

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

#### **V.1 Conclusion**

Each word stored in Long-term Memory is actually bearing a lot of information. It is because the word enters LTM through Elaborative Rehearsal which requires significant cognitive effort such as repeating the word, making a simple sensory judgment or more complex comparison includes thinking about the meaning of the new information and attempting to relate it to information already exists in LTM.

The information each word bears is the ideas of the object and consists of an intention meaning, the semantic features, properties, associates, etc. Therefore, when people are asked to retrieve the word, they might use the information as the retrieval cues which are stimuli that are associated with the information stored in memory and can help them bring the word to mind.

From the retrieval process of stimulus-target words through semantic network structures described in this study, the writer found that the way the respondents associated stimulus-target words in the semantic network structures involves the retrieval of the information of the associated concepts. The information is mainly the semantic features or properties, characteristics and also external environment cues – sight, sound, or smell.

In chapter III, the writer presents an extensive data of the study. Here, it can be seen that most respondents associated two concepts based on their features,

characteristics, external environment, or even their knowledge about the concepts, for example, tree-forest, big-mountain, sock-stink, thief-night. In addition, the writer found that the retrieval process from the stimulus to the target word also involves the interference of each other. For example, the association chain of gajah-duduk-merek. The previous learning of the concept 'gajah' that is a brand name 'gajah duduk' influences the retrieval process from 'duduk' to 'merek'. It is the proactive interference, which is the disruptive effect of previous learning on the recall of new information.

Even though, the writer assumes the data to be independent to each other, in fact, the findings indicate that there might be proactive interference in the construction of the two versions of semantic network structures. The associated concepts, which appear in the English version of semantic network structure look as if they were the translation equivalent of the Indonesian version. Indeed, not all Indonesian association can be translated into English. However, as stated earlier, the writer in this study does not make attempt to check the validity of the associations. The writer only wants to interpret the data based on the respondents' mental lexicon or their knowledge of external environment.

The findings of this study also support the earlier argument that the vocabulary storage in LTM is stored in organized fashion. The respondents tried to associate a concept with another concept, from stimulus to reach its target word through association or retrieval of the properties or features possesses by the associated concepts that present in their LTM, even their mental lexical

knowledge of the concept or external environment experienced by the respondents may encourage them to recall the new concept.

The different kinds of associations produced in the semantic network structures of this study lead the writer to conclude that most respondents gave typical or common responses to the associated concepts. After the writer classified the associations, the writer found that the most common types of associations based on Reed's theory are *characteristic* and *leads to*. "Characteristic", in this case, means that the respondents mostly associated the concepts based on the features, which characterized the concepts, while "leads to" indicates that the respondents associated the concepts based on the recalling process of the external environment or mental knowledge of the respondents through the concepts.

Furthermore, most common responses based on Palmer's theory of paradigmatic or sense relations other than componential analysis are *hyponymy* and *metaphor*. The retrieval of literal or transferred meanings of the concepts encourage the respondents to produce this type of paradigmatic or sense relations.

On the other hand, concerning the assumption on the vocabulary storage of L1 and L2 in LTM, the result of the hypothesis test of this study leads the writer to a conclusion which is very contrast to the previous expectation. The assumption that L1 vocabulary storage is bigger than that of L2, and that it is expected to produce higher valency can not be reached and proven in this study. The result of the hypothesis test of this study forces the writer to conclude that it is, in fact, the valency of L2 vocabulary items which is bigger

than that of L1. It means, the valency of Indonesian vocabulary items is smaller than that of the valency of English vocabulary items. Of course, such conclusion leaves a broadening question. It needs to conduct further studies to find out the more acceptable reason of the rejection of  $H_0$  and the acceptance of  $H_1$ . Unfortunately the writer is unable provide all in this study because of the limited time of this study.

## REFERENCES