

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA

**RECALL AND RETENTION OF L2 TO L1 WORD
TRANSLATION EQUIVALENTS VIA SUB-
VOCALIZATION AMONG WEAK MALAYSIAN
LEARNERS**

ALBERT ANAK WILSON ENG HOCK

**Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Masters in Education (TESL)**

Faculty of Education

FEBRUARY 2009

Abstract

Effective word recall and retention is important in vocabulary learning. Therefore, there is a tendency that weak learners may memorize the meaning of an L2 word through its L1 translation equivalent as an effective word recall learning technique. This quasi-experimental study examined the effectiveness of these learners' ability to recall the Malay language translation equivalents (L1) of English words (L2) via rote memorization technique. Two different groups of non native English speakers at age thirteen were compared in the written word recall tests. In the first group (SV), the subjects were given 15 seconds to memorize sub-vocally each of the twenty L2 to L1 word translation equivalent pairs whereas for the other group, the control group (NSV), the subjects were not allowed to memorize the same word pair list. In both groups the subjects were to write the Malay language translation equivalents of the English words in a word recall test immediately after instruction and seven days later. There was no significant difference in the ability of the subjects to recall between the two groups and the effect of time was also insignificant. This finding is interpreted as evidence that the use of translation equivalents through rote learning and sub-vocalization is inadequate for word recall and retention among weak non-native speakers. This study also explored whether these learners were able to recall syntagmatic or paradigmatic word structure better than the other. Results, taken from the data above, showed that there was no significant difference in the type of words recalled across the two different time periods. This implies that these learners have no preference over any of these two word structures that they can recall and retain effectively in L2 vocabulary teaching and learning.

Candidate's Declaration

I declare that the work in this thesis was carried out in accordance with the regulations of Universiti Teknologi MARA. It is original and is the result of my own work, unless otherwise indicated or acknowledged as referenced work. This topic has not been submitted to any other academic or non-academic institution for any other degree or qualification.

In the event that my thesis be found to violate the conditions above, I voluntarily waive the right of conferment of my degree and agree be subjected to the disciplinary rules and regulations of Universiti Teknologi MARA.


| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Name of candidate | Albert Anak Wilson Eng Hock |
| Candidate's ID No | 2006885597 |
| Programme | Masters in TESL |
| Faculty | Education |
| Thesis Title | Recall and Retention of L2 to L1 Word Translation Equivalents via sub-vocalization among weak Malaysian learners |
| Signature of Candidate |  |
| Date | 16 February 2009 |

Table of Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|----------|
| 1 | Introduction to the Study | 1 |
| | 1.0 Introduction | |
| | 1.1 Explicit vocabulary teaching and memory retention | 2 |
| | 1.1.1 Weak L2 learners and the use of translation equivalents | 3 |
| | 1.2 Statement of the Problem | 4 |
| | 1.3 Research Objectives | 6 |
| | 1.3.1 L2 to L1 translation equivalents and word recall | 6 |
| | 1.3.2 Word structure preference | 7 |
| | 1.4 Research Questions | 7 |
| | 1.5 Significance of the Study | 8 |
| | 1.5.1. L2 to L1 vocabulary teaching and language use | 9 |
| | 1.6 Limitations of the Study | 10 |
| | 1.7 Definition of Terms | 11 |
| | 1.8 Conclusion | 14 |
| 2 | Literature Review | |
| | 2.0 Introduction | 15 |
| | 2.1 Levelt Model of Lexical representation | 16 |
| | 2.2 Information Processing theory in relation to vocabulary learning | 19 |
| | 2.3 Theoretical Framework | 21 |
| | 2.4 Previous studies on L2 word recall and retention | 23 |
| | 2.4.1 L2 parts of speech | 23 |
| | 2.4.2 Length of L2 words | 24 |
| | 2.4.3 Morphological Complexity | 25 |
| | 2.4.4 The ability to pronounce the word well | 26 |

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 2.5 | The role of Sound and Meaning in Vocabulary Learning | 27 |
| 2.5.1 | The phonological view | 28 |
| 2.5.2 | The semantic link versus the phonological view | 30 |
| 2.6 | Syntagmatic and Paradigmatic word structures | 33 |
| 2.6.1 | Choice of word structure, L2 proficiency and Syntagmatic to Paradigmatic shift | 34 |
| 2.7 | Direction of this study | 36 |
| 2.8 | Conclusion | 37 |

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| 3 | Research Methodology | |
| 3.0 | Introduction | 39 |
| 3.1 | Research design | 40 |
| 3.1.1. | General issues influencing the research design | 41 |
| 3.2 | Population, Sample and Setting | 43 |
| 3.3 | Instrumentation | 45 |
| 3.3.1 | Pilot Test | 47 |
| 3.4 | Research Procedure | 47 |
| 3.4.1 | Preparation | 48 |
| 3.4.2 | The experiment | 49 |
| 3.5 | Data Collection Procedure | 51 |
| 3.6 | Data Analysis | 51 |
| 3.6.1 | SPANOVA | 52 |
| 3.6.2 | T-test | 55 |
| | Conclusion | 56 |