as that that is equal to the others. Vice versa, obviously each negative construction of ‘no’ and ‘not’ leads to different entailment. Quirk (1990: 779) states negation with ‘no’ may have different implication than verb negation with ‘not’. He, further, explains that ‘no’ usually converts non-gradable noun into a gradable noun to characterize the person. The different implication, meaning or entailment that each negative construction brought is caused by the different function and distribution of negative marker ‘no’ and ‘not’ given to the clause. According to Huddlestone (1985: 420), ‘no’ and ‘not’ has principal function in syntactic distribution, in which ‘no’ stands for determiner in NP structure and modifier in comparative structures of AdjPs and AdvPs, and ‘not’ can be modifier to such determinatives as *much, many, enough, one,* rather than its main function as an adverb.

In addition, the scope and focus of negation is also being concerned as the point driving the negative construction into different meaning or entailments. According to Quirk (1990: 789), the negative construction may have the contrast of implicit meaning in the part, in which the stress of negation located. In other words, the scope and focus of negation can be used to figure out the semantic entailment that may occur in the negative construction. Goddard (1998: 17) states

semantic entailment is a relationship that applies between two concepts, where the truth of one implies the truth of other because of the meanings of the words involved. Semantic entailment involves the meaning of the words, and each word has the relation with other words in the construction. This word relation can be examined to find semantic entailment since it analyzes the meaning of each word, not in terms of its component features, but of its relation to other words, known as lexical relation (Yule, 2006: 104).

Furthermore, how similar the negative equivalent to other construction can be figured out by analyzing the systems of relation of concepts THING, EVENT, and ATTRIBUTE defined as case and state roles (Larson, 1984: 199). These concepts are described to compare which construction that is more similar or less as negative equivalent.

The last but not least, there are some theories of linguists who support the analysis of this research such as Celce, Linda Thomas, and Kersty Borjars.