# SYNTACTIC MATURITY IN THE ENGLISH WRITTEN TEXTS OF BILINGUAL STUDENTS IN A SECONDARY SCHOOL IN SURABAYA

#### **A THESIS**



## Jap Tjan Han 8212713025

ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT GRADUATE SCHOOL WIDYA MANDALA CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY SURABAYA 2017

# SYNTACTIC MATURITY IN THE ENGLISH WRITTEN TEXTS OF BILINGUAL STUDENTS IN A SECONDARY SCHOOL IN SURABAYA

#### **A THESIS**

Presented to Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Degree of

Magister in Teaching English as a Foreign Language



Jap Tjan Han 8212713025

ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT GRADUATE SCHOOL WIDYA MANDALA CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY SURABAYA 2017

# Approval Sheet (I)

This thesis entitled "Syntactic Maturity in the English Written Texts of Bilingual Students in a Secondary School in Surabaya", prepared and submitted by Jap Tjan Han (8212713025), has been approved and examined by the Thesis Board of Examiners.

Prof. Dr. Agustinus Ngadiman Thesis Advisor

# Approval Sheet (II)

This thesis entitled "Syntactic Maturity in the English Written Texts of Bilingual Students in a Secondary School in Surabaya", prepared and submitted by Jap Tjan Han (8212713025), has been approved and examined by the Thesis Board of Examiners on

Prof. Wuri Soedjatmiko Chair

Prof. Dr. A. Ngadiman Secretary

Dr. Hendra Tedjasukmana Member

Prof. Anita Lie, Ed.D. Director

#### Statement of Authenticity

I declare that this thesis is my own writing, and it is true and correct that I did not take any scholarly ideas or work from others dishonestly. That all the cited works were quoted in accordance with the ethical code of academic writing.

I also declare that I agree to submit my thesis entitled "Syntactic Maturity in the English Written Texts of Bilingual Students in a Secondary School in Surabaya" to Widya Mandala Catholic University library and fully understand that it will be made public via Internet and other uses of online media.

Jap Tjan Han NRP: 8212713025

#### Acknowledgements

First of all, it is my greatest gratitude to our Lord, Jesus Christ for His abundant blessings and grace upon my life, and for the opportunity to continue my study so far.

Secondly, I would like to express my thankfulness to Prof. Dr. A. Ngadiman, my thesis advisor for his professional guidance and time spent to discuss my research, and to Dr. Ignatius Harjanto, the lecturer and Head of Department of MPBI, for his willingness to share his Master thesis with me so that I am able to gain more insights that I need for my research. I really appreciate his continuous support given to me as one of his students since I was in my S1 study. My appreciation also goes to Prof. Wuri Soedjatmiko and Dr. Hendra Tedjasukmana for their indispensible feedbacks given during the thesis proposal examination, and to all the lecturers of MPBI for all the guidance and expertise shared during my study at the Graduate School of Widya Mandala Catholic University.

Moreover, I would like to acknowledge the valuable contribution provided by Cita Hati Christian Senior School-West Campus for the opportunity to collect the data from the students of grade 7 to grade 9, and sincerely extend my thankfulness to Limris Gorat, S.Pd, M.Pd for his assistance during the data collection which was carried out in his English classes. Last but not least, I would like to thank all the parents and students who have been willingly participating in this research and providing the data needed.

Finally, this thesis is dedicated to my beloved family who has always been with me through all the challenges I faced during my study until I am able to finish it. I wish that this will inspire and motivate my two daughters to strive for their best in their education. I'm thanking my husband, my daughters and all my brothers and sisters for their never-ending love, supports and prayers. May God keep and bless us always!

Jap Tjan Han

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Inside Cov   | ver                            |     |
|--------------|--------------------------------|-----|
| Approval     | Sheet(I)                       | i   |
| Approval     | Sheet (II)                     | ii  |
| Statement    | of Authenticity                | iii |
| Acknowle     | dgements                       | iv  |
| Table of C   | Contents                       | V   |
| List of Tal  | bles                           | ix  |
| List of Illu | astrations                     | X   |
| List of Ap   | pendices                       | xiv |
| Abstract     |                                | XV  |
| Chapter 1    | : Introduction                 | 1   |
|              | Background                     | 1   |
|              | Research Question              | 8   |
|              | Purpose of the Study           | 9   |
|              | Theoretical Framework          | 10  |
|              | Significance of the Study      | 11  |
|              | Assumptions                    | 11  |
|              | Scope and Limitation           | 12  |
|              | Definition of the Key Terms    | 14  |
|              | Thesis Organization            | 15  |
| Chapter 2    | : Review of Related Literature | 17  |
|              | Historical Background          | 17  |
|              | Theories                       | 19  |

|            | Language acquisition                     | 20 |
|------------|--|----|
|            | Syntactic acquisition and development    | 23 |
|            | Measure of syntactic maturity            | 27 |
|            | T-Unit (minimal terminable unit)         | 28 |
|            | Errors as syntactic immaturity indicator | 29 |
|            | Criteria of effective writing            | 33 |
| Chapter 3: | Research Method                          | 35 |
|            | Research Design                          | 35 |
|            | Subjects                                 | 35 |
|            | Source of Data                           | 37 |
|            | Data and Instruments                     | 37 |
|            | Data Collection Procedure                | 39 |
|            | Data Analysis Technique                  | 43 |
| Chapter 4: | Results and Discussion                   | 45 |
|            | Results of the Study                     | 45 |
|            | The subjects' background                 | 45 |
|            | The family background                    | 46 |
|            | The language background                  | 47 |
|            | Syntactic Maturity Indicators            | 83 |
|            | Syntactic Immaturity Indicators          | 85 |
|            | Academic Performance                     | 87 |
|            | Discussions of the Findings              | 89 |

|            | Syntactic maturity development             |     |
|------------|--|-----|
|            | across the secondary levels                | 90  |
|            | Syntactic immaturity indicators            | 91  |
|            | Errorneous T-units index as the            |     |
|            | syntactic immaturity indicator             | 92  |
|            | Factors influencing the syntactic maturity | 93  |
|            | The role of acquisition device             | 93  |
|            | The role of language inputs                | 96  |
|            | The role of outputs                        | 100 |
| Chapter 5: | Conclusion and Suggestion                  | 104 |
|            | Conclusion                                 | 104 |
|            | Suggestion                                 | 107 |
| REFERENC   | CES  | 110 |
| APPENDICES |  | 115 |

## **List of Tables**

| Table 2.1 | : Criteria of Effective Writing           | 33 |
|-----------|---|----|
| Table 3.1 | : Details of the Subjects                 | 40 |
| Table 4.1 | : Report Card Score vs T-Unit Lengths     |    |
|           | vs Errorneous T-Unit Index (Grade 7)      | 87 |
| Table 4.2 | : Report Card Scores vs T-Unit Lengths    |    |
|           | vs Errorneous T-Unit Index (Grade 8)      | 88 |
| Table 4.3 | : Report Card Scores vs T-Unit Lengths vs |    |
|           | Errorneous T-Unit Index (Grade 9)         | 88 |

## **List of Illustrations**

| Graph 3.1  | : Data Collection Procedure               | 42 |
|------------|---|----|
| Graph 4.1  | : Parents' Educational Background         | 47 |
| Graph 4.2  | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Speaking |    |
|            | English to Their Parents                  | 48 |
| Graph 4.3  | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Speaking |    |
|            | Indonesian to Their Parents               | 49 |
| Graph 4.4  | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Speaking |    |
|            | English to Their Siblings                 | 51 |
| Graph 4.5  | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Speaking |    |
|            | Indonesian to Their Siblings              | 52 |
| Graph 4.6  | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Speaking |    |
|            | English to Other People at Home           | 54 |
| Graph 4.7  | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Speaking |    |
|            | Indonesian to Other People at Home        | 55 |
| Graph 4.8  | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Writing  |    |
|            | in English for Daily Communication        |    |
|            | and Interaction                           | 56 |
| Graph 4.9  | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Writing  |    |
|            | in Indonesian for Daily Communication     |    |
|            | and Interaction                           | 57 |
| Graph 4.10 | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Writing  |    |
|            | in English for School Purposes            | 58 |

| Graph 4.11 | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Writing    |    |
|------------|---|----|
|            | in Indonesian for School Purposes           | 59 |
| Graph 4.12 | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Writing    |    |
|            | in English for Personal Interest            | 61 |
| Graph 4.13 | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Writing in |    |
|            | Indonesian for Personal Interest            | 62 |
| Graph 4.14 | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Reading    |    |
|            | English Books and Articles Assigned by      |    |
|            | the Teachers                                | 63 |
| Graph 4.15 | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Reading    |    |
|            | Indonesian Books and Articles Assigned      |    |
|            | by the Teachers                             | 64 |
| Graph 4.16 | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Reading    |    |
|            | English Books and Articles for Leisure      |    |
|            | & Enrichment                                | 66 |
| Graph 4.17 | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Reading    |    |
|            | Indonesian Books and Articles for           |    |
|            | Leisure & Enrichment                        | 67 |
| Graph 4.18 | : The Subjects' Feeling about Reading in    |    |
|            | English compared to Reading in              |    |
|            | Indonesian                                  | 69 |
| Graph 4.19 | : The Subjects' Comprehension Ability       |    |
|            | when Reading in English                     | 70 |

| Graph 4.20 | : The Subjects' Comprehension Ability      |    |
|------------|--|----|
|            | when Reading in Indonesian                 | 71 |
| Graph 4.21 | : The Subjects' Preference of Watching     |    |
|            | English Movies, Videos, TV Programs,       |    |
|            | You-Tube, etc                              | 72 |
| Graph 4.22 | : The Subjects' Preference of Listening to |    |
|            | English Songs                              | 73 |
| Graph 4.23 | : The Subjects' Confidence when            |    |
|            | Speaking in English                        | 74 |
| Graph 4.24 | : The Subjects' Equal Confidence when      |    |
|            | Speaking in English and in Indonesian      | 75 |
| Graph 4.25 | : The Subjects' Confidence when Writing    |    |
|            | in English                                 | 76 |
| Graph 4.26 | : The Subjects' Equal Confidence when      |    |
|            | Writing in English and in Indonesian       | 77 |
| Graph 4.27 | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Speaking  |    |
|            | English to Teachers & Classmates           |    |
|            | during Classroom Interactions              | 79 |
| Graph 4.28 | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Speaking  |    |
|            | Indonesian to Teachers & Classmates        |    |
|            | during Classroom Interactions              | 80 |
| Graph 4.29 | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Speaking  |    |
|            | English to Teachers, Schoolmates &         |    |
|            | Staff during Break & Daily Interactions    | 81 |

| Graph 4.30 | : The Frequency of the Subjects' Speaking |    |
|------------|---|----|
|            | Indonesian to Teachers, Schoolmates &     |    |
|            | Staff during Break & Daily Interactions   | 30 |
| Graph 4.31 | : Syntactic Maturity Indicators           | 84 |
| Graph 4.32 | : Syntactic Immaturity Indicators         | 86 |

# **List of Appendices**

| Appendix 1  | : Observation Rubric                     | 115 |
|-------------|--|-----|
| Appendix 2a | : Letter to Parents (Indonesian version) | 116 |
| Appendix 2b | : Letter to Parents (English version)    | 118 |
| Appendix 3  | : Open-ended Questionnaires              | 119 |
| Appendix 4  | : Closed-ended Questionnaires            | 126 |
| Appendix 5a | : Text Analysis: Sample 1                | 130 |
| Appendix 5b | : Text Analysis: Sample 2                | 132 |
| Appendix 5c | : Comparison of the Syntactic Maturity   | 134 |
| Appendix 6  | : Writing Test                           | 136 |

Jap, Tjan-Han.(2017). Syntactic Maturity in the English Written Texts of Bilingual Students in a Secondary School in Surabaya. Master Program in Teaching English as a Foreign Language, Widya Mandala Catholic University, Surabaya. Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Agustinus Ngadiman

#### Key words: Syntactic maturity, T-unit, English written text, Bilingual students

#### Abstract

This research was a cross-sectional, descriptive, explanatory study that was aimed to investigate the syntactic maturity and development of bilingual students in a secondary school in Surabaya. The research questions was then formulated as (1) "To what extent does the syntactic maturity develop across the secondary levels as shown in the English written texts produced by bilingual students of grade 7 to grade 9 in a bilingual school in Surabaya?" and (2) "What factors might influence the differences and/or similarities in the English syntactic maturity of those bilingual students?

Referring to some previous studies (Hunt, 1965, O'Donnel, 1968; Dixon, 1970; Steward, 1978; Scott and Tucker in Lim Ho-Peng, 1984; Larsen-Freeman, 1978 in Kyle, 2011; and Polio 1997), this study measured the (1) mean T-unit length, (2) subordinate clause index, (3) mean clause length, (4) mean sentence length, (5) main clause coordination index, and (6) the index of errorneous T-units/total T-units as the indicators of the syntactic maturity. However, it was the mean T-unit length that was used as the main indicator of the syntactic maturity as mean T-unit length was considered to be the most reliable index. The data of the syntactic maturity indicators were obtained by analyzing the descriptive texts that the subjects wrote in response to a writing test instruction.

The results of this study and the discussions made based on the theories of language acquisition, Hunt's syntactic maturity and Burt and Kiparsky's (1972) error analysis have brought into the conclusion that the syntactic maturity is continuously developing across the secondary levels as shown in the English written texts produced by the bilingual students (of grade 7 to grade 9) of a secondary school in Surabaya. This conclusion was drawn based on the mean T-unit length that is significantly increasing from grade 7 to grade 9. This syntactic maturity and development were influenced by three dominant factors with universal and individual variations. First, the innate acquisition device enables the students to acquire English and Indonesian almost simultaneously. Second, the amount of English inputs obtained from parents, teachers, English-immersion program schooling, English movies, books and social media have provided the students with a variety of English resources. Third, the abundant opportunities to produce outputs available at home and at schools have enabled the students to use their English and then modify it during the process of English acquisition. Lastly, the individual variations have caused different syntactic maturity and development in each individual result of this study's findings, regardless of their grade levels.

Due to the limitation of this study, it is suggested that further studies be conducted with better administration of the writing test, a bigger number of subjects, and different text types/genres to analyze. To reveal a more accurate result of the influencing factors of the syntactic maturity, a longitudinal research, and/or a more detailed case study about the individual variations are recommended. Then, for the improvement of English, and writing courses, it is suggested that sufficient proportion for meaningful English inputs and opportunities to produce outputs be given.