

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

In this chapter, the writer presents conclusion and recommendation of this study.

5.1 Conclusion

There was a research question proposed in the beginning of the study, “How is syntactic knowledge of Senior High School Teachers of English in Jakarta?” The sub-questions are (1) How is the grammaticality knowledge of senior high school teachers of English? (2) How is the phrase structure rules knowledge of senior high school teachers of English? (3) How is the structural ambiguity knowledge of senior high school teachers of English?

Those research questions were finally answered after conducting this study. The writer concluded this study as follows:

1. Senior high school teachers of English in Jakarta had good knowledge of syntax. By calculating the overall total correct items divided with the total of test items, the average score that they achieved was 77% or 699 correct items out of 900 total items. It was found that their previous syntax study in college helped them with good background knowledge of syntax. Their teaching experiences also contributed in possessing their syntactic knowledge.

2. Based on the first sub research question, this study found that teachers of English grammaticality knowledge were good with 80% or 322 correct answers out of 400 total items. Most of teachers of English could judge the correctness of sentences in terms of grammar.
3. Based on the second research question, this study found that teachers of English phrase structure rules knowledge were good with 83% or 249 correct answers out of 300 total items. A few teachers of English did mistake in answering the rules of preposition phrase and distinguishing determiner and noun. But most of teachers of English could answer the rules of phrase structure and identify the lexical category.
4. Based on the third research question, this study found that teachers of English structural ambiguity knowledge was fair with 64% or 128 correct answers out of 200 total items. Some of teachers were difficult in analyzing the structural ambiguity. It might happen because their lack of that.

5.2 Recommendation

After conducting this study, there are some opinions that the writer wants to suggest:

1. For teachers of English to enrich their knowledge with the correct grammar of English. The structural ambiguity is rarely touched and discussed in the classroom that is why many teachers are not aware of it. The writer also suggests the teachers of English to include this material, to be taught and learner deeper. Although, in writing skill, the teachers should avoid ambiguity in order not to mislead the students but in non- academic writing such as reading a poem, the ambiguity may happen or exist. Because of that, the teachers should have knowledge to explain the ambiguous phrases or sentences to the students.
2. For students of English Department who will be the teacher, linguistics especially syntax should be learned deeper in the class. Considering syntax is linked to grammar and the structure or formation of sentences, it can help the students to improve writing skill especially.
3. For English Department to improve the department quality. The improvement might be done in subject *English Morphology and Syntax*. The writer recommend the English Department not only teach the theory but also the application or implication of linguistic for teaching which was needed by the teachers.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, R., Torgerson, C., Beverton, S., Freeman, A., Locke, T., Low, G., Robinson, A., & Zhu, D. 2006. *The effect of grammar teaching on writing development*. British Educational Research Journal, 32(1).
- Bachman, L.F. (1990). *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford etc.: OUP.
- Borg & Gall. 1983. *Educational Research: An Introduction, 4th edition*. Prentice Hall Press
- Bornstein, Diana D. 1997. *An Introduction to Transformational Grammar*. Queen of the City University of New York. Winthrop Publisher Inc. Cambridge Massachusetts.
- Brinton, Laurel J. 2000. *The Structure of Modern English: A Linguistic Introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Canale, M. and Swain, M. 1980. "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing". *Applied Linguistics* 1/1:1.-47.
- Creswell, John W. 2008. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Ohio: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Creswell, John W. 2010. *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. California: Sage Publication. Inc. Crouch, R., & Williams.

- Durgunoglu, A.Y. 2002. *Cross Linguistic Transfer in Literacy Development and Implications for Language Learner*. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 52, 189-205.
- Eastwood, John. 2002. *Oxford Guide to English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. 2005. Measuring implicit and explicit knowledge of a second language: A psychometric study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 141-172.
- Fromkin, Victoria and Robert Rodman. 1998. *An Introduction to Language*. Florida: Harcourt Brace and Co.
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. 2003. *An introduction to language*. Boston, MA: Heinle.
- Larson-Hall, J. 2010. *A Guide to Doing Statistics in Second Language Using SPSS*. New York: Routledge.
- Layton, A, Robinson, J, & Lawson, M. 1998. *The relationship between Syntactic Awareness and Reading Performance*. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 21 (1). 5-23.
- Malkina, Natalia. (2008). *Teaching Foreign Languages to Young Children in the Russian Federation*. In: Ritva Kantelinen, Eija Liisa Sokka-Meaney & Victoria Pogolian (Eds.) *Seminar Papers on Early Foreign Language Education*, University of Joensuu, 2008, pp. 23-36. [Online] Available: <http://persona.yasni.ru/victoria+pogolian+97317/kantelinen>.
- Martohardjono, G., Otheguy, R., Gabriele, A., & Troseth, E. (2005). *The role of syntax in reading comprehension: A study of bilingual readers*. In: J. Cohen, K. McAlister, K. Rolstad, & J. MacSwan (Eds.),

Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism.
Somerville, MA: Cascadilla.

McNamara, Tim. 2000. *Language Testing*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Mousavi, Seyyed Abbas. 1999. *A Dictionary of Language Testing*. 2nd ed. Tehran:
Rahnama Publications.

Musthafa, B. 1994. Literary Response: A Way of Integrating Reading-Writing
Activities. *Reading Improvement*, Vol.31, No.1, pp.52-58.

Nation, K & Snowling. 2000. *Factor Influencing Syntactic Awareness Skill in
Normal Readers and Poor Comprehenders*. *Applied Psycholinguistics*,
21, 229-241.

Nunan, D. (2001). *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Heinle and Heinle
Publishers.

O'Grady, Dobrovolsky & Katamba. 1987/1996. *Contemporary Linguistics: An
Introduction*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Pogosian, Victorian. (2008). *The Russian System of Training Teachers of Foreign
Languages for Young Learners: History and New Developments*. In:
Ritva Kantelinen, Eija Liisa Sokka-Meaney & Victoria Pogosian
(Eds.) *Seminar Papers on Early Foreign Language Education*,
University of Joensuu, 2008, pp. 45-55.

Radford, A. 1997. *Syntactic Theory and the Structure of English*. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.

Rahman, A., Asriyanti, E., Hamra, A., Noni, N. 2013. *The Competence of Primary
School English Teachers in Indonesia*. Vol.4, No.11, p.39-145

- Rahimy, R and Moradkhani, N. 2012. *The Effect of using Grammatical Judgment Tasks on Iranian EFL Learners' Knowledge of Grammatical Patterns*. Iran:Tonekabon Branch.
- Santoso, Singgih. 2009. *Panduan Lengkap Menguasai Statistik dengan SPSS 17*. Jakarta: PT. Elex Media Komputindo.
- Siegel, L. S., & Ryan, E. B. (1988). Development of grammatical-sensitivity, phonological, and short-term memory skills in normally achieving and learning disabled children. *Developmental Psychology*, 24, 28-37.
- Singarimbun, M. and Sofian E. 1987. *Metode Penelitian Survei*.Yogyakarta: LP3ES.