

The Influence of Similarity Vocabulary on New Vocabulary Learning in Indonesian for Taiwanese Students

Apriliana Lase (✉ aprilianalase25@gmail.com)

National Chung Cheng University <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5388-4776>

Research Article

Keywords: Indonesia, new vocabulary, old vocabulary, Phonological neighbour, lexical neighbour, similarity, pretest, post-test

Posted Date: April 6th, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-20793/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

This study investigated the new vocabulary effect to remember the old vocabulary in task reading Indonesia as a second language. The similarity of vocabulary related to Phonological neighborhood by giving two pretest and posttest methods in two groups and presenting a control group to be able to see how far the ability of students to understand related vocabulary. The task in the form of reading shows an image. The Lexicon neighbor is constrained because of the similar word can affect the memory of students. The problem of students they have limited time to finish the task of reading – the issue of student they found when running the experiment.

Introduction

Vocabulary is essential to support our communication with people. The word of vocabulary without words can't express the meaning of the communication in the second language also cannot be successful in delivering the meaningful way to people; people should have memorized it especially in the new language whether they never learn before. Indonesian is L2 or second language, have the characteristic of vocabulary. Indonesian is different from another language. The words of Indonesia have similarity, and the morpheme should make confused if people don't know how to distinguish. The similarity of pronunciation is not necessarily of the same meaning. Remember of vocabulary should have specific rules or pattern, in addition to similar morpheme of Indonesia also have suffixes, affixes and prefixes can trick the memory into remembering the word. For example: owning *memiliki* and choosing *milih* is almost the similarity as the pronunciation or fonem. The first word contains suffixes *i*, during the second word without it.

Whereas, learning vocabulary is practical strategies to memorizing word meaning in context for reading, writing at least should make growth the ability of children (Gray & Holmes, 1938; Thomas & Robinson, 1972). The human has remembered a word has an individual capacity in their memory to realize new vocabulary or similar vocabulary. Watts suggests that the average seven years old of a child can learn and recognition vocabulary of 2000 words, that at 14 years early has reached some 7000 words Watts (1944).

This study focuses on how students could recognize the new vocabulary without forgetting the old vocabulary in a sentence. The part of new vocabulary that appears can influence learning. L2 on vocabulary learned from the context of a sentence, it's easier to guess the meaning of unknown words and produce a much higher test score recognition and remembering of the meaning Web (2008). Knowing of the new vocabulary is useful to increase our vocabulary in speaking. But the failure is to process a language while almost similarity makes the memories forget the old vocabulary; this usually happens when a word has a characteristic in its pronunciation or phoneme. Learning vocabulary memory should have an effectivity strategy in storing of vocabulary Meara (1980). Therefore, it is necessary to differential the meaning of words, to understand vocabulary in a reading text to study L2 Lawson & Hogben (1996); learn new vocabulary to be able should know how to connect the meaning from the real

sense. Pulido (2007) Pulido's study was qualified by topic familiarity, with the effect of comprehension diminishing for common topics. Suggests that when they are reading for general understanding, readers are less likely to pay attention to unfamiliar words if the overall meaning. Another study (Pellicer-Sanchez & Schmitt, 2010) used an authentic L2 (English) text (67,000 words) and assessed recognition and recall of spelling, meaning, and a grammatical class of new words.

The goal of this study to know how do students can have recognized the similarity vocabulary and what the problem that they found when the memorizing the vocabulary for the task reading I gave to them, and they could have recognized the vocabulary of the new vocabulary was an embedded in short narrative texts.

The hypotheses for this study related to Phonological neighborhood by Metsala and Walley (1998) studied how different word characteristics, such as lexical status and word familiarity. Therefore, the new vocabulary many similarities sounding word and phoneme but in a different meaning, if old of vocabulary find is '*kepala*' head and the new vocabulary target's lexical neighbor is '*kelapa*' coconut. The students had more difficult to distinguish the word. It has a few similarities the old to new vocabulary. If their focus only in one way especially new vocabulary if they are changed to remember again the old vocabulary thier memories difficult to processing it well.

Research Question

How do students can recognize the similarity of vocabulary from new vocabulary to old vocabulary, can their memories distinguish the Indonesian of vocabulary?

Methods

Participants

At six of students' learners of Intermediate Innovative Learning Indonesia, University Central Taiwan. They based on purposive sampling. The Participants were chosen in randomly to run the experimental task *pretest* and *post-test*. The participants are intermediate level in learning Indonesian. They are in the different major in the University. The name of students also I used A1-A6 to protect their identity for this experiment.

Design and Task

The Taiwanese-speaking learners of Bahasa Indonesian as a second language. The task given to participants is a short reading with Indonesian without English or Chinese translations and supported by some pictures in each sentence then, they are helped to remember new or old vocabulary from the

pictures. Each sentence has the similarity of vocabulary in pronunciation and phoneme but has different meanings.

I divide into two groups to running the experiment of *pretest & post-test* and put the *control group* to compare how task had been works. Students will be told to read and pay attention first, and they should go to the reading task within 3 minutes. The task was fill-in task, the targeted word was deleted from the reading text, and the participants have to fill in the blanks as they read, in other words, participants do not have to search for the meaning of the new words, but they had to remember which word is suitable to put in the blank. Then, give Q&A for participants to answer the questions based on the short reading of the task. The material of the task can see on the APPENDIX below.

Procedure

The procedure I used to pretest and post-test before beginning my experiment, I give the first test for participants.

Pretest

The first test is pretest while giving only to participants in Group 1 of the reading sentences and pay attention to find a new vocabulary. The short reading has five sentences include with pictures to help the participants find a new word. Then was followed the short practice by participants for three minutes to read aloud of the reading later and try to memorize each new word for the reading. I put a bold of the new word in the sentences so that the focus of students only remembers the new word.

Post-test

The final test is post-test is a post-test I give to Group 1 and Group 2 as (Control Group) to determine the extent of participants' memories in remembering new vocabulary and provide the similarity test reading as the first time doing a pretest with three minutes of reading. They filled the questions from reading that had read. The format of the vocabulary test is a Q&A question and answer. I will read the question, and they will answer it fill the blank and write on a paper quiz and the end of the test, participants should write how many old vocabularies they don't recognize and also keep writing how many new vocabularies they were remembered.

Results

Pretest Memorizing Vocabulary of Indonesian

Group 1

Name of	New	Test New	Average	Total
Students	Vocabulary	Vocabulary		
	Recognize			
A1	15	28	21,5	43
A2	13	28	20,5	41
A3	19	28	23,5	47
Result:	15,7			

Table 1.

The score of the results in the pretest is 15,7; there is an increase in the quality of learning and very significant, which can see from the result of evaluating for students in memories the new vocabulary in the context of sentences. A1 students can get 15 new vocabulary words, with an average of 21,5 higher than A2 students who can memorize 13 words with an average of 20,5 lower than another student A3 students can memories 19 new vocabularies with average 23,5 with overall of new words in all sentences was 28 in vocabulary. Using the method of pictures on sentences helps students focus on the new vocabulary, the new words also made in bold. At the pretest, I also gave the task to the students were following the task of the activity. The total significant for the test of new vocabulary student A3 take the higher overall score to memories the vocabulary than student A1 which get 43, in lowest one is student A2.

Post test Memomorizing Vocabulary of Indonesian

Group 1

Name of	Old	Test Old	Average	Total
Students	Vocabulary	Vocabulary		
	Recognize			
A1	9	42	25,5	51
A2	7	42	24,5	49
A3	5	42	23,5	47
Result:	7			

Table 2.

Shown in Table 2 The result of this post-test is lowest than Group 2. Which had been 11,3 the Group 1 has result overall is 7. The different from my prediction, what I think they will be able to answer it because this is a trial for old vocabulary, but some of them cannot recognize the old vocabulary and they are confused. They found more confused the similarity word with new vocabulary example for new vocabulary they found if the lexical item has single that are neighbor such as; 'tau' know, 'tahu'tofu, kencing pee in the old vocabulary they found kucing cat, janda widow and anda you, jerit scream and jerat snare. A word was considering a target vocabulary neighbour if it different so that the word they cannot memorize in their memory, the similarity in the new vocabulary or the lexical neighbors made them weak in determining it in old vocabulary.

Post Test of Control Group; Group 2

Group 2

Name of Students	Old Vocabulary Recognize	Test Old Vocabulary	Average	Total
<i>Control group</i>				
A4	12	42	27	54
A5	11	42	26,5	53
A6	11	42	26,5	53
Result:	11,3			

Table 3.

The students obtain the similarity of vocabulary in Group 1. The result of post-test shown in Table 3. The correlation between Table 1 and 2. Different, Group 2 did not give the pretest before; the student only follows the rules and running the post-test with the same instructions with Group 1. The post-test of the students' knowledge was reduced to memories the length of vocabulary around 11,3 with the approval of 42 the old vocabulary words that they should have known. Student A1 gets 12 to finger out the old vocabulary with an average 27, and a total 54, different in students A2 and A3 gets 11 vocabularies at an average of 26,5 a total of 53 results obtained by considering the old vocabulary task in 3 minutes. Is it an excellent achievement for the control group, they can add the old vocabulary better compared to Group 1, which has been deceived by the similarity word in new vocabulary.

Discussion

Indonesian vocabulary was remembered by using pictures to support the sentences actually, trains the students to arrange their independence to recognize new and old words simultaneously. The differences

in the control group and the experimental group have differed values because the methods used are different. As the pictures put in sentences attracts the attention of the student to work the task, it is given to help students remember better of the clue. The results of the first and second weeks in the control group and experiment showed that there were differences. The result obtained in the first week is higher than the second week in the first experiment, which means the students can remember of Indonesian vocabulary in their memory only for a short period. Whereas in the second week, the test was given the same as the group control and experiment, and they should know the old vocabulary only, however, group control was excellent in remembering the old vocabulary. The similarity of vocabulary cannot maintain the information well in long term memory, because the similarity sometimes can not be processing well in mind. The students can not found or word identification if the word has a similar word such as sounding and phoneme.

This study is to see how new vocabulary can affect memory in remembering the old vocabulary for students. The structure of sentences would make it possible for students to suggest that the new vocabulary to the lexicon neighbor will be constrained because of the similar word Dollaghan (1994). For the present study, more analysis of phonological neighborhoods was conduct. Similarity neighbors were computed for Group 2 find the vocabularies, and the Group 1 cannot compare well the similarity word in old vocabulary inversely proportional to the Group 2 which had no previous pretest so that the similar new vocabulary did not affect in their memories.

Gu (1994) shows understanding of learning the L2 vocabulary is aspect language development which has consequences of recognizing word in similar way. The related sounding vocabulary is called lexical neighbors, and the word representation compete with each other Luce& Pisoni (1998). Indeed, the more critical problem in spoken word recognition is the process which discrimination between lexical items in memory can achieve Pisani&Luce (1987). That's means that are the factors make it difficult to recognize, namely the existence of function discrimination, the lexical items are activated to input stimuli primarily refer to phoneme and sounding similarities in new vocabulary to old vocabulary. In the end one language shows the differences in student's ability to read the similarity vocabulary, language has a direct on those who approve decoding abilities.

Phonological neighbors monitor of lexical information in long-long term and short term memory in making decision about identiy word. When memories get stressed, the length of the forgetfulness will be forgotten. The task given students are only 3 minutes in reading and completing it. When they have to be forced to remember the similiar vocabulary, automatically their memories forget and the factors are change it in the environmental situation and memory barriers. In others words, this research clearly suggested the effect of phonology neighbors are contrained by the phonological counterparts in lexical neighbour decisions.

Conclusion

Lexical and phonological structures neighbour are important issue in this study to undertanding the second language or L2 used in accesing memory to remember the old vocabulary. The study was introduction of the similarity words in a sentences sensuring how memory should remember less perfect sensory input for students to memories the vocabulary in a short time. Thus, neighbors had its effect in similarity of vocabulary Indonesia. The feedback for students also present that vocabulary Indonesia more difficult than English. When working on their task as a trapped in a new vocabulary, the memory still remember the similiar new vocabulary. They want to reexamine their memories once more. But I have no time to solve all their problems. In fact, this study is not perfect because there are still many trial that must be done again. Actually, the task is easy, but the time is limited for student to solved the problem in the task.

References

- Anthony, Edward M. 1975. Towards a theory of lexical meaning. Singapore, RELC
- Chiang, P., & Rvachew, S. (2007). English-French bilingual children's phonological awareness and vocabulary skills. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquée*, 10(3), 293-308.
- Coady, J. A., & Aslin, R. N. (2003). Phonological neighbourhoods in the developing lexicon. *Journal of Child language*, 30(2), 441-469.
- De Cara, B., & Goswami, U. (2003). Phonological neighbourhood density: Effects in a rhyme awareness task in five-year-old children. *Journal of child language*, 30(3), 695-710.
- Dollaghan, C. A. (1994). Children's phonological neighbourhoods: half empty or half full? *Journal of Child Language*, 21(2), 257-271.
- Gu, Y. (1994, March). *Vocabulary learning strategies of good and poor Chinese EFL learners*. Paper presented at TESOL '94, Baltimore. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 370 411)
- Lawson, M. J. & Hogben, D. (1996). The vocabulary-learning strategies of foreign-language students. *Language Learning*, 46, 101-135.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1974. *Semantics*. Middlesex, Penguin Books.
- Luce, P. A., & Pisoni, D. B. (1998). Recognizing spoken words: The neighborhood activation model. *Ear and hearing*, 19(1), 1.
- McCarthy, M. (1990). *Vocabulary*. Oxford University Press.
- Meara, P. (1980). Vocabulary acquisition: A neglected aspect of language learning. *Language Teaching*, 13, 221-246.

Mohammed, H. A., Majid, N. A., & Abdullah, T. (2016). The Differential Effect of Attentional Condition on Subsequent Vocabulary Development. *English Language Teaching, 9*(1), 88-100.

Nagy, W. E., & Herman, P. A. (1987). Breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge: Implications for acquisition and instruction. *The nature of vocabulary acquisition, 19*, 35.

Pisoni, D. B., & Luce, P. A. (1987). Acoustic-phonetic representations in word recognition. *Cognition, 25*(1-2), 21-52.

Watts, A. F. 1944. The language and mental development of children. London, Harra

Webb, S. (2008). The effects of context on incidental vocabulary learning. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 20*, 232-245.

Ziegler, J. C., Muneaux, M., & Grainger, J. (2003). Neighborhood effects in auditory word recognition: Phonological competition and orthographic facilitation. *Journal of Memory and Language, 48*(4), 779-793.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [Appendix.pdf](#)