CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This chapter, as the conclusion of this study, presents the result of the analysis. In order to obtain the data of this study, the writer uses the sampling of analysis to the plays. Here, the writer finds only 171 data in English passive structures and 206 data in Indonesian passive structures, and then all of them are analyzed. So, it is adequate for making judgment about the result of the study.

Accordingly, in order to elaborate the characteristics, similarities and differences of English and Indonesian passive structures which occur most frequently, the result is noted down in percentage. Then the result shows that the first most frequent the characteristics of English passive structures according to the tenses are 85 in present tenses (61,70%), 33 in past tense (20,30%), 9 in present perfect (6,26%), 3 in past tense (1,75%), 2 in present continuous (3,17%), 9 in present future (6,26%) and 11 in past future (7,43%). Then, others expression of English passive structures are 22 in stative passive (12,86%), 7 in get (4,09%), 9 in infinitive (5,26%), & in gerund (1,75. While, the characteristics of Indonesian passive structures are based on prefix di (51,46%), 57 in prefect ter (27,67%), 41 in the verb with personal pronoun (19,90%) and 2 in ke-an form (0,97%). Further, prefect di can be decided into six forms, that are 58 in prefect di (28,16%), 39 in di-kan form (18,93%), 6 in di-i form (2,91%), 2 in diper-kan form (0,97%) and 1 in diper-i (0,49%) but diper- form is not included in this data. Thus, prefect ter can express some aspect, that are 21 in undeliberateness aspect (10,19%), 6 in perfective aspect (2,91%), 2 in repetitive aspects (0,97%) and 9 incontinuative (4,37%), but in comparative aspects is not included in the data. And then, prefect di form can express two aspects, namely, 9 in *incoative* aspects (4,37%), and 17 in *perfective* aspects (8,25%). At last, the verb with *personal pronoun* can use to express four aspects, that are 1 in *incoative* aspect (0,49%), 11 in *futurative* aspect (5,34%), 12 in *perfective* aspect (5,83%) and 2 in *durative* aspect (0,97%).

Next, the similarities of English and Indonesian passive structures show that the datum of them can be changed into active structure. So, the subject of the sentence is moved into the object. Besides that, English and Indonesian passive structures are signed by by phrase in English and by oleh In Indonesian to indicate the doer of the action.

Furthermore, the differences of English and Indonesian passive structures show that both of them have some differences and they are based on the pattern that is, English passive structure can be formed with $be + past \ participle$, while, this case doesn't occur in Indonesian. Then, the verb in English passive structure is appropriate with the tenses, but in Indonesian there is no change of time. Next, in English the verb of time is not expressed into dependent word, while in Indonesian it can express into dependent word. At last, in English there are form to arrange the passive structure, but this case is not occur in Indonesian passive structure.

From the data analysis the writer interprets that in the play *The Wild Duck*, Henrik Ibsen uses *present* passive with the mostly than the others. Meanwhile, in *Bebek Liar* he uses prefix *di* in Indonesian passive structures.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, W Stannard. 1982. Living English Speech. Singapore: Kyodo Shing Loong.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 1983. Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktis. Jakarta: Bina Aksara.
- Azar, Betty Schrampfer. 1985. **Fundamental of English Grammar**. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs.
- Azar, Betty Schrampfer. 1989. **Understanding and Using English Grammar**. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. Inc.
- Dixon, Robert. 1983. **Graded Exercises in English**. United State of America: Pretice-Hall. Inc.
- Frank, Marcella. 1972. **Modern English:A Practical Reference Guide**. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs.
- Graver, B.D. 1971. Advanced English Practice. London:Oxford University Press.
- Hadi, Sutrisno.1979. **Metodology Research**. Yogyakarta: Yayasan Penerbitan Fakultas Psikologi UGM.
- Kessler, Hauren and McDonal Duncan. 1984. When Words Collide: A Journalistic Guide to Grammar and Style. California: Wadswort.
- Krohn, Robert. 1990. English Sentence Structure. Jakarta:Bina Rupa Aksara.
- Martin, Anne V. 1977. Guide to Language and Study Skills of College Students English as a Second Language. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Marzuki. 1981. **Metodology Research.** Yogyakarta: Badan Penerbitan FE Universitas Indonesia.
- Moeliono, Anton. 1988. **Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia**. Jakarta: Perum Balai Pustaka.
- Nazir, Mohamad. 1988. Metode Penelitian. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Quirk, Randolph and Sidney Greenbaum. 1973. A University Grammar of English. Hongkong: Longman.

- Rustiati. 1999. **Widya Warta** No.02 Th XXII/Juli. Madiun: Universitas Widya Mandala Madiun.
- Santoso, Kusno Budi.1990. **Problematika Bahasa Indonesia**. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Sapir, Edward.1949. Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech. New York: A Harves Book.
- Slametmuljana. 1969. **Kaidah Bahasa Indonesia**. Ende:Percetakan Arnoldus/Percetakan Nusa Indah.
- Surachmad, Winarno. 1978. Dasar dan Teknik Research. Bandung: CV Tarsito.
- Thomson, A.J. and A.V. Martinet. 1986. A Practical English Grammar. New York:Oxford University.
- Wishon, George E. and Julia M. Burks. 1980. Let's Write English. New York: American Book.