
SECOND LANGUAGE STUDENTS ACQUISITION MI GRADE III AND VI AT THE LEVEL SYNTAX

Ary Fawzi*
Universitas Negeri Malang

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 9 Mar 2020

Accepted: 26 Mar 2020

Published: 27 Mar 2020

Keyword:

acquisition, second language, elementary school students, syntactic level

ABSTRACT

This study aims to describe the language acquisition of elementary / MI grade III and VI students at the syntactic level which includes focus, complexity, and sentence patterns based on categories/classes of words filling in the S-P function. This research uses a descriptive design with a qualitative approach. The results of this study indicate the following. In the aspect of sentence focus, the writing of the second subject has 3 diversity of focus sentences, while subject 1 is only 2. In the aspect of complexity, the writing of the second subject has a greater variety of compound sentences than the first subject, and vice versa for simple sentences. In the aspect of sentence patterns, the writing of the second subject has more diversity than the first subject.

INTRODUCTION

In general, investigators in the field of language acquisition assume that syntactic acquisition only starts if children can develop two or more words. In other words, the ranking of one word or often referred to as the holophrases ranking is not considered as the starting point for mastering the syntactic system (Djuwarijah, 2017; Maharani & Astuti, 2018; Usman, 2015; Wulandari, 2018).

Syntactic acquisition of children begins at less than 2 years. At that age, the child can arrange sentences of two or more words "Ujaran Dua Kata" (UDK). Children begin with two words interspersed with pauses so as if the two words are separate. With the two words in UDK, adults can better guess what is meant by children because the scope of meaning becomes more limited. The syntactic UDK is more complex and the semantics are also increasingly clear (Dardjowidjojo, 2010:

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: ary.fawzi.fs@um.ac.id (Ary Fawzi)

248). Another feature of UDK is that the two words are words from the main categories, namely nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs.

According to Brown (in Dardjowidjojo, 2010: 249) children aged 2 years has mastered relations cases and operations such as actor-action (FN-FV), the actor-object (FN-FN), the action-object (FV-FN), the action-locations (FV-FAdv), owner-owned (FN-FV), the object-location (FN-FAdv), the entity attributes, nominative, repeated word. Although, the meaning is clear every child's utterance must be adapted to the context.

Based on these descriptions, this study was conducted to determine the acquisition of the language of MI class III and VI students at the syntactic level. The things studied were sentence focus, sentence complexity, and sentence patterns based on the category/class of words the function fills in. Madrasah Ibtidaiyah, MI, is one of the basic education levels in Indonesia based on the Islamic religion. This level is the same as Elementary School.

METHOD

This research is a descriptive type with a qualitative approach. This study uses a cross-sectional research design by comparing the acquisition of languages of two subjects at different levels of education (Isnaini et al., 2019; Levin, 2006; Rose, 2000). The data obtained in this study are nonverbal/nominal data. The data is in the form of students' writing about their personal experiences. There are two research data sources hereinafter referred to as subjects one and two. Third grade MI students as subject one and sixth MI students as the second subject. This study uses two different sample levels because the researcher intends to explain the development order of the acquisition of the second language of the students based on their level of education at the syntactic level.

Researchers prepare specific strategies to reduce or even if possible eliminate the distance between researchers and students and establish the intimacy between researchers and students to obtain natural data. The steps to get data are as follows.

- (a) The researcher introduces himself casually to students while joking with the aim that students feel comfortable around the researcher (applies to the first or second subject).
- (b) The researcher introduces students one by one, joking with each student's name (applies to the first or second subject).
- (c) The researcher tells about personal experiences that are assumed to be able to motivate students. The steps in points (a), (b), and (c) are used by researchers as a way to reduce psychological distance with students, build familiarity with students, eliminate psychological stress or psychological disturbances that students experience due to the arrival of researchers. Also, the step in point (c) is used by researchers as an incentive for students to write their experiences. The time taken by the researcher to carry out the steps from points (a) to (c) is approximately one hour and thirty minutes (ninety minutes) (applies to the first or second subject).
- (d) The researcher asks students to write down their personal experiences. Within 45 minutes of writing, all students have finished writing their personal experiences (applicable to the first or second subject).

The analysis technique of this research was carried out with syntactic segmentation. What is meant by syntactic segmentation analysis is to describe the functions and categories of each constituent element (Haryono, 2005).

FINDINGS

Sentence Focus Subject 1

Sentence Number	Sentence Pattern
1	K1SPK2
2	KSP
3	KSPO
4	KonKSP
5	K1K2SP
6	KSP
7	KSP
8	KonKSPel
9	SP
10	(KonSP)KP
11	KonSP
12	KSP
13	KSP
14	KonSPKKonKonSP
15	KonSP
16	SPOK1KonK2
17	SP

Note:

S: *Subjek*: Subject

P: *Predikat*: Predicate

O: *Objek*: The object

K: *Keterangan*: description

Kon: *Konjungsi*: Conjunction

Based on the data exposure, it is known that 11 sentences begin with the 'description' function and there are 6 sentences that begin with the 'subject' function. Thus it can be concluded that the focus of the sentence in the writing of the first subject is 'description' because the sentence pattern that begins with the statement is more dominant than the sentence that starts with the function 'subject'.

In addition to the focus of the sentence, based on the above data, it can be seen that when the first subject narrates his experience through writing, there is a tendency to use "*lalu*" inter-sentence conjunctions. This is evident from the number of between sentence conjunctions used at the beginning of the sentence, several five conjunctions, all using "*lalu*" conjunctions.

Sentence Complexity Subject 1

Sentence Number	Simple Sentences	Compound Sentences	
		coordinate	Multilevel
1	√		
2	√		
3	√		

4		√
5	√	
6	√	
7	√	
8	√	
9	√	
10		√
11	√	
12	√	
13	√	
14		√
15	√	
16	√	
17	√	

Based on the above data exposure, it can be seen that 14 sentences still use simple sentence types, 1 parallel compound sentences, and 2 stratified compound sentences. Thus it can be concluded that simple sentence types are still dominant in the writing of the first subject, even though they have started using compound sentence types.

Sentence Pattern of First Subject Based on Category / Class of Filling S-P Functions

Sentence Number	Sentence Pattern (SP)
1	FN-FV
2	FN-Fadj
3	FN-FV
4	FN-FV
5	FN-FV
6	FN-FV
7	FN-Fadj
8	FN-FV
9	FN-Fadj
10	FN-FV
11	FN-FV
12	FN-FV
13	FN-FV
14	FN-FV dan FAdv
15	FN-FV
16	FN-FV
17	FN-FN

Note:

S: *Subjek*: Subject

P: *Predikat*: Predicate

FN: *Frase Nomina*: Nominal Phrases

FV: *Frase Verba*: Verb Phrases

FAdv: *Frase Adverbialia*: Adverb Phrases

FAdj: *Frase Adjektiva*: Adjective Phrases

Based on the above data exposure, it is known that the range of sentence patterns based on the categories of the constituent elements / main clauses of the first subject is four, namely FN-FN, FN-FV, FN-Fadj, and FN-FAdv. The number of sentences that use the FN-FN pattern is only one, namely sentence number seventeen. Twelve sentences using the FN-FV pattern. The number of sentences using the FN-Fadj pattern is three. The number of sentences that use the FN-FAdv pattern is one. Besides, the data exposure also states that in parallel compound sentences clause one and clause two may have different patterns as in sentence number fourteen.

Sentence Focus Subject 2

Sentence Number	Sentence Pattern
1	K1SPK2
2	SK1PK2
3	KonK1PK2
4	SKP
5	PS
6	KonK1SP1K2P2O
7	K1OSPK2
8	SKP
9	KonKO1PO2
10	KonKP
11	KonSPK
12	K1P1O1KonSP2K2K 3
13	K1SPK2
14	KonSPK1K2
15	SP1K1K2KonP2K3K 4
16	SPK
17	KonKSP

Note:

S: *Subjek*: Subject

P: *Predikat*: Predicate

O: *Objek*: The object

K: *Keterangan*: description

Kon: *Konjungsi*: Conjunction

Based on the explanation above, there are three kinds of focus sentences used, namely the focus of information, subject, and predicate. Sentences with eight focus words are found in sentences number 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, and 17. Sentences with subject focus are seven found in sentences numbers 2, 4, 8, 11, 14, 15, and 16. Sentences with predicate focus there are only two, namely contained in sentences numbers 5 and 10. Thus, it can be concluded that in the writing of the second subject of this study the focus of the sentence written is still dominant on the focus of the information even though the sentence with the focus of the subject has begun to

compensate the number of sentences with a focus on the subject, while the sentence with predicate focus has begun to appear although it is still small.

Sentence Complexity Subject 2

Sentence Number	Simple Sentences	Compound Sentences	
		Coordinate	Multilevel
1	√		
2	√		
3	√		
4	√		
5	√		
6			√
7			√
8	√		
9			√
10			√
11	√		
12		√	√
13	√		
14	√		
15		√	
16	√		
17			√

Based on the data exposure, it can be seen that there are 10 simple sentences in the second subject and compound sentences, both parallel and graded, there are 7. Of the seven compound sentences, there are 1 parallel compound sentences, 5 stratified compound sentences, and 1 sentence which is a combination between parallel and stratified compound sentences. Thus it can be concluded that the writing of the second subject of this study is still dominant in simple sentences even though the number of compound sentences in this paper has begun to compensate for the number of simple sentences written.

Sentence Pattern of Second Subject Based on Category / Class of Filling S-P Functions

Sentence Number	Sentence Pattern (SP)
1	FN-FAdv
2	FN-FV
3	FAdv
4	FN-FAdv
5	FN-FAdv
6	FN-Fadj dan FN-FV
7	FN-FV
8	FN-Fadj
9	FN-FV
10	FN-FV
11	FN-FV
12	FN-FV dan FN-FV

13	FN-FV
14	FN-FAdv
15	FN-FV dan FN-Adv
16	FN-FAdv
17	FN-FV

Note:

S: *Subjek*: Subject

P: *Predikat*: Predicate

FN: *Frase Nomina*: Nominal Phrases

FV: *Frase Verba*: Verb Phrases

FAdv: *Frase Adverbia*: Adverb Phrases

FAdj: *Frase Adjektiva*: Adjective Phrases

Based on the above data exposure, it is known that the range of sentence patterns based on the categories of the constituent elements / main clauses of the second subject are three, namely FN-FV, FN-Fadj, and FN-FAdv. The number of sentences using the FN-FV pattern is eleven. The number of sentences using the FN-Fadj pattern is twofold. The number of sentences using the FN-FAdv pattern is seven. Besides, the data exposure also states that in parallel compound sentences clause one and clause two may have different patterns as in sentence numbers 6, 12, and 15.

DISCUSSION

Sentence Focus on First and Second Subject Writing

Research subject	Subject	Predicate	The object	Complement	Description
Subjek 1	6 sentences	-	-	-	11 sentences
Subjek 2	7 sentences	2 sentences	-	-	8 sentences

Based on the above data exposure it is known that the focus of the sentence written by the first subject is 6 sentences with the focus of the subject function and 11 sentences on the adverb function, while the second subject is 7 sentences with the focus of the subject function, 2 sentences with the predicate function focus, and 8 sentences with focus function description. Thus, it can be concluded that the writing of the second subject compared to the first subject, there is a tendency to decrease the focus of sentences on the function of information, the addition of sentence focuses on the function of the subject and the predicate.

Sentence Complexity in First and Second Subject Writing

Research subject	Simple Sentences	Compound Sentences
Subjek 1	14 sentences	3 sentences
Subjek 2	10 sentences	7 sentences

Based on the above data exposure it is known that in the writing of the first subject there are 14 simple sentences and 3 compound sentences, while in the second subject there are 10 simple sentences and 7 compound sentences. Thus, it can be concluded that the writing of the second subject compared to the first subject, the

fewer number of simple sentences written and the more compound sentences are written.

Sentence Patterns on First and Second Subject Writing Based on Categories / Class of Filling S-P Functions

Research Subject	Sentence Pattern						
	FN-FV	FN-FAdj	FN-FN	FN-FAdv	FN-FV dan FN-FAdv	FN-FAdj dan FN-FV	FN-FV dan FN-FV
1	12	3	1	-	1	-	-
2	7	1	-	5	1	1	1

Note:

FN: *Frase Nomina*: Nominal Phrases

FV: *Frase Verba*: Verb Phrases

FAdv: *Frase Adverbia*: Adverb Phrases

FAdj: *Frase Adjektiva*: Adjective Phrases

Based on the above data exposure, it is known that in the first subject writing there are 12 sentences, while in the second subject there are 7 sentences with the SP FN-FV pattern. The FN-FAdj pattern found in the first subject writing is 3, while the second subject is 1 sentence. The FN-FN pattern only found 1 sentence found in the writing of the first subject. The FN-FAdv pattern of 5 sentences was found in the writing of the second subject. The FN-FV and FN-FAdv patterns each have 1 sentence found in the writing of the first two subjects. There are 1 sentence FN-FAdj and FN-FV patterns found in the writing of the second subject. The pattern of FN-FV and FN-FV is 1 sentence found in the writing of the second subject. Thus, it can be concluded that the writing of the second subject has a variety of sentence patterns based on the category/class of words filling the SP function more than the first subject.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of a study of the writing of the first and second subjects of this study, the following conclusions can be drawn.

- 1) The higher the level the less the number of simple sentences written and the more compound sentences are written.
- 2) The higher the level there is a reduction in sentence focus on the adverb function, the addition of sentence focus on the subject and predicate functions.
- 3) The higher the level, the more diverse categories/classes of words that fill the S-P function.

REFERENCES

- Darjowodjojo, S. (2012). *Psikolinguistik: Pengantar Pemahaman Bahasa Manusia*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Djuwarijah, S. (2017). PEMEROLEHAN BAHASA TELEGRAM DAN KALIMAT ANAK USIA PRASEKOLAH DAN SD. *Konstruktivisme : Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran*, 9(1), 19-38. <https://doi.org/10.35457/konstruk.v9i1.149>
- Dulay, H. et all. (1982). *Language Two*. New York: Oxfodrd University

- Field, J. (2003). *Psycholinguistics: a Resource Book for Students*. New York: Routledge.
- Haryono, M. E. A. (2005). Sistem Pengidentifikasi Otomatis Pokok Kalimat Suatu Paragraf dalam Dokumen Ekspositori dengan Model Ruang Vektor. *Media Informatika*, 3(1), Article 1. <https://journal.uii.ac.id/media-informatika/article/view/26>
- Isnaini, M., Putra, A. B. A., Sartika, F. D., & Arifuddin, F. (2019). KEMAMPUAN SELF DIRECTED LEARNING DAN PENCAPAIAN HASIL BELAJAR: Studi Cross Sectional. *Journal of Islamic Nursing*, 4(2), 68-76. <https://doi.org/10.24252/join.v4i2.10039>
- Levin, K. A. (2006). Study design III: Cross-sectional studies. *Evidence-Based Dentistry*, 7(1), 24-25. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.ebd.6400375>
- Maharani, T., & Astuti, E. S. (2018). Pemerolehan Bahasa Kedua dan Pengajaran Bahasa dalam Pembelajaran BIPA. *Jurnal Bahasa Lingua Scientia*, 10(1), 121-142-142. <https://doi.org/10.21274/lj.2018.10.1.121-142>
- Rose, K. R. (2000). AN EXPLORATORY CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY OF INTERLANGUAGE PRAGMATIC DEVELOPMENT. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22(1), 27-67. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100001029>
- Usman, H. (2015). Studi Pemerolehan Bahasa Pada Anak Usia 4 Tahun (Kajian Sintaksis). *Jurnal Linguistik Terapan*, 5(2), 16-28.
- Wulandari, D. I. (2018). Pemerolehan Bahasa Indonesia Anak Usia 3-5 Tahun di PAUD LESTARI Desa Blimbing Kecamatan Paciran Kabupaten Lamongan. *Lingua Franca: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 2(1), Article 1. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30651/lf.v2i1.1346>