



The Significance of Relativization in the Teaching of Grammar in English as a Foreign Language Classrooms

Ekram Mohammed Ali

Al-Dhuluiya Education Department in Salah al-Din Governorate Education

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the relative clauses included in the plays Major Barbara and Arms and the Man written by George Bernard Shaw. In order to do this, the researcher decided to examine the two to determine the frequency with which relative phrases occurred in each of the works. Within the scope of the study, there are four questions covered in the study . The study discovered that the subject relative clause (RC) occurred 231 times, which is 72.864% of the total, the “ direct object” RC approximately 68 times, which is 21.482% of the total, the indirect object RC occurred 6 times, which is 1.861% of the total, also an eight-time occurrence of the object of the preposition RC, which is 2.151 percent, eleven occurrences of the possessive RC, which is 3.51 %, because there was absolutely no appearance of the object of comparison (0%). This demonstrates that the subject relative clause and the direct object relative clause are at the top of the hierarchy and are used more often in contemporary English literature..

*Correspondence:

Katibaibasha@gmail.com

Received: 09 July 2025

Accepted: 28 July 2025

Published: 01 November 2025

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.31185/wjfh.Vol21.Iss4.1197>



This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0)

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Cite:

Ali , E. M. (n.d.). The Significance of Relativization in the Teaching of Grammar in English as a Foreign Language Classrooms. Wasit Journal for Human Sciences, 21(4).
<https://doi.org/10.31185/wjfh.Vol21.Iss4.1197>

Keywords: Significance of Relativization, Teaching of Grammar, Foreign Language Classrooms

أهمية النسبية في تدريس قواعد اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية

م.م اكرام محمد علي

قسم تربية الضلوعية في تربية محافظة صلاح الدين

المُستخلص

في هذا البحث تم دراسة تحديد الفئات الأكثر استخدامًا والأقل استخدامًا في مسرحيتي جورج برنارد شو "الرائد باربرا" و "الرجل والسلاح"، تبحث هذه الدراسة في الجمل الوصلية المضمنة في كلٍ منهما. ولتحقيق ذلك، قرر الباحث دراسة مسرحيتي جورج برنارد شو، وهما "الرائد باربرا" و "الرجل والسلاح"، لتحديد مدى تكرار استخدام الجمل الوصلية في كلٍ منهما. وفي نطاق الدراسة، تطرح أربعة أسئلة: هل توجد حالات تُستخدم فيها الكلمات الوصلية كأدوات تبعية؟ عند مقارنتها بالجمل الوصلية الأقل استخدامًا في التسلسل الهرمي، هل تظهر الجمل الوصلية الأعلى في التسلسل الهرمي بشكل أكثر تكرارًا؟ إلى أي مدى ينخفض تكرار استخدام الجمل الوصلية مع الصعود في "تسلسل كينان"؟ علاوة على ذلك، من المهم النظر في آثار هذه الدراسة على تدريس الجمل الوصلية في اللغة الإنجليزية لمن يتعلمون الإنجليزية كلغة ثانية. اكتشفت الدراسة أن جملة الفاعل النسبية (RC) حدثت 231 مرة، أي بنسبة 72.864% من الإجمالي، وجملة المفعول به المباشر RC حوالي 68 مرة، أي بنسبة 21.482% من الإجمالي، وجملة المفعول به غير المباشر RC حدثت 6 مرات، أي بنسبة 1.861% من الإجمالي، وأيضًا حدثت ثماني مرات لمفعول حرف الجر RC، أي بنسبة 2.151 في المائة، وإحدى عشرة مرة لجملة الملكية RC، أي بنسبة 3.51%، لأنه لم يكن هناك أي ظهور لمفعول المقارنة (0%). ما يشير إليه هذا هو أن النوعين الأساسيين من الجمل النسبية هما جملة الفاعل النسبية (RC) والمفعول به المباشر. وهذا يوضح أن جملة الفاعل النسبية وجملة المفعول به النسبية المباشرة تقعان في أعلى التسلسل الهرمي وتستخدمان كثيرًا في الأدب الإنجليزي المعاصر. بمجرد تحقيق ذلك، تُعتبر الفئات الأخرى من الجمل الوصلية، والتي تشمل المفعول به غير المباشر، ومفعول حروف الجر، والملكية، ومفعول المقارنة، أقل أهمية وأقل استخدامًا. إضافة إلى ذلك، تشير النتائج إلى أن كُتاب المسرحيات الإنجليز المعاصرين يبدلون هذا لدمج الجمل باستخدام تمثيلات أبسط للجمل الوصلية، أي الفاعل والمفعول به المباشر.

الكلمات المفتاحية: أهمية النسبية، تدريس القواعد، فصول اللغات الأجنبية

1. Introduction

The associated clause is a frequently employed form of subordination. English, especially written English, utilises subordination. Relative clauses are clauses that modify nouns through relative pronouns such as which, who, and whose and it is a significant and complex syntactic feature in English. This kind of subordination is often used, particularly in written English. The incorporation of relative clauses demonstrates grammatical sophistication (Arka, 2021:183).

There are a number of relative clause constructions used by creative writers in English. The study's author has not come across any research on relative clauses in Arabic literature, specifically in Palestine, that examines their prevalence, kinds, or use by native English speakers. "Relative clauses" provide a challenge for EFL Arab learners due to their intricate syntactic patterns in English, which may impede efficient communication because of their semantic and syntactic complexity (Mochizuki & Ortega, 2008:29).

This study aims to focus on the relative clauses in contemporary English literature by conducting a discourse analysis of many current English plays, demonstrating that contemporary language favours simpler forms of relative clauses for sentence combination. Relative clauses are classified into nine categories: "Subject (SU) relative clauses", "direct object (DO) relative clauses", indirect object (IO) relative clauses, and object of preposition (OP) relative clauses (Salzmann, 2009:139).

In addition to: Restrictive, nonrestrictive, and reduced (contact) clauses, each presenting varying degrees of complexity. The simpler structure is believed to be used more often. This study analyses

the occurrence, classification, as well as proportion of relative sentences in George Bernard Shaw's plays "Major Barbara" and "Arms and the Man."

2. Literature Review

Linked clauses, according to Crown (2008), are subordinate clauses that modify nouns. You introduce them to a string of relative pronouns: "which," "who," "which one," and "whose." They are termed adjective clauses because they operate similarly to adjectives, albeit they are positioned after the head noun as "postnominal modifiers." Furthermore, relative sentences are constructed by Wh-movement (Cardoso, 2017:97).

This rule creates a space at its initial location by bringing the noun phrase in the relative clause that matches the noun phrase in the primary phrase to the front of the relative clause. When a noun phrase is Wh-moved, a relative pronoun takes its place. The movie we saw was very scary. Although there are restrictions on the types of relativised noun phrases that may be used in English, Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman pointed out that the language has a complete relativization system (Al-Maksousi, 2024: 119).

English relative clauses can be classified as "restrictive" or "non-restrictive" according to the function of the relative pronoun, which may serve as a "subject, object, complement", or "prepositional complement. A restrictive relative clause" consists of a clause that constrains the reference of the modified noun phrase and conveys vital information. My brother, residing in Baghdad, is a teacher. A non-restrictive relative phrase is a sentence that does not limit the noun's reference and provides further, non-essential information concerning the modified noun (the head noun) (Salzmann, 2009:143).

2.1 Relative Clauses Classification

When speaking English, there are six distinct kinds of relative clauses: subject (S), direct object (DO), indirect object (IO), subject of the preposition (S), and oblique object (IO). Following from the fact that the relative pronoun in an English relative sentence might be a "subject," "object," "complement," or "prepositional complement," its function in deciding whether the phrase is restrictive or non-restrictive ensues. By limiting the reference of the altered noun phrase and conveying vital information, restrictive relative clauses are useful. According to Salzmann (2009:143), a non-restrictive relative phrase is a sentence that adds additional, non-essential information about the changed noun (the head noun) without limiting the noun's reference (Taki John, 2022:89).

It is 'denoted by the surrounding commas. For instance, the attractive girl, who is a typewriter, is Mary Smith'. Commas are crucial for distinguishing between restrictive as well as nonrestrictive sentences, imparting distinct meanings to each. Azar (2002:16) 'clarified the difference in meaning between restrictive and "non-restrictive clauses"' using the following example:

1. Non-restrictive clauses need the use of commas: *The kids, eager to play a game of football, dashed to a nearby open field.* All those youngsters wanted to play, so they all ran to an empty field, as we can see from the commas. The adjective phrase only provides some background information about the children. A relative sentence is an appositive phrase if it does not limit (Chamoreau, 2021:526).

2. Restrictive clauses do not need a comma: "*The children desiring to play football rushed to an open pitch*". The absence of commas indicates that only some youngsters want to play soccer, whereas the relative phrase specifies which children raced to the field (Royer, 2021:327).

2.2 The difference between relative clauses and non-restrictive

There are situations in which the relative phrase "which Mary purchased at the shop" functions as restrictive, and others in which it serves as non-restrictive. Considering the speaker's or writer's purpose is beneficial, particularly when analysing non-restrictive clauses. Presented below are instances of both applications "A" and "B" denote distinct interlocutors in a dialogue (Pixabaj, 2021:273). Here are a few important distinctions between RRCs and NRCs ('non-restrictive relative clauses'):

1. In order to identify the head noun in the context of the main sentence, RRC provides crucial information. But NRC provides no useful information for identifying the main phrase's head noun.
2. The RRC must not be interrupted by pauses, commas, or intonation from the main phrase. However, NRC use commas, along with distinctive pauses and tone, to delineate the relative phrases from the main sentence.
3. Unlike NRC, which may modify nouns (e.g., Lecturer Ali is the teacher; he wears a hat), RRC is unable to do so.
4. I do not have any friends among those who "renege on their commitment." It is possible to qualify a head noun using determiners like as every, any, or indefinite pronouns like anybody, everyone, or no one according to RRC. An example of a head noun that the NRC is unable to alter is "anyone who reneges on his commitment is no buddy of mine" because it includes determinants or indefinite pronouns. That is what Polian and Aissen have found (2021:403).
5. Professor Ali is the teacher who wears a hat; a related sentence or pronoun might introduce RRC. The idea, that we discussed yesterday, will be implemented is an example of how that cannot replace who or which as a relative pronoun in NRC.
6. Changing a whole preposition is not something RRC can do. But NRC changes a whole sentence (such, "He determined to quit," which everyone agreed was a good choice).
7. Unlike NRC, which comes from two different sources, RRC only has one underlying destination. (Toledo (B'alam), 2021:295).

2.3 Noun and the Relative Pronoun in The Syntactic Roles

Depending on the relative pronoun's and head noun's grammatical function, several forms of expression are more prevalent in American English than others. How particular, anthropomorphic, or lively the referent is, and what the connected phrase is trying to convey (new information, context, etc.). Keenan and Comrie (1972) said that there are three ways in which languages differ in how they build their relative clauses. The many ways that relative clauses are used in different languages make things harder for ESL and EFL learners (Probert, 2015:33). The three parts are:

- .1 The placement of relative clauses in relation to the head noun.
- .2 The marking of related clauses.
- .3 The existence or nonexistence of a pronominal reflex.

In 1977, Keenan and Comrie put out a theoretical framework they called the Noun Phrase Availability Hierarchy (NPAH). Positions higher in the hierarchy are more amenable to relativization, according to their paradigm. Positions one through six in the Hierarchy model are as follows: subject, object, obliquely object, genitive, and comparative object (Caponigro, 2021:29).

Their hierarchy posits that, under universal language, subject noun phrases are more readily relativised than direct object noun phrases. Both the subject and object are comparatively simpler to relativise than indirect object noun phrases, among others. The most challenging position is that of the object in a comparison, and it is hardly used (Abdulwahed, 2012:179).

2.4 Relative Pronoun Functions

According to Quirk (1985), relative pronouns may indicate their role as part of the relative sentences or as structural aspects of the clauses in relative phrases. They can also demonstrate agreement with their antecedents. In a relative sentence, the relative pronoun may take on the role of subject, object, complement, adverb, and prepositional complement, depending on the kind of antecedent,

(Abdulwahed, 2012:182) e.g., for example:

1. Who talked with him?(subject)
2. Who did he meet...? ... (object).
3. Who did he speak to? (prepositional complement).
4. "To whom he said..." (prepositional complement).
5. The dog raced towards someone (adverbial).
6. Who did the dog run towards? (adverbial).

Quirk (1985) said that the selection of the relative pronoun is contingent upon three factors:

1. The connection between relative clauses and their antecedents, whether restrictive or non-restrictive, e.g., The woman who is approaching seems to be someone I recognise. The Bible, although its many retranslations, remains a bestseller.

2. The gender categorisation of the antecedent as personal or nonpersonal, for instance

A-The individual I was visiting.....

B- The book that I was reading.....

3. The role of relative pronouns as Subject, Object, and Complement. A. (PP. 1245-1253). A relative clause is a clause that modifies a noun and is placed inside a noun phrase (Vestergaard, 1977:36).

2.5 Accessibility Hierarchy in Relativization.

Hogbin with Sony (2007) compared Keenan and Comrie's (1977) concept of the noun term "Accessibility" with the Accessibility Hierarchy. In order to understand how relativization works, we examine Fox's (1987) Absolutive Hypothesis and the concept of hierarchy via tales from the 18th and 20th centuries. The results from the 1700s are still relevant in the 1900s, according to Keenan and Comrie (1977) and Fox (1987) (Madsen, 2015:163).

To juxtapose the results of this investigation with those of Fox and Keenan. The patterns of relativization exhibit slight differences and variances between the eighteenth & twentieth centuries, with the discrepancies being modest. Relativization on intransitive subjects (S-RCS) and direct objects happens more often than on transitive subjects (ARCS) and oblique arguments. However, relativization on indirect objects (IO-RCS) and objects of comparison is unrecorded, whereas relativization on genitives happens with low frequency (Caponigro, 2021:511).

It is proposed that the prevalence of intransitive subjects and oblique relative clauses seems to derive directly from recorded narratives. This requires a substantial quantity of description to convey the conditions of individuals or other things or to establish a setting. The elevated frequency of relativization on direct objects (DO-RCS) indicates that a primary role of relative clauses (RCs) is to establish the head noun phrase (NP) inside discourse; the other NP in a DO-RC, for example (Chapman, 2020:69).

Because of this, the transitive subject noun phrase is generally a pronoun, which makes it a good anchor. The rare RCS, such as transitive subject (A-), Generation-, and IO-RCS, are frequently based on grammatical relationships that show up in pronouns. Because of this, the tasks of RCs in these RCs—whether to distinguish, characterise, or establish—become basically pointless. So, accessibility in relativization is more about the preferences or qualities of the discourse than about a hierarchy of grammatical connections (Dow et al., 2005).

2.6 Problems That Arab EFL Learners Have with Relative Clauses

Empirical research by Tushyeh (1983) along with Khalil (2000) identify the prevalent mistakes made by Arab EFL learners as follows:

1. The reiteration of the object inside the relative clause "resumptive pronoun", as in "This is the individual whom we met him last week".
2. Subject Pronoun Retention, which involves using the same pronoun in several relative clauses, is an example of this. For example, "The girl who *she is attractive attended".
3. The Utilisation of Relative and Possessive Pronouns in Place of Whose, shown by "I conversed with

the guy whose wife works at the library ".

4. Misuse of Relative Pronouns (which – who), shown by "The mechanist fixed the automobile who caused an accident ".

5. Exclusion of the Relative Pronoun When it refers to an indefinite noun, for instance, "Fatima is a girl who does not arrive late."

Furthermore, there are errors including: Omission of the Relative Pronoun, Omission of the Relative Antecedent, Incorrect Number Concord in Relative Clauses, Incorrect Placement of the Relative Clause, all of which constitute significant challenges for Arab EFL learners.

3. Design and Methodology of the Research

Hogbin and Sony (2007) looked at the Accessibility Hierarchy in light of Keenan and Comrie's (1977) idea of noun phrase Accessibility. We look at literary stories from the 18th and 20th centuries to see how the idea of hierarchy, together with Fox's (1987) Absolutive Hypothesis, fits into the pattern of relativization. Keenan and Comrie (1977) and Fox (1987) said that the effects of the 18th century still exist in the 20th century.

For instance, according to their hierarchy, subject noun phrases are easier to relativise than direct object noun phrases in universal language. The subject and object are simpler to relativise than, say, indirect object noun phrases. The hardest job is to be the object of comparison, which is not right; nevertheless, the other jobs are fine. To back up the researcher's claim that modern language uses simpler structures, they looked at two plays, *Arms and the Man* and *Major Barbara*, and counted how many relative clauses there were. They then argued that simpler relative clauses are used more often than their more complicated counterparts. The researcher gathered information regarding relative clause pronouns, including what kinds there are and what they do. "Who, Whom, Whose, Which, and That" are the only five relative pronoun clauses.

The researcher looked at the different types of noun phrases that can be relativised. These included Subject NP, Oblique Object NP, Object NP, Genitive NP, Indirect Object NP, as well as Object of NP in comparative contexts (like "The girl who Fatima was taller than won the 200-meter dash"), as well as restrictive, non-restrictive, and reduced relative clauses. He opted to look at relative clauses via plays after doing a thorough study. The researcher picked "*Arms and the Man*" and "*Major Barbara*" by George Bernard Shaw since he is a well-known and respected English playwright who is known as a key figure in English literature.

The researcher learnt about the two plays. *Major Barbara* includes three acts and 89 pages. *Arms and the Man* also has three acts and 51 pages. The author then looked at how frequently and what types of relative clauses were used in these two plays. The NPAH helped Keenan and Comrie write about this inquiry in 1977. We tallied the number of relative clauses in both plays and then calculated out what percentage of the total they made up to assess how hard relative sentences are. After that, tables were produced to indicate the proportion of relative clauses in George Bernard Shaw's plays *Arms and the Man* and *Major Barbara*, depending on their forms and goals.

Subsequently, the study's data were analysed to assess the influence of this analysis on grammar instruction within the EFL environment. The researcher created a six-part breakdown of the most common relative clause kinds to make it easier to look for trends in relative clause sentences: possessive, object of comparison, direct object, object of preposition, and indirect object.

4. Result and Discussion

This part shows how often and how many "relative clauses" are used in George Bernard Shaw's plays "*Arms and the Man*" and "*Major Barbara*." The tables below provide the results of the two plays. They indicate how often and how many times each kind of relative phrase was used, which may be used to help evaluate and report the results.

4.1 Relative Clause in *Arms and the Man*.

Within this section, we will try to find a breakdown of how often and to what extent George Bernard Shaw employs relative clauses in his play ***Arms and the Man***.

Percentage %	Total	Act III	Act II	Act I	Kinds of RC and Functions	Subject
48/115=42.83%	48	9	16	25	Non-Restrictive RC Subject /Contact Form	
40/115=35.05%	40	20	13	8	Restrictive RC Subject /Full Form	
15/115=13.21%	15	7	2	6	Restrictive RC Subject /Full Form	
12/115=10.61%	12	21	14	9	Restrictive RC Subject /Contact Form	
115/156=73.584%	115	Total				
9/31=31.12%	9	4	5	2	Restrictive RC Direct Object /Full Form	direct object
1/31=3.21%	1	0	1	1	Non-Restrictive RC Direct Object /Contact Form	
5/31=15.41%	5	1	2	2	Non-Restrictive RC Direct Object /Full Form	
17/31=52.9%	17	9	4	4	Restrictive RC Direct Object /Contact Form	
31/156=20.117%	31	Total				
0/2=0%	0	0	0	0	Restrictive RC Indirect Object /Contact Form	Indirect object
1/2=51%	1	0	0	1	Non-Restrictive RC Indirect Object /Full Form	
1/2=50%	1	1	0	0	Restrictive RC Indirect Object /Full Form	
0/2=0%	0	0	0	0	Non-Restrictive RC Indirect Object /Contact Form	
2/156=1.248%	2	Total				
0/2=0%	0	0	0	0	Restrictive RC Object of Preposition /Contact Form	Object of Preposition
1/2=50%	1	0	0	1	Restrictive RC Object of Preposition /Full Form	
0/2=0%	0	0	0	0	Non-Restrictive RC Object of Preposition /Contact Form	
1/2=50%	1	0	1	0	Non-Restrictive RC Object of Preposition /Full Form	
2/156=1.257%	2	Total				
4/5=65.54%	4	3	0	1	Restrictive RC Possessive	Possessive
2/5=32.45%	2	1	0	1	Non-Restrictive RC Possessive	
5/156=3.82%	5	Total				
0/0=0%	0	0	0	0	Object of Comparison	
0/156=0%	0					
100%	156					

	6					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

Tabl (4,1): The types of relative clauses used, how often they occur, and what categories they fall under in George Bernard shaw's arms and the man.

The researcher will begin the discussion of the findings on relative clauses in the play Arms and the Man by talking about how important the different types of relative clauses are based on how often they appear in the text. The first one will be the more common. The Arms and the Man table (4,1) shows that subject relative clauses are the most common kind of relative clause. They showed up more often than the other forms of relative clauses. This pattern happened 115 times, or 73.584% of the time. It comprises four subsections. Each subsection includes instances from the play Arms and the Man as follows":

1. Restrictive RC Subject/Contact Form:

- a. "That's *what you'd have said if you'd seen the first man in the charge today*".
- b. "*She then takes up the salver and uses it as a mirror, with the result that the handkerchief tied round her head follows the apron*".
- c. "*I wish I could believe a man could be so unlike a woman as that*".

2. Restrictive "RC Subject /Full Form":

- a. "*The Serbs have Austrian officers who are just as clever as our Russians; but we have beaten them in every battle for all that*".
- b. "*I know things about Raina that would break off her match with Sergius* „,
- c. "*I am sure Miss Raina is incapable of saying anything that is not true, sir*"

3. Non-Restrictive " RC Subject /Contact Form"

- a. "*Raina, left alone, takes off her fur cloak and throws it on the ottoman*"
- b. "*Louka, smoking a cigarette, is standing between the table and the house.*"
- c. "*Raina, standing at the entrance, straightens herself with arrogance and exits.*"

4. Non-Restrictive „, RC Subject /Full Form"

- a. "*Raina secures the shutters. She pivots and observes Louka, who has been observing the incident with intrigue*".
- b. "*Bluntschli remains immobile. Sergius, astonished, gazes at Raina, then at Petkoff, who returns his gaze before looking at his wife.*"
- c. "*He retrieves the coat and presents it to the Major, who rises to don it. Nicola tends to the fire*".

The most prevalent kind of subject relative clause throughout George Bernard Shaw's drama "Arms and the Man" is the non-restrictive clause that functions as a subject or contact form, as seen in the chart. As a percentage, it occurred 48 times (41.83).

The "Restrictive Relative Clause as topic / Full Form" is the second topic category. This group includes 40 cases, or 35.05%. The "Non-Restrictive Relative Clause," which is the Subject/Full Form, is the following kind. There were thirteen of these events (12.81% of the total). Finally, there is the "Restrictive Relative Clause functioning" as a Subject or Contact Form. It recorded twelve times, which is 10.25% of the time. "Arms and the Man," a play by "George Bernard" Shaw, has the fewest characters from this category.

According to the results shown in the previous section, "the Non-restrictive Relative Clause" as a topic/Contact Form is the most common and dominating topic type. Restrictive "Relative Clause Subject / Full Form," Non-restrictive "Relative Clause Subject / Full Form," and Restrictive "Relative Clause / Contact Form" follow accordingly.

The direct object is the second most important kind of relative clause. The data shows that the direct object came in second in terms of frequency and importance after the subject RC. The results show that the direct object showed up 32 times, which is 21.17% of the instances that "relative clauses" were

used in the drama "Arms and the Man." The direct object will be divided into four groups, which will be demonstrated in the next lines using sentences and phrases from the three acts of the play Arms and the Man:

1. Restrictive "RC Direct Object" /Contact Form

a. *"I provide this information to demonstrate that you are not in the presence of uneducated rural people who would harm you "the instant they beheld your Serbian uniform," but rather among cultured individuals".*

b. *"The insights I have gained into the sordid aspects of life over the past few months" have rendered me cynical".*

c. *"I would wed the guy I adored."*

2. Restrictive RC Direct Object /Full Form

a. *"Your neighbours are so preoccupied with the notion of runaway Serbs that they see their presence everywhere ".*

b. *"The fervour of courageous patriotism ignited by the Serbian assault has sustained him throughout the conflict ".*

c. *"It is for this reason that I hold you accountable, not for having gotten benefits that I never experienced".*

3. Non-Restrictive " RC Direct Object /Contact Form"

a. *"Some troops, I am aware, have a fear of death ".*

4. Non-Restrictive "RC Direct Object /Full Form"

a. *"My gracious lady, I offer a thousand apologies. Good night. (Raina responds to the military bow with indifference ".)*

b. *"Louka emerges from the home with a salver, that she holds suspended by her side."*

c. *"He rushes into the corridor and reemerges, pulling Louka, whom he forcefully throws against the table, yelling".*

An examination of the direct object reveals that the restricted relative clause direct object/contact form appeared 16 times in the table's subsections. This denotes 52%. This pattern is regarded as the most prevalent and predominant kind under the direct object category. The second most frequent kind in the direct object category is the restricted relative clause direct object/full form.

It makes up 10 occurrences, or 31.12% of the total. Nonrestrictive relative clauses in complete form are the next kind. In Arms and the Man, it occurred five times, or 15.625% of the time, in RCs. Finally, there is the direct object/contact form of non-restrictive relative clauses. It was 3.21% of the total and occurred just once in Act I. According to critics, this kind appears just once in Arms and the Man.

According to the data shown in the table, the play in question made little use of this kind of object (the indirect object). In all four sections of the indirect object category, it happened exactly twice. One and a half percent is this. However, the restricted relative clause in its whole as an indirect object and the "non-restrictive relative clause" in its entirety as an indirect object were both seen just once. Fifty percent each falls within these two groups. Both took place in Act III and Act I, correspondingly.

Also, the play did not include any non-restrictive relative clauses that acted as indirect object contact forms or restrictive relative clauses that accomplished the same thing. In short, these sorts of relative clauses do not truly exist in the play. The indirect object (M.B.) is not very present throughout the play. It only shows up twice in all three acts, which is half of the total. The object is the fourth primary kind of relative clause.

The subject of a preposition is the fourth main kind of relative phrase. There are four parts to it. Very few people utilise this kind. There were only two instances of each form of the oblique relative phrase. So, this is equal to 3.82 percent. Half of all relative clauses were the fully formed limited relative clause that was the object of a preposition, which occurred just once. On the flip side, it is not common

to see a non-restrictive relative phrase either alone or as the object of a preposition. This occurred only once out of all the relevant clauses, which is 50%. In addition, throughout all three acts of the play, neither the "non-restrictive relative clause" nor the restrictive relative phrase that operate as prepositional objects were present. This amounts to zero percent of the play's "relative clauses" (MB). The researcher refrained from using instances from the play due to the pattern's apparentness in understanding the nature's functioning as a prepositional object.

Possessive relative clauses make up the fifth major kind of "relative clauses.". Out of all the "relative clauses" taken from the play "Arms and the Man," this particular kind appears just six times. It accounts for 3.82 percent. There were four instances of restrictive relative clauses, making up 65.54 percent of the total. Just two instances, or 32.45% of all relative clauses, were nonrestrictive. Final "relative clauses" include comparison subjects. Rare is the sort that this is. Without any data at all, the investigation could not proceed. It stands for nothing. Throughout the performances, it never happened. Furthermore, it is difficult to find grammatical examples that deal with relative clauses as comparison objects.

4.2 Relative Clause in " Major Barbara" play.

Presented below are the relative sentences that appear in Gorge Bernard Shaw's play Major Barbara, along with their frequency, classification, and percentage. The purpose of this table is to display the study's findings and to aid in the research process by showing how often and to what extent each type of relative clause appears in the play Major Barbara. The table will serve as a reference for the analysis and presentation of the results. Look at this table.

Percentage %	Total	Act I	Act II	Act III	Kinds of RC and Functions	Subject
14/116=12.5%	14	6	3	8	Non-Restrictive RC Subject /Contact Form	
56/116=47.2%	56	26	21	9	Restrictive RC Subject /Full Form	
25/116=22.41%	25	7	13	6	Restrictive RC Subject /Full Form	
21/116=16.94%	21	9	4	4	Restrictive RC Subject /Contact Form	
116/168=71.3%	116					
12/34=33.36%	11	4	5	3	Restrictive RC Direct Object /Full Form	direct object
20/334=56.24%	19	8	8	5	Non-Restrictive RC Direct Object /Contact Form	
2/34=2.72%	1	1	1	2	Non-Restrictive RC Direct Object /Full Form	
3/34=5.29%	2	1	1	0	Restrictive RC Direct Object /Contact Form	
34/168=22.31%	34				Total	
0/5=0%	0	0	0	1	Restrictive RC Indirect Object /Contact Form	Indirect object
3/5=77%	3	2	0	1	Non-Restrictive RC Indirect Object /Full Form	
0/4=0%	1	0	0	0	Restrictive RC Indirect Object /Full Form	
1/4=24.2%	1	0	1	0	Non-Restrictive RC Indirect Object /Contact Form	
4/168=2.320%	4				Total	
0/4=0%	0	0	0	0	Restrictive RC Object of Preposition /Contact Form	Object

3/6=61%	4	0	1	1	Restrictive RC Object of Preposition /Full Form	
0/5=0%	0	0	0	0	Non-Restrictive RC Object of Preposition /Contact Form	
2/6=41.23%	2	0	1	0	Non-Restrictive RC Object of Preposition /Full Form	
5/168=2.898%	5				Total	
3/5=52.4%	4	3	1	0	Restrictive RC Possessive	Possessive
3/5=52.4%	2	1	0	1	Non-Restrictive RC Possessive	
5/168=3.651%	6				Total	
	0	0	0	0	Object of Comparison	
0/0/0=0%	0				Total	
100%	168					

Table (4,2): The Types of Relative Clauses Used, How Often They Occur, and What Categories included in G. B. Shaw's Play Major Barbara.

The table indicates that the subject relative clause is the most prevalent kind of relative clause in the play "Major Barbara" (M.B). This category includes 118 instances, or 71.3%. It is divided into four subsections, shown with examples from all three acts of the play in the following order:

1. Restrictive "RC Subject /Contact" Form

a. *"I implore you to leave me in peace for once and explain this distressing matter of my father's desire to replace me with another son".*

b. *"A kind guy would not have assaulted innocent Jenny, would he?"*

c. *"I want a guy without of connections and formal education; specifically, a man who would be entirely excluded from competition were he not very robust".*

2. Restrictive "RC Subject /Full Form"

a. *"I do not belong to the category of guys who segregate their ethics from their professional affairs".*

b. *"It is your soul that is causing you pain, Bill, not me".*

c. *"Lazarus is a tender romantic Jew who is only devoted to string quartets and stylish theatrical stalls."*

3. Non-Restrictive ,, RC Subject /Contact Form"

a. *"Homer used the same term when referring to Autolycus".*

b. *"Barbara, efficient and pragmatic, emerges from the shelter with a notebook and directs her attention to Shirley".*

c. *"Lady Britomart, attired for outside activities, opens the door prior to his arrival".*

4. Non-Restrictive "RC Subject /Full Form"

a. *"Your Christianity, which instructs you to oppose not evil and to turn the other cheek, would render me financially destitute."*

b. *"The coin captivates Snobby Price, who seizes an early chance to put his cap on it."*

c. *"Stephen, who is in close proximity, gazes at it with trepidation and swiftly retreats to the cannon."*

The output with the count reveals a number of noteworthy results that need further investigation. Of the several kinds of restrictive relative clauses used in the play under consideration, the Subject/Full Form was by far the most common (M.B.). It logged 56 occurrences, or 47.2% of the total. There are 25 occurrences (22.41% of the total) of the Non-Restrictive Relative Clause as Subject/Contact Form. The third kind is the full form of a non-restrictive relative clause.

With 21 occurrences, or 16.94%, this category was present. This section concludes with the Restrictive RC Subject/Contact Form category. Among all the types of characters in "Major Barbara," this one

appeared the least. Only fourteen times did it happen. It accounts for 12.5% of the total. According to the previous description, the most common type is Restrictive RC Subject/Full Form, next Non-Restrictive RC Subject/Contact Form, a second sort that is not restrictive, and lastly Restrictive RC Subject/Contact Form.

Considered the second most common kind of RCs, Direct Object led to the following discoveries: The Direct Object appeared 35 times. This represents 22.31% of the occurrences of RCs in the play. The Direct Object is classified into four categories:

1. Restrictive " RC Direct Object /Contact Form"
 - a. *"Since her promotion to major in the Salvation Army, she has shown a tendency to assert her own preferences" .*
 - b. *" Barbara: Will there be a reduction in alcohol consumption or an increase if all those unfortunate individuals we are assisting arrive tomorrow and see the doors of our shelters closed to them?"*
 - c. *"That is precisely the issue: all the foundlings I can locate resemble Stephen identically".*
2. Restrictive "RC Direct Object /Full Form"
 - a. *"I really suspect that you visited the Salvation Army just to venerate Barbara "*.
 - b. *" Ah, I recognise you: you are the one for whom Jenny Hill was praying moments ago."*
 - c. *"There is nothing that any Italian or German could do that Stephen could not achieve ".*
3. Non-Restrictive "RC Direct Object /Contact Form"
 - a. *"Therefore, the five thousand is presumably intended to redeem his soul ".*
4. Non-Restrictive RC Direct Object /Full Form
 - a. *"In most of Stephen's seminars, people typically feel a deep feeling of helpless fear when they find out that there are bad people in the world."*
 - b. *"Cusins hastens to the drum, which he lifts and dons".*

At first, limited relative clause direct objects in full form showed up 20 times, which is 56.24% of the time. People think that this sort is the most common in the Direct Object group. The second kind, which is less common, is the restricted relative phrase that acts as a direct object or contact form. It has 12 cases, which is 33.36% of the total. The non-restrictive relative clause direct object/contact form only appears once in the play, making up 2.72% of it. The non-restrictive relative clause as a direct object/full form did show up twice, however, making up 5.29% of the total.

The third primary category of RCs examined in the paper is the indirect object, but without illustrations. This kind was uncommon and seldom used in the play "Major Barbara." The overall incidence was just 4 times, constituting 2.320%. The restrictive relative clauses' indirect object/full form appeared three times, constituting 77%, whereas the non-restrictive indirect object/full form occurred just once in Act II, accounting for 24.2%. Alternatively, the play (MB) did not have either the non-restrictive or restrictive RC indirect object/contact form. The occurrence of the indirect object category is very unusual, appearing just four times during the whole play (MB). This clearly indicates that the indirect object is seldom used in the play, maybe owing to its complexity or disinterest.

The Oblique category appeared 5 times, or 2.898%. The restricted relative clause object of preposition/full form appeared three times, constituting 61%. The nonrestrictive relative clause object of the preposition/full form appeared twice. This event represents 41.23%. There were no restrictive or non-restrictive relative clauses used as objects of preposition/contact forms in any of the play's acts (MB). The Possessive Relative Clause is the sixth kind. You may call this kind of possessive RC either restrictive or non-restrictive. In the statistics taken from the play's table, they happened six times, or 3.651%. There were three instances of both restricted and non-restrictive relative clauses of possession, each accounting for 52.4% of the total.

4.3 A comparison between Major Barbara and Arms and the Man

Next, we will analyse the roles played by various clause forms and their frequency of use in Major

Barbara and Arms and the Man, two plays by George Bernard Shaw. In relative clauses, these types of expressions are known as non-restrictive, contact form, and complete form. The following table summarises the relative clause types and percentages used in both plays.

Percentage value %	Total	Act I, II & III		Classification and Use of RC
		Arms and the Man	Classification and Use of RC	
231/325=72.864%	233	116	118	Subject RC
66/325=21.482%	68	31	34	Direct Object RC
5/325=1.861%	6	3	5	Indirect Object RC
8/325=2.151%	8	2	4	Object of Preposition RC
13/325=3.51%	11	7	7	Possessive Relative Clause
0/325=0%	0	0	0	Object of Comparison RC
100%	325	158	168	Total

Table (4,3): The Frequency and Classification of Relative Clauses

In regards to the percentage of relative clause types and their roles in George Bernard Shaw's plays Major Barbara, Arms, and the Man. The facts and statistics shown in the table above suggest that the various relative clauses employed in plays and their acts are very consistent with one another. This number is less than one percent. Compared to Arms and the Man, Major Barbara had 118 occurrences of subject relative sentences. "M.B." used "direct object relative clauses" 34 times, although "A&M" only used them 31 times. Each play had seven instances of possessive relative clauses.

Based on the information in the table, we can deduce the following percentage breakdown of relative clause types in "M.B." and "A&M": There were 235 subject relative clauses, or 72.864% of all relative clauses in the two plays. Direct object relative clauses constituted 21.482% of all relative clauses in both plays, with 68 occurrences in total. In the two plays, the relative clauses with an indirect object appeared six times, accounting for 1.861% of the total, while the relative clause with an object for preposition appeared eight times, accounting for 2.151% of the total. The proportion of possessive relative clauses in the play's total number of "relative clauses" was 3.51%, or eleven instances. This contrast is relevant to the last category. Not a single one of the plays had anything even similar.

Conclusion

George Bernard Shaw's plays Arms & the Man and Major Barbara both include 325 relative sentences of different types, as seen in Table 3, which displays the overall percentage: Arms and the Man only has 158 recurrent incidents, but Major Barbara has 168. The findings from this examination of two of George Bernard Shaw's plays—Arms and the Man and Major Barbara—appear to support certain assertions. The frequency with which they occur classifies relative clauses into three groups: A "subject relative clause" (used 72.864% of the time in both plays) and a "direct object relative clause" (used 21.482% of the time) are the two most prevalent kinds of relative clauses in the first set. Additionally, there is a set of less frequent or more confusing relative clauses. As an example, in both plays there is the "possessive relative clause" (3.51%), the "object of preposition" (2.151%), and the indirect object (1.861%). For the third set, we have the "compare relative clause" item. Both understanding and using it are a major challenge. Nothing in either play comes close to this. Relative clauses are not always the way to go in formal writing. The first category usually denotes the top echelon of the hierarchy, as opposed to the lesser levels denoted by the second and third categories. This study's findings on the prevalence of subordination mechanisms with relative clauses

are in line with other studies. A further feature is the prevalence of higher-level hierarchical relative clauses, such as subject and direct object.

References

1. Arka, I. W. (2021). Pivot and puzzling relativization in Indonesian. *Modular Design of Grammar*, 181–202. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192844842.003.0012>
2. Mochizuki, N., & Ortega, L. (2008). Balancing communication and grammar in beginning-level foreign language classrooms: A study of guided planning and relativization. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(1), 11–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168807084492>
3. Salzmann, M. (2009). Different notions of variation and their reflexes in Swiss German relativization. *Describing and Modeling Variation in Grammar*, 135–162. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110216097.2.135>
4. Wang, S. (2010). The significance of English grammar to middle school students in China. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(3). <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.3.313-319>
5. Cardoso, A. (2017). Appositive relativization. *Oxford Scholarship Online*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198723783.003.0004>
6. Nazari, A., & Allahyar, N. (2012). Grammar teaching revisited: EFL teachers between grammar abstinence and formal grammar teaching. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(2). <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2012v37n2.6>
7. Chapman, D. (2020). Grammar is the key. *The History of Grammar in Foreign Language Teaching*, 63–76. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1b0fvzr.6>
8. Royer, J. (2021). Headless relative clauses in Chuj. *Headless Relative Clauses in Mesoamerican Languages*, 327–361. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197518373.003.0010>
9. Pixabaj, T. A. (2021). Headless relative clauses in k'iche'. *Headless Relative Clauses in Mesoamerican Languages*, 260–289. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197518373.003.0008>
10. Polian, G., & Aissen, J. (2021). Headless relative clauses in tseltalan. *Headless Relative Clauses in Mesoamerican Languages*, 403–443. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197518373.003.0012>
11. Toledo (B'alam), E. M. (2021). Headless relative clauses in q'anjob'al. *Headless Relative Clauses in Mesoamerican Languages*, 290–326. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197518373.003.0009>
12. Probert, P. (2015). Approaches to proto-indo-european relative clauses. *Early Greek Relative Clauses*, 21–54. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198713821.003.0003>
13. Caponigro, I. (2021). Introducing headless relative clauses and the findings from mesoamerican languages. *Headless Relative Clauses in Mesoamerican Languages*, 1–57. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197518373.003.0001>
14. Abdulwahed, H. (2012). Relative pronoun and its relative clause in the Akkadian language. *Athar Alrafedain*, 1(1), 177–188. <https://doi.org/10.33899/athar.2012.69782>
15. Abdulwahed, H. (2012a) 'Relative pronoun and its relative clause in the Akkadian language', *Athar Alrafedain*, 1(1), pp. 177–188. doi:10.33899/athar.2012.69782.
16. Vestergaard, T. (1977) 'Preface', *Prepositional Phrases and Prepositional Verbs* [Preprint]. doi:10.1515/9783110802368-001.
17. Madsen, R. (2015). The accessibility hierarchy of relativization in Second language acquisition. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 1(3). <https://doi.org/10.14706/jfltal15134>
18. Al-Maksousi, Dh. (2024). Social rejection sensitivity and its relationship to emotional communication among middle school students. *Wasit Journal of Humanities*, 20(3), 138-107. <https://doi.org/10.31185/wjfh.Vol20.Iss3.659>
19. Taqi John. (2022). The Mawlid School of Poetry. *Wasit Journal of Humanities*, 15(44). <https://doi.org/10.31185/.vol15.iss44.280>