II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Concept of Grammar

The writer discusses the concept of grammar in this chapter because past tense belongs to grammar. According to Quirk (1984), Grammar shall be used to include both Syntax and the inflections (or accidence) of Morphology. The fact that the past tense of *buy* is *bought* (inflection) and the fact that the interrogative form of *He bought it* is *Did he buy it?* (Syntax) are therefore both equally the province of grammar. There is nothing esoteric or technical about the usage in this respect.

Based on the definition made by Crystal (2004), grammar is the structural foundation of the ability to express ourselves. The more awareness there is of how it works, the more accurate it is to be understood in the meaning and effectiveness of the language. It can help foster precision, detect ambiguity, and exploit the richness of expression available in English. And it can help everyone, not only teachers of English, but teachers of anything, for all teaching is ultimately a matter of getting to grip with meaning.

Greenbaum (1996) states ancient attitudes to grammar still survive: many people are in awe of it, know little about it, tend to fear or dislike it, often find it baffling

or boring if exposed to it at school, and yet a minority is fascinated by it: a field in which precise scholarship and nit-picking pedantry have co-existed for centuries. "Grammar is concerned with how sentences and utterances are formed. In a typical English sentence, it can be seen the two most basic principles of grammar, the arrangement of items (syntax) and the structure of items (morphology):

I gave my sister a sweater for her birthday.

The meaning of this sentence is obviously created by words such as *gave, sister, sweater* and *birthday*. But there are other words (*I, my, a, for, her*) which contribute to the meaning, and, additionally, aspects of individual words and the way they are arranged which enable people to interpret what the sentence means (Carter and McCarthy, 2006). In accordance with the concepts of grammar stated by the experts above, it can be said that grammar is the key of a language which consists of two basic principles which are syntax and morphology.

According to Chomsky (1971), syntax is the study of the principles and processes by which sentences are constructed in particular languages. Syntactic investigation of a given language has as its goal the construction of a grammar that can be viewed as a device of some sort for producing the sentences of the language under analysis. In other words, syntax should be based on some analysis

Radford says that within traditional grammar, the syntax of a language is described in terms of a taxonomy (i.e. the classificatory list) of the range of different types of syntactic structures found in the language. The central assumption underpinning syntactic analysis in traditional grammar is that phrases and sentences are built up of a series of constituents (i.e. syntactic units), each of which belongs to a specific grammatical category and serves a specific grammatical function. Given this assumption, the task of the linguist analysing the syntactic structure of any given type of sentence is to identify each of the constituents in the sentence, and (for each constituent) to say what category it belongs to and what function it serves as different sentences have different structure.

In contrast to the taxonomic approach adopted in traditional grammar, Chomsky (1971) takes a cognitive approach to the study of grammar. For Chomsky, the goal of the linguist is to determine what it is that native speakers *know* about their native language which enables them to speak and understand the language fluently: hence, the study of language is part of the wider study of cognition (i.e. what human beings know). In a fairly obvious sense, any native speaker of a language can be said to *know* the grammar of his or her native language.

Chapman (1995:182) states that syntax is the part of grammar, or the subsystem of a grammar that deals with the position, order and function of words and larger units in sentences, clauses, and phrases. The "rules" of English syntax are so numerous and complex that they will never be fully codified. They control our verbal expression over a vast range of free choices and choices required by the rules of grammar from the construction of complex sentences, to the precise patterns required for questions and passive constructions, to the very subtle ordering of modifiers and nouns. The terms "subject", "predicate", "object" and the like are syntactic designations. Where the choices have to do not so much with "correctness" as with beauty and force of expression, syntax merges with stylistics. It also merges with morphology. The use of a possessive form shows the relation between "hat" and "girl." Linguists find it difficult to define the exact limits of syntax, but the meaning of the Greek *syntassein* (to arrange; to put in order), from which "syntax" derives, provides a good basis of understanding.

While the term 'morphology' has been taken over from biology where it is used to denote the study of the forms of plants and animals. It was first used for linguistic purposes in 1859 by the German linguist Salmon (2000), to refer to the study of the form of words. In present-day linguistics, the term 'morphology' refers to the study of internal structure of words and form-meaning between words.

"The notion 'systematic' in the definition of morphology given above is important. For instance, it is likely to observe a form difference and a corresponding meaning difference between the English noun *ear* and the verb *hear*. However, this pattern is not systematic: there are no similar word pairs, and it cannot form new English verbs by adding *h-* to a noun" (Booij, 2007).

Crystal (2003) states "For English, “morphology” means devising ways of describing the properties of such disparate items as *a, horse, took, indescribable, washing machine,* and *antidisestablishmentarianism*. A widely recognized approach divides the field into two domains: *lexical* or *derivational morphology* studies the way in which new items of vocabulary can be built up out of combinations of elements (as in the case of *in-describ-able*); *inflectional morphology* studies the ways words vary in their form in order to express a grammatical contrast (as in the case of *horses*, where the ending marks plurality)."

Further, Crystal states that the distinction between words and lexemes provides the basis for the division of morphology into two branches: *inflectional morphology* and *lexical word-formation*. Inflectional morphology deals with the inflectional forms of various lexemes. It has something of the character of an appendix to the syntax, the major component of the grammar. Syntax tells when a lexeme may or must carry a certain inflectional property, while inflectional morphology tells what form it takes when it carries that inflectional property.

Crystal emphasizes that lexical word-formation, by contrast, is related to the dictionary. It describes the processes by which new lexical bases are formed and the structure of complex lexical bases, those composed of more than one morphological element. The traditional term is simply 'word-formation.

In accordance with wikipedia.org (retrieved on January 20th , 2011), morphology is the identification, analysis and description of the structure of morphemes and other units of meaning in a language like words, affixes, and parts of speech and intonation/stress, implied context (words in a *lexicon* are the subject matter of *lexicology*). Morphological typology represents a way of classifying languages according to the ways by which morphemes are used in a language —from the analytic that use only isolated morphemes, through the agglutinative ("stuck-together") and fusional languages that use bound morphemes (affixes), up to the polysynthetic, which compress lots of separate morphemes into single words.

While words are generally accepted as being the smallest units of syntax, it is clear that in most languages, words can be related to other words by rules (grammar). For example, English speakers recognize that the words *dog* and *dogs* are closely related — differentiated only by the *plurality morpheme* "-s," which is only found bound to nouns, and is never separate. Speakers of English recognize these relations from their tacit knowledge of the rules of word formation in English. They infer intuitively that *dog* is to *dogs* as *cat* is to *cats*; similarly, *dog* is

to *dog catcher* as *dish* is to *dishwasher* (in one sense). The rules understood by the speaker reflect specific patterns (or regularities) in the way words are formed from smaller units and how those smaller units interact in speech. In this way, morphology is the branch of linguistics that studies patterns of word formation within and across languages, and attempts to formulate rules that model the knowledge of the speakers of those languages.

B. Kinds of Grammar

There are three kinds of grammar:

1. Descriptive grammar
2. Prescriptive grammar
3. Transformational-generative grammar

1. Descriptive and Prescriptive Grammar

Descriptive grammar is the systematic study and description of a language. While prescriptive grammar is a set of rules and examples dealing with the syntax and word structures of a language, usually intended as an aid to the learning of that language.

Descriptive grammar refers to the structure of a language as it is actually used by speakers and writers. Prescriptive grammar refers to the structure of a language as certain people think it *should* be used.

Both kinds of grammar are concerned with rules, but in different ways. Specialists in descriptive grammar (called *linguists*) study the rules or patterns that underlie the use of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences. On the other hand, prescriptive grammarians (such as most editors and teachers) lay out rules about what they believe to be the "correct" or "incorrect" use of language.

To illustrate these different approaches, let's consider the word *interface*. The descriptive grammarian would note, among other things, that the word is made up of a common prefix (*inter-*) and a root word (*face*) and that it's currently used as both a noun and a verb. The prescriptive grammarian, however, would be more interested in deciding whether or not it is "correct" to use *interface* as a verb.

Here's how the prescriptive Usage Panel at *The American Heritage Dictionary*, 4th edition passes judgment on *interface*: The Usage Panel has been unable to muster much enthusiasm for the verb. Thirty-seven percent of Panelists accept it when it designates the interaction between people in the sentence *The managing editor must interface with a variety of freelance editors and proofreaders*. But the percentage drops to 22 when the interaction is between a corporation and the

public or between various communities in a city. Many Panelists complain that interface is pretentious and jargony.

By their nature, *all* popular style and usage guides are prescriptive, though to varying degrees: some are fairly tolerant of deviations from standard English; others can be downright cranky. The most irascible critics are sometimes called "the Grammar Police."

Though certainly different in their approaches to language, both kinds of grammar; descriptive and prescriptive are useful to students.

2. Transformational-Generative Grammar

To attempt to extend phrase structure grammar to cover the entire language directly, would cause to lose the simplicity of the limited phrase structure grammar and of the transformational development. This approach to syntactic analysis is not appreciable. Chomsky in `Syntactic Structures' observes that "notions of phrase structure are quite adequate for a small part of the language and that the rest of the language can be derived by repeated application of a rather simple set of transformations to the strings given by the phrase structure grammar. Thus "Transformational Generative Grammar" was introduced. The name suggests that there are two aspects of this theory. The grammar that it provides is both `transformational' and `generative'. These two aspects are not logically

dependent upon each other, though the theory gains plausibility from the interaction of the two.

3. Transformational Grammar

"Essentially, transformation is a method of stating how the structures of many sentences in languages can be generated or explained formally as the result of specific transformations applied to certain basic sentence structures.", as R. H. Robins observes in his book "General Linguistics". Further, he says, "These basic sentence types or structures are not necessarily basic or minimal from the point of view of Immediate Constituent Analysis, the transformational syntax presupposes a certain amount of phrase structure grammar of the immediate constituent type to provide the basis of the `kernel' from which transformations start." Thus active sentences are `kernel' sentences whereas passive sentences are the transforms. However, the notion of `kernel' has been abandoned by Chomsky since the publication of his "Aspects of the Theory of Syntax".

In "Syntactic Structures" Chomsky handles the active-passive relationship by saying that if S1 is a grammatical sentence with the form

NP1----Aux----V----NP2,

then the corresponding string of form

NP2----Aux + be + en----V----by + Np1

is also a grammatical sentence. It states how to convert an active sentence into a passive sentence. It is necessary to change the positions of the noun phrase and insert `by' before the second one in the passive and, at the same time, change the verb from active into passive. In this way, the sentence "The door was opened by Shaw" is the transform of the sentence in active voice "Shaw opened the door".

There are, however, plenty of other transformations. One that occurs in English but is not paralleled in most languages is that of `permutation'. That is, "Has Jim played the piano?" is a transformation of "Jim has played the piano." This occurs with all the auxiliary verbs of English as "Is he coming?", "Can you go?", "Must I sleep?" etc.

A different and in some ways more important type of transformation is "relative transformation" which involves more than one "kernel sentence". There is a sense in which one sentence can be regarded as being part of another sentence, that one structure can be embedded into another. The sentence that is embedded into another is known as the "constituent" and the sentence into which it is embedded as the "matrix". For example, the sentence `The boy who was standing there ran away.' can be treated as a transformation of the two sentences:

The boy ran away and *The boy was standing there*.

Thus the relative transformation places the second sentence after `boy' in the first and then replaces `the boy' in the second by `who'.

The relevance of transformational grammar becomes obvious when it resolves ambiguity in sentences.

4. Generative Grammar

Another characteristic of Transformational Grammar is that it is `generative'. In other words, a grammar must generate all and only the grammatical sentences of a language. It means merely that the grammar must be so designed that by following its rules and conventions people can produce all or any of the possible sentences of the language.

To `generate' is thus to `predict' what can be sentences of the language or to `specify' precisely what are the possible sentences of the language. Thus a grammar should `generate', `specify', and `predict' sentences such as:

He plays the piano. but not *plays the piano he* or *He the piano plays*. A generative grammar is not concerned with any actual set of sentences of the language but with the possible set of sentences. It is not necessary, then, to be concerned or even primarily with any observed sentences that have occurred, but rather with those that can or could have occurred.

The advocates of Transformational Grammar point out that any corps has a finite number of sentences, no matter, how large, yet a language consists of an infinite

number of sentences. This infinity is a result of what is known as `recursion' that can be applied the same linguistic device over and over again. For example;

This is the house that Jack built.

This is the corn that lay in the house that Jack built.

This is the rat that ate the corn that lay in the house that Jack built.

The generative grammar is explicit, that is, it explicitly indicates just what the possible sentences of the language are. By its rules and conventions it generates all the sentences so its rules and conventions are totally explicit.

The `competence' and `performance' of a native speaker of a language are related to the Transformational Grammar grammarians' interest not in the neutral text but in what is linguistically possible. Their interest does not lie, therefore, in the actual utterances of the native speakers of a language but rather in what he can say. This concerns his knowledge of the language, his `competence' not what he actually does at any time, the sentences he actually produces, which are a matter only of performance. According to the theory, the native speaker of a language has `internalized a set of rules' which form the basis of his ability to speak and understand his language. It is the knowledge of these rules that is the object of the linguist's attention, not the actual sentences he produces.

Transformational Grammar is a rule-based grammar. Generative rules share some characteristics of both prescriptive and descriptive rules. They are in the first place instructions like the prescriptive rules but instead of being instructions for the production of correct speech, they are instructions for generating all the possible sentences of the language. In the second place, like descriptive rules, they relate to the facts of actual languages not the invented languages of grammarians, and are ultimately based, therefore upon what people say rather than what they ought to say.

The rules of Transformational Grammar are rewritten rules. That is to say, they rewrite one symbol as another or as several others or one set of symbols by another until eventually the sentences of the language are generated. The rules start with symbols `S' (sentence) and then a sequence of rules rewrite this symbol until a sentence is produced.

The sentence like `A man read the book' will be described as;

1. S → NP + VP

2. VP → V + NP

3. NP → D + N

4. V → read

5.Det → a, the

6. N → man, book

If people apply the rules in sequence, they generate the following strings successively:

SNP + VP

NP + V + NP

Det + N + V + Det + N

Det + N + read + Det + N

In Transformational Grammar phrase structure rules form the basic part of the grammar and are technically described as the `base component'. As long as, however, one is restricted to Passive Sentence rules, one cannot generate passive sentences from active ones.

Transformational rules contain two parts. The first part of each rule is a structural analysis specifying the class of strings to which the rule applies. The second part of the rule specifies the `structural change'.

The grammar of a language should describe the linguistic facts of the language economically and accurately. From this perspective one finds traditional grammar to be deficient. The western grammarians inherited the basic postulates of Greek tradition and interpreted language through categories of logic. This conceptual interpretation is notional and fails to give a scientific interpretation. Moreover, the traditional grammars distinguish written language and oral

language, the formal being the basis of grammatical study for them. But modern linguists have proved that it is speech which is the real language and written language only a representation of it. Therefore no wonder many forms which grammarians declared to be incorrect and unacceptable exist in everyday speech. The traditional grammar notional and prescriptive approach towards language is ephemeral and fails to go into the deeper problems involved.

The point that traditional grammar overlooks is the inherent system, the inner mechanism or what Saussure calls `Langue' at work when an utterance is made. An individual can utter a sentence and this sentence can have unpredictable possibilities of variations. The grammar's role is not to prescribe rules for the correctness of the sentence but to find out the system at work which enables the individual to manipulate such a great and complex range of utterances.

Chomsky rightly asserted that traditional grammars are deficient in that they leave unexposed many of the basic regularities of the language. They emphasize exceptions and irregularities but only give examples and hints concerning regular and productive syntactic process due to their preoccupation with the extra linguistic view of `natural order of thought' being reflected in the order of words. The rules of sentence formations as formulated by them do not belong to the field of grammar.

In Transformational Grammar sentence refers to the individual elements of which a language contains an infinite number. Grammar is the concept which refers to finite system which specifies and generates these infinite numbers of sentences. Transformational Grammar has a comprehensive approach as it deals with the language on the syntactic, semantic, and phonological level which three put together represent language in both its structural and functional terms. No other grammar is complete in this sense.

C. Deductive and Inductive Methods in Teaching Grammar

Since the title of this script is closely related to deductive and inductive methods, the writer finds it necessary to explain what deductive and inductive methods are. According to Widodo (2006:126), there are two core methods in grammar teaching. They are deductive and inductive methods. Both approaches can offer certain advantages, but the biggest difference is the role of the teacher. In a deductive classroom, the teacher conducts lessons by introducing and explaining concepts to students, and then expecting students to complete tasks to practice the concepts; this approach is very teacher-centered. Conversely, inductive instruction is a much more student-centered approach and makes use of a strategy known as noticing which is the process of students becoming aware of something in particular; it can be used to teach a grammar concept when students are given the

examples, and they come to understand the rule by noticing what those examples have in common.

When teachers speak at a more advanced level, they are giving the students constant opportunities to notice the differences between the teacher's speech and theirs. This way each student can become aware of the differences at his own pace.

Teachers can provide students with opportunities for noticing simply by putting posters up in the classroom in the target language. As before, when the students are ready to notice the difference, they will.

Students have different intellectual capacities and learning style that favour or hinder knowledge accumulation. As a result, teachers are interested in ways to effectively cause students to understand better and learn. Teachers want to bring about better understanding of the material that she or he wants to convey. It is the responsibility of the educational institutions and teachers to seek more effective ways of teaching in order to meet individual's and society's expectations from education. Improving teaching methods may help an institution meet its goal of achieving improved learning outcomes.

1. Deductive Method

A deductive method is derived from the notion that deductive reasoning works from the general to the specific. In this case, rules, principles, concepts, or theories are presented first, and then their applications are treated. In conclusion, when one uses deduction, one reasons from general to specific principles.

Dealing with the teaching of grammar, the deductive method can also be called rule driven learning. In such a method, a grammar rule is explicitly presented to students and followed by practice applying the rule. This method has been the bread and butter of language teaching around the world and still enjoys a monopoly in many course books and self-study grammar books Fortune (1992). The deductive method maintains that a teacher teaches grammar by presenting grammatical rules, and then examples of sentences are presented. Once learners understand rules, they are told to apply the rules given to various examples of sentences. Giving the grammatical rules means no more than directing learners' attention to the problem discussed. Eisenstein (1987) suggests that with the deductive method, learners be in control during practice and have less fear of drawing an incorrect conclusion related to how the target language is functioning.

To sum up, the deductive method commences with the presentation of a rule taught and then is followed by examples in which the rule is applied. In this

regard, learners are expected to engage with it through the study and manipulation of examples.

In the case of the application of the deductive method, therefore, Michael Swan (cited in Thornbury, (1999:32) outlines some guidelines for when the rule is presented. Among them are:

1. The rules should be true;
2. The rules should show clearly what limits are on the use of a given form
3. The rules need to be clear;
4. The rules ought to be simple;
5. The rules needs to make use of concepts already familiar to the learners; and
6. The rules ought to be relevant.

Most importantly, when the rules are presented in the deductive method, the presentation should be illustrated with examples, be short, involve students' comprehension and allow learners to have a chance to personalize the rule.

2. Inductive Method

According to Felder and Henriques (1995), inductive method comes from inductive reasoning stating that a reasoning progression proceeds from particulars (that is, observations, measurements, or data) to generalities (for example; rules,

laws, concepts or theories). In short, when one uses induction, one observes a number of specific instances and from them infer a general principle or concept.

In the case of pedagogical grammar, most experts argue that the inductive method can also be called rule-discovery learning. It suggests that a teacher teach grammar starting with presenting some examples of sentences. In this sense, learners understand grammatical rules from the examples. The presentation of grammatical rules can be spoken or written.

Eisenstein (cited in Long & Richards (1987)) maintains that the inductive method tries to utilize the very strong reward value of bringing order, clarity and meaning to experiences. This method involves learners' participating actively in their own instruction. In addition, the method encourages a learner to develop her/his own mental set of strategies for dealing with tasks. In other words, this method attempts to highlight grammatical rules implicitly in which the learners are encouraged to conclude the rules given by the teacher.

The inductive method is deeply entrenched in Science education. Traditionally science courses were taught deductively, with the teacher teaching the students the facts and theory, then moving to textbook exercises and finally application. Using the inductive method, the teacher presents the students with a specific challenge or problem that needs to be solved. The students must then use their base-knowledge to investigate, test, analyze and come to their own conclusion or solution. (wik.ed, 2012)

D. General Procedures in Teaching Grammar

1. Teachers should first decide on the method they intend to use for teaching a new grammatical structure. The method chosen will also largely determine the activities which will be done. Deductive methods involve writing out grammatical concepts and rules and explaining them. Inductive methods encourage students to come up with the rule on their own after seeing sentences with the targeted grammatical structure. Learning grammatical structures inductively also facilitates the stage of producing language.

2. Teachers should spend a lot of time exposing students to the structure. Students need time to recognize new structure. If the students need the rules, then present them.

3. Teachers should provide an extensive amount of practice ranging of simple recognition type activities. Students need practice learning the new forms and structures. Multiple choice questions allow students to simply recognize the forms without having to conjugate any verbs or produce sentences using the new grammatical concepts.

4. After engaging the students in practice, teachers should encourage them to notice grammatical patterns. Recognizing grammatical patterns is an important stage of practicing grammatical concepts.

5. The final step of the practice is to provide enough guided practice so that students feel comfortable producing and semi-producing the structures on their own. On a level of speaking, semi-production type activities include completing a dialog (teachers write the questions and students write the answers) using some verbs in the new tense. Complete production is writing complete sentences or questions using some of the verbs the teacher provides.

E. Concept of Past Tense

Past tense is the form of language used to refer to an event, transaction, or occurrence that did happen or has happened, or an object that existed, at a point in time before now. Compare with present tense, which refers to an event, transaction or occurrence which is happening now (or at the present time), or an object that currently exists; or with future tense, which refers to an event, transaction or occurrence that has not yet happened, is expected to happen in the future, or might never happen (wiktionary.org).

Generally, the simple past tense refers to events, habitual activities, and states in the past. In the sequence of tenses rule in reported speech, it restates the present tense of the original utterance (Palmer and Greenbaum, 1992).

The Past Simple tense, also called the Simple Past, is used for past actions that happened either at a specific time, which can either be given by a time phrase

(*yesterday*, *last year*, etc.) or understood from the context. Regular Verbs add -ed to the base form, or -d if the verbs ends with -e. Irregular verbs can change in many different ways and the verb form is the same for all persons.

F. Kinds of Past Tense

In English, the so-called simple past form is a true tense in that its use always places the action in the past. The other basic form of English verbs is the progressive aspect form, which shows ongoing action; this too can be altered to place the action in the past. English also has two forms, one of them unique to the past, that indicate past habitual action.

1. The Simple Past Tense

   The simple past is formed for regular verbs by adding -d or – ed to the root of a word. Examples: He walked to the store, or They danced all night. A negation is produced by adding did not and putting the verb in its infinitive form. Example: He did not walk to the store. Question sentences are started with did as in Did he walk to the store? The simple past is used for describing acts that have already been concluded, regardless of whether they took place habitually or are viewed as a single occurrence seen as a unit (but not if they are viewed as having occurred continuously). It is commonly used in storytelling.

2. The Past Progressive Tense

The past progressive is formed by using a simple past form of to be (was or were) and the main verb's present participle: He was going to church. This form indicates that an action was continuously ongoing. By inserting not before the main verb a negation is achieved. Example: He was not going to church. A question is formed by fronting the simple past form of to be as in Was he going?

3. The Past Habitual Tense

The past habitual can be formed in one of two ways. One construction is formed by "used to" plus the bare form of the main verb (or, technically and equivalently, by "used" plus the "to-infinitive" of the main verb). With an action verb it indicates that something occurred repetitively, as in I used to go there, while with a stative verb it indicates that a state was continuously in effect, as in I used to belong to that club. The used to form can be used whether or not the specific time frame of the action is specified (I used to go there; I used to go there every Friday in June). The negation of this form is exemplified by I used not to go there, although in informal usage I didn't use to go there is frequently heard. The interrogative form Used you to go there? is rare; the informal alternative Did you use to go there? is sometimes heard.

The other past habitual form uses the auxiliary verb would (which has other uses as well). For example, Last June I would go there daily. When this form is used, it must be accompanied by an explicit time frame (so for example I would go there. does not occur unless the time frame has already been specified). This form is negated as in Last June I would not go there daily, and it is made interrogative as in Last June, would you go there daily?

4. The Past Perfect Tense

The past perfect is formed by combining the simple past form of "to have" with the past participle form of the main verb: We had shouted. This form conveys that an action occurred before a specified time in the past, so it is actually the past of the past tense. A negation is achieved by including not after had: You had not spoken. Questions in past perfect always start with had: Had he laughed?

5. The Past Perfect Progressive Tense

The past perfect progressive is formed by "had", "been" and the present participle of the main verb: You had been waiting. This form describes action which happened in continuous fashion prior to sometime in the past.

For negation, not is included before been: I had not been waiting. A question sentence is formed by starting with had: Had she been waiting? If emphasis is put on the duration of an action that continued to the reference time in the past, "since" and "for" are signal words for the past perfect progressive: We had been waiting at the airport since the 9 P.M. flight; We had been waiting there for three hours.

Of all kinds of past tense above, the writer only used simple past tense in the materials given to the classes in which the research was conducted.

G. Concept of Narrative

The concept of narrative is presented in this chapter because the type of texts used in this research was narrative texts. Chatman (1978: 31) defines narrative as a structure which is made up of narrative statements. Kenan (1983: 2) defines narrative fiction as "the narration of a succession of fictional events". Bal (1985: 3) defines *narrative* as a corpus which should consist of all narrative texts and only those texts which are narrative.

Fortunately, there is broad agreement on the dualistic nature of narrative, that is has a *what* and a *way*. The *what* of narrative can be viewed in terms of narrative content, which consists as far as the main elements are concerned; events, actors, time, and locations. The *way* has to do with how the narrative is told.

The *what* is also called the story. The *way* is the discourse. These terms and the difference between *story* and *discourse* can be seen below. This dualism is found in the title of an important book of narrative: *Story and Discourse* by Seymour Chatman.

- Story is what narrative is; its content consisting of events, actions, time and locations
- Discourse is how the narrative is told; arrangement, emphasis / de-emphasis, magnification / diminution, of any of the elements of the content.

The binary classification of narrative may be necessary in order to conceptualize the idea of the 'translation' or conversion of a particular narrative from one art form or medium to another: when one translates, one translates the *story* and not the *discourse*. *Discourse* is obviously different in different art forms, although there may be similarities in the *story*. It is also necessary when to specify what is meant by the *beginning* and *end* (or for that matter, the *middle*) of a narrative, as the *beginning* and *end* of a narrative at the *story* and *discourse* levels may differ.

It may be useful to divide narrative discourse into two further aspects; the story-internal aspect and the aspect which involves an interaction with story-external factors: The definition of *discourse* as 'the arrangement, emphasis / de-emphasis, magnification / diminution of any of the elements of the content has to do with the

story-internal aspect of *discourse*. Also important, is the story-external aspect, which tells how the narrative arises, how it ends, what are the motivating factors in the telling, beginning, ending and continuation of narrative and so on. Such a view of narrative does not look at it as an autonomous entity.

Sometimes, a three-level division of narrative is proposed. According to Bal (1985:7-9), the three levels are:

- The *fabula* is a series of logically and chronologically related events, caused or experienced by actors. Bal calls this the *deep* or *abstract structure* of the text.
- The *story* is the *way* the *fabula* is looked at, and consists of the 'aspects'or 'traits' peculiar to a given story. One must note here that Bal's definition of *story* is quite different from the definitions given by Chatman and Rimmon-Kenan.
- Finally, there is the *text*, by which one uses *language signs* to relate a *story*, which is produced by an *agent* who relates the *story*.

Another three-level conception is given by Kenan (1983: 3-4). To her, a *narrative* consists of *story*, *text* and *narration.*

- The *story* is equivalent to the *histoire* and *fabula* mentioned above; the *story* to her is an abstraction of text events.

- *Text* is equivalent to *discourse*, and consists of what one reads or hears. The *text* is spoken or written discourse *as it is told*; the *events* of a *text* need not be arranged in chronological order.
- *Narration* is the process of production, and involves an agent who produces the text.

There have also been attempts to define narrative in terms of communicative framework. To Chatman (1978:28), "narrative is a communication; hence, it presupposes two parties, a sender and a receiver". Chatman (1978:31) is also of the view that "narratives are communications, thus easily envisaged as the movement of arrows from left to right, from author to audience".

The term *narration* has also been defined in terms of *communication*. To Kenan (1983:2), "*narration* suggests a *communication* process in which the narrative as a message is transmitted by addressor to addressee". It has been claimed (for example by Martin (1986: 27)), that the recent trend in narrative analysis represents a shift from the linguistic to the communication model.

In the *communicative* framework, a narrative is viewed in terms of a *transaction* which has an *addresser, addressee* and (possibly) a *message*. If one is referring to a written text, the addresser is the author or *narrator* and the addessee is the

reader or *narratee*. If one is referring to a *spoken text*, the *addresser* is the *speaker* or *narrator* and the *addessee* is the *listener* or *narratee*. One can also take a *semiotic perspective* of the communicative framework, where the *addressee* is the *encoder*, who *intends* a meaning in relation to the *sign system* he or she has produced; the *listener* is the *decoder* who *interprets* the meaning according to the given *sign system*.

H. Constituents of Narrative

1. Beginnings and Ends

Beginnings and ends of narrative are often treated as concepts that are derived from Aristotle, but they may come from life itself. They are seen in birth and death. In this regard, Kermode (1967: 44-45), refers to the tick-tock of the clock. There is also a natural psychological tendency to look for beginnings and ends in everything, of which narrative is certainly not an exception. Edward (1975:5) said, for example, narrative refers to the "aboriginal human need to point to or locate a beginning". The response to narrative seems to accentuate this tendency, as conceptions of beginnings and ends in narrative are more determinate than related ideas in life.

Attempts to define *beginning* and *end* in narrative, just like the attempts to define *narrative* itself, may be circular. Martin (1986: 85) notes that the contention that

beginning and *end* exist in narrative presupposes that one knows what these words mean and how they actually work in narrative. However, just like the attempts to define *narrative* (which have been seen to be of paramount importance in any study of narrative, in spite of their tendency to be circular) one cannot avoid trying to delimit the *beginnings* and *ends* of narrative, as they are also of extreme importance in any study of narrative.

Another constituent that is often associated with the beginning of a narrative is the exposition which is a plot constituent found at the beginning. The exposition consists of the following elements:

- The explanation of the background
- The introduction to the characters
- The establishment of the setting
- The definition of the basic situation

As for the end of narrative, there is one major problem that one cannot really discuss it until other components of narrative are discussed, unless of course one is dealing with external factors which trigger the end. Said (1975) has noted that the end implies that there is a beginning before it. The same can be said about the other components of narrative prior to the end, which all lead to, and are clearly responsible for, the *end* of the narrative. These components, which occur prior to

the end of narrative, are clearly responsible for the *end* of the narrative. External factors may tell how the discourse has ended, but not the story, although it can be said that the discourse may be all one has, and not the story.

2. Settings

The setting of a narrative has been define as the background material pertaining to the characters and events, the actual immediate surroundings of the objects or characters in a narrative or the spatial location which is able to extend over a sequence of actions, events and situations but independent of any of them. The *setting* has also been seen in terms of *place*, *space*, and *state*. However, although each of these terms has a contribution to make to the *setting*, none of them is the same as the *setting* itself. A *setting* is often associated with the *objects* found within it, but again, these objects together do not completely define the *setting*.

There are some differences between settings that are described using language and those that are not. Settings that are not described linguistically are likely to be visual, with some non-linguistic elements. As such, more elements of the setting are usually presented to the respondent, whereas a linguistically-encoded setting usually resorts to some kind of linguistic shorthand, such as the use of certain key words, for example, hospital, battlefield, etc, without going into great detail about

all the elements of the setting. In this regard, it can be noted that a detailed linguistic description of a setting in a narrative makes it more concrete.

The difference between linguistic and non-linguistic presentations of setting, as regards the level of detail of its elements, is especially evident when one contrasts the settings of a short written tale with that of a film. However, some narratives that are dependent on artificial sets, such as ballet and drama, may resort to what can be described as minimalist settings, because of economic, artistic, conventional or practical reasons. These settings are described as minimalist because they are dependent on some kind of visual shorthand: for example, the sketchy drawing of a window instead of a real window, or sometimes, no representation of a window at all. At any rate, even the settings of ballet or drama are usually more detailed than those described linguistically.

3. Characters

By definition, the word *character* designates a human or human-like individual, and as such, the concept is less amenable to a formulaic or mechanical approach. The difficulty in arriving at a complete and coherent theory of character or characterization is thus connected to the equivocation of the term "character" with regard to its relationship to human beings and the question of whether it exists only within the text or has a relationship with entities outside the text.

4. Events

Events are the constituents of a story and are thus crucial to it. Without events, there will be no story. The bottom line is that events are the changes from one state to another. Event is defined by Kenan (1983: 15), as a change from one state of affairs to another. An *event* is essentially a process, an alteration, which deals with the occurrence of change. As such, it need not always be observably or distinctly dynamic. All it needs is a succession of two states and an indication that a change has taken place, even if the change is virtually imperceptible. The idea of "change" is thus of crucial importance in the definition of "event".

5. Plot

The term narrative structure is often taken to be equivalent to "plot". More specifically, if narratologists use the word narrative structure, it is likely that they are referring to what people call plot. To them, plot is the literary (or traditional) term for what they prefer to call narrative structure. They avoid the term plot because they believe that "it has become too vague in ordinary critical usage" (Kenan, 1982: 135).

Plot has been defined as the sequence of incidents or events of which a story is composed. It has also been defined as an array of events, some of which can be described as being key moments in the narrative (Chatman, 1978). Clearly, plot is

not a merely a stringing of events, but these events must be of some significance. Also, the events must have a connection to each other, and as a whole, should be relatively coherent.

I. Language Features of Narrative

The language features used in narrative are as follows:

- Adjectives, adverbs, and similes are used to describe characters and places.
  For examples; heavy, light, dark, cheerfully, slowly, as bright as the sun, etc.

- Time words are used to indicate when a certain event or story happens.
  For examples; Once upon a time, once, last week, many years ago, etc.

- Verbs are used to inform what action is taken. For examples; ate, drank, sat, etc.

J. Kinds of Narrative

1. Legend

A legend is a narrative of human actions that are perceived both by a teller and listeners that takes place within human history. Typically, a legend is a short, traditional and historicized narrative performed in a conversational mode. Some define legend as folktale. The examples of legend in narrative texts are Sangkuriang, Malin Kundang and The Legend of Tangkuban Perahu.

2. Fable

A fable is a short allegorical narrative which contains moral points, by means of animal characters that speak and act like human beings. The examples of fable in narrative texts are Mousedeer and Crocodile, The Ants and the Grasshopper, The Smartest Parrot, Monkey and Crocodile.

3. Fairy

A fairy tale is a type of short narrative story. A fairy tale typically features such folkloric characters as fairies, goblins, elves, trolls, dwarves, giants or gnomes, and usually with magic or enchantments. The examples of a fairy tale in narrative texts are Cinderella, Snow White, Pinocchio.

4. Science Fiction

Science fiction is fiction based upon some imagined development of science, or upon the extrapolation of a tendency in society. Science fiction is that class of prose narrative treating of a situation that could not arise in the world people know. Some examples of science fiction are Starship Troopers, Inception, Minority Report and The Time Tunnel.

Out of the four kinds of a narrative text above, the writer used the fable and fairy kinds in this research. It is because those two kinds suit the interest of junior high school students'.