CHAPTER III

RESEARCH OBJECT AND METHOD

This chapter is concerned with the object of this research and the method applied in conducting this research.

3.1 Research Object

The object of this research is negative construction ‘no’ and ‘not’ taken from The Jakarta Post’s October 13th 2011. The Jakarta Post is chosen as the data source since there are various data of negative constructions ‘no’ and ‘not’ related to negative equivalent found in this newspaper. After that, each negative construction is analyzed based on scope and focus of negation to find different entailments.

3.2 Research Method

The method used in this research is analytic descriptive. According to Djadjasudarma (1993: 15), the method of analytic descriptive is conducted through the process of describing and analyzing the facts of the research data. The research object is examined syntactically and semantically. The negative construction ‘no’ and ‘not’ are analyzed syntactically by examining the changing construction based on the features to which word categories ‘no’ and ‘not’ can attach. Similarly, it will be analyzed semantically by examining the semantic entailments based on the scope and focus of negation, as well as the case and state

roles involved in the construction. In complementary to that, the descriptive method is used to describe the process and the result of analysis that have been conducted. Thus, analytic descriptive is used as the proper method for this research.

3.2.1 Data Collection

In collecting the data, some ways have been conducted. First, to get the valid data The Jakarta Post's October 13th 2011 is chosen as the data source of this research. Second, the data source needs to be read to observe and to find the existences of negative construction 'no' and 'not'. Third, the data are collected by highlighting and marking the negative constructions 'no' and 'not' that indicate negative equivalent. If the negative construction belongs to compound or complex sentence that consists of several clause, then it will be separated in which the data taken will be a clause where the 'no' and 'not' belongs to. Fourth, the data are identified by seeing the word categories forming the construction whether it is possible to have negative equivalent or not. After that, the data are classified based on the possibility of whether or not to have negative equivalent. Eventually, the data are selected and analyzed syntactically and semantically.

3.2.2 Data Analysis

After collecting the data, the data are analyzed by applying several ways. First, the negative constructions are examined based on the word categories of those involved in constructing the clause. The data are analyzed to see whether it

consists of features indicating the negative construction with negative equivalent or not. Second, the data are analyzed based on the scope and the focus of negation to examine the semantics of the construction. Third, the lexical relation of words related to scope and focus of negation are analyzed to find the different semantic entailments. In the end, the case and state roles involved are analyzed to show how similar the negative equivalent of each negative construction. Those ways above are conducted purposefully to prove that the data of negative equivalent construction may indicate different semantic entailments.

The example of the analyzed data below will give a prior mapping of the analysis of the research.

Data

"In the season transition, the wind doesn't disperse the clouds, but helps create towering clouds". He said, as quoted by tempointeraktif.com. (TJP, p.9)

Analysis

Construction: (det+NP) + (aux+not) + V + (det + NP)

The wind *doesn't* disperse the clouds

S V O

The negative construction above may have another construction to state that *the clouds are not dispersed by the wind,* called as negative equivalent as follows:

The wind disperses *no clouds*

S V O

The construction of negative equivalent is quite different from the previous, where the construction changes into (det + NP) + V + (no + NP). Even

though the negative equivalent represents the similar meaning, in which the clouds are not treated at all by the winds. However, these two similar constructions may have different semantic entailments that can be found by examining the scope and focus of negation as follows:

(i). The wind *doesn't* disperse the clouds

(ii). The wind disperses *no clouds*

In (i) construction, the focus of negation 'not' goes to the verb denoting the action 'disperse', thus the entailment appear is something other than 'disperse'. In respect to opposite relation between 'not' and 'disperse', the (i) construction may entail '*the wind blows the clouds'*. On the other hand, the focus of negation 'no' goes only to 'the clouds' in (ii) construction, it may entail that the object dispersed by the wind is not 'clouds'. In opposite relation, the entailments appear may be *'the wind disperses raindrop'* or *'the wind disperses snow'.*

The difference of two similar negative constructions also can be seen in terms of case and state role. In the constructions above, since they have an EVENT as the central concept they belong to case roles as follows:

Case Role I :

(i). The winds *doesn't* disperse the clouds

THING EVENT THING

In case roles, it shows that the EVENT as the central concept is negated, and it does not cause the clouds as the affected as it supposed to be in positive construction.

Case Role II:

(ii). the winds disperse *no clouds*

THING EVENT THING

In (ii) construction, the case roles involved is where the EVENT as the central concept does the action of causing the affected even though the affected is implied--‘no clouds’-- in which the truly affected is not ‘no clouds’ but others. Thus, by using the case roles involved, the differences between the two similar negative constructions can be examined.