

The Effectiveness of Focus on Forms and Focus on Form Instruction on Productive Vocabulary Knowledge

Welda Yusriana
SMPN 15 Banjarbaru
Email Address: Welda14@gmail.com

Abstract

The aim of the study was to investigate the effectiveness of Focus on Forms (FonFs) and Focus on Form (FonF) instruction on productive vocabulary knowledge. Being designed in quasi-experimental, 65 students in the classes of the first grade of junior high school were divided into two different groups receiving different instruction. FonFs group as Experimental group receiving instruction through present-practice-produce (PPP) task, while Control (FonF) group receiving instruction through Dictogloss task. These two groups were proved on the different level of productive vocabulary knowledge before treatment by the score of productive vocabulary level test, the scores than became pretest score. After the treatment, a set of test was given to get the posttest score. To achieve the purpose of this study, the scores of the productive vocabulary test then analyzed using ANCOVA in SPSS 20. The result of this study indicated that FonFs affected perfectly on students' productive vocabulary knowledge ability. It concluded that Form-Focused instruction is claimed to be indispensable for productive vocabulary knowledge.

Keywords: focus on instruction of forms, productive vocabulary knowledge

One of the knowledge areas in language is vocabulary. It plays a great role for learners in acquiring a language. The significant of vocabulary on language learning are found by many researchers, who is appreciate that the skill in vocabulary is important for key success in second or foreign language and play as the main role to complete spoken and written texts. For English as a foreign language (EFL), learning vocabulary components plays a vital role in all language skills (i.e. reading, speaking, listening, and writing).

In accordance with teaching vocabulary, the problem has arisen when learner learn a new word especially new word in English, as has been occurred at the school where many students actually know the meaning of the word while written form has been ignored and vice versa. Students should do not use the word accurately. However, the accuracy is one of the important aspects to use a new language. The accuracy of meaning and written

form of the word is necessary especially in writing skill, in English, one word has multiple meaning and sometimes the written form of its word has a similar letter but in a different position and different meaning (i.e. sneak = snake, bare = bear, etc.). Furthermore, to avoid that problem, an appropriate approach and instruction in teaching and learning vocabulary is a need.

In general, there are many kinds of approaches and instruction that teacher can use in teaching a second or foreign language, one of them is Form-Focused instruction. Form-focused instruction divided into FonF instruction (focus-on-form) and FonFs (focus-on-forms) instruction. In FonF instruction, linguistics structure taught within a communicative task environment and involved accidental learning while FonFs instruction involved intentional learning and linguistics structure taught in the separate lesson in a sequence determined by syllabus writers. In other words, in FonF instruction second language learner unconsciously learn the language knowledge during their communicative language task while learner those who in FonFs instruction consciously learn the language knowledge into a discrete item and should be taught one by one at one time.

Furthermore, many kinds of research on Form-Focused instruction (FonF and FonFs) conducted mainly in teaching grammar. However, the study in teaching vocabulary is rare. Based on that consideration, this recent study is conducted to examine whether Form-Focused instruction also has a positive contribution to teaching vocabulary.

FonFs and FonF instruction have not accepted much attention to research about vocabulary. A reason can indicate in the rigid belief from many educators related to the default hypothesis in vocabulary learning, the idea is that many vocabularies in the second language obtained from the input, mainly reading. Researchers who really believe in skill acquisition and also support FonFs have claimed that vocabulary acquired mainly through meaning-centered instruction. DeKeyser (1998) stated that pronunciation is quietly unusual matter, which is immune to all but the most concern is form-focused treatment, whereas large amounts of vocabulary can be gotten with very little focus on form.

Nowadays, no studies conducted FonFs and FonF in vocabulary learning. However, some studies report comparing the effect of these instructions (FonF and FonFs) on vocabulary acquisition, or with different participants of the study.

There were about an investigation on vocabulary learning by the use of word banks, online dictionaries, concordances, cloze exercises, hypertexts, and self-quizzes by Horst, Cobb, and Nicolae (2005). They found many of the practiced words learned to disturb receptively and productively. The participants in the studies mentioned above were high-school learners, as well as both low and forceful university students. The result showed that most learners could get the benefit from FonFs instruction, contrary to what many proponents of communicative language teaching.

De la Fuente (2006) conducted a study by comparing FonFs instruction through Present-Practice-Produce (PPP) task and FonF instruction and involved college students in the elementary Spanish classroom. The invention of his research showed the deliberation of meaning, the productivity of the target word, and online retrieval of the new word from the learner was improved by using FonF instruction than using PPP task. However, that result only assessed the acquisition by using a discrete-point test. Although the differences of research findings might be occurred by extraneous variable, it might because of age, culture, motivation, mother language inferences, social economic level, place, and other factors.

Elsewhere, Laufer's research on comparing the effect of both approaches; FonFs and FonF on vocabulary mastery in Israel. Based on the findings, she suggested that FonFs instruction (intentional learning) is better than FonF instruction (incidental learning) for vocabulary acquisition. This may occur because FonFs instruction assert learners to note the word's forms.

Shintani (2013) compared the effects of input-based tasks with production-based activities on English concrete nouns. The participants were young beginning-level-learning. The FonF group listen-and-do task that challenged the learner to recognize and comprehend the purposed nouns while the FonFs group was taught using PPP (present-practice-produce) task. The vocabulary mastery was assessed by four tests (comprehension and the production in both discrete-item and task-based). The results published that both approaches were impacted learners' receptive and productive to the knowledge of vocabulary. Interestingly, she discovered the same level of product knowledge in the two groups, despite the significantly decreasing opportunities for output in the group input-based. She explained that FonFs group interaction consisted of Initiate-Respond-Feedback (IRF) while FonF group get involved in the negotiation of meaning initiated by the students. These studies have produced mixed results. This is not surprising, because they operationalized FonF and FonFs instruction in different ways.

Based on the problem at SMPN 15 Banjarbaru on previous explanation and the limitation of vocabulary studies on the effectivity of FonFs and FonF instruction on vocabulary teaching and learning, this study conducted to investigate the influence of FonFs and FonF instruction on vocabularies productivity knowledge. The subject of this study was junior high school students at Banjarbaru.

Method

Participant

Participants in this study were 65 Indonesian junior high school student whose groups were consisting of both males and females, with age 14-16, in beginning level learner.

Instruments

Productive vocabulary level test adapted by Nation (2008) and applied to estimate students' productive vocabulary ability. The pretest and posttest both are developed and used. Pretest and independent t-test developed to ensure the homogeneity of the groups before treatment. It consists of fill in the blank question in which learner was supposed to complete the missing letter and write the accurate written form of the word.

Procedure

In FonFs group as Experimental group, students involved in present-practice-produce phase, in which students followed teacher utterance of the new word before knowing the word meaning, wrote it in their notebook and made a sentence of it.

In FonF group as the control group, students involved in Dictogloss task, in this task teacher read a short passage containing new words three-time and at a normal fast to students. The students listened carefully and wrote the keywords as much as they listened. When the reading was incomplete, the students were divided into groups and reconstructed their keywords in order to make the passage as closely as possible to the original version.

Data Analysis

This study involved quasi-experimental design. The independent variables were FonFs and FonF instruction and the students' productive knowledge score in the posttest, is a dependent variable. ANCOVA analysis was used to clarify the research problem about the difference between the two different instructions.

Results

Independent t-test used to ensure the homogeneity of the two groups score in the pretest, the result confirmed that all students in the two group had significant differences in word knowledge.

Table.1 Independent t-test Result for Pretest scores in two groups

Levene's t-test for Equality of Means								
Test for Equality of Variances								
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower Upper
Equal Pretest variances assumed	750,390	,390	2,361	63	,021	9,60701	4,06937	1,4750317,73899

Equal
variances
not
assumed

2,36662,238,021 9,60701 4,06037 1,4910617,72296

After the treatment and administering the posttest, ANCOVA was conducted to see whether two groups were significantly different. The results of ANCOVA analyses revealed a significant difference between the two groups after treatment. See table.2. According to the table above, the Corrected model showed significance value of both groups on ($0.000 < 0.05$) that means independent variables (FonFs and FonF instruction) simultaneously affected students' productive vocabulary ability. Pretest significance value is on $0.00 < 0.05$ means the pretest influenced productive vocabulary knowledgeability significantly. Finally, the Significance of the Group (FonFs&FonF instruction) is on $0.019 < 0.05$ means that FonFs and FonF instruction also affected students' productive vocabulary knowledgeability.

To identify which instructional approaches produced the significant results means score from both groups compared. The FonFs group has higher means score then FonF group.

Table. 2 ANCOVA Analysis
Dependent Variable: Posttest

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	8942.127 ^a	2	4471.064	29.978	.000	.492
Intercept	10953.075	1	10953.075	73.440	.000	.542
Pretest	6057.203	1	6057.203	40.613	.000	.396
Group	858.163	1	858.163	5.754	.019	.085
Error	9246.857	62	149.143			
Total	393781.000	65				
Corrected Total	18188.985	64				

a. R Squared = .492 (Adjusted R Squared = .475)

Discussion

This research inquired into the effectiveness of two kinds of instruction concern on Forms and Form (FonF). The result of this study indicated that learners in FonFs group achieved significantly higher scores than the FonF group.

This research investigated the effectivity of FonFs and FonF instruction on productive vocabulary knowledge by junior high school. Although the productive vocabulary ability in both groups was not similar before the treatment, the Form-Focused

(FonFs and FonF) teaching was found affected productive vocabulary knowledge by junior high school.

The findings of this study further strengthen the theory of skill acquisition has drawn by Anderson (1983). The theory states that the acquisition of a second language will be more optimal by converting declarative knowledge become procedural knowledge through practicing the particular linguistics form. Therefore, drill-like practice is insufficient, learners require to use second language under real circumstance, example in the performance of a communicative task.

There are previous studies related to this research result. Laufer (2006) conducted research which compare the effect of FonF through the task of reading and FonFs through exercises on the acquisition of new English vocabulary from second-grade students in Israel. Results showed that the FonFs group outperformed the FonF group. Laufer claimed FonFs instruction is to be indispensable for L2 vocabulary learning. Fuente (2006) appeal PPP task used (FonFs) with Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT; FonF) from university students in the level of an elementary Spanish classroom. The result confirmed that two conditions were equally effective for vocabulary learning. He said that instruction of TBLT presented more opportunities to the meaning negotiation, the productivity of the target words, and retrieval of target words for online than the instruction of PPP. Shintani (2013) investigated the effect of FonFs and FonF instruction to the output of nouns and adjective of young Learners in Japanese who finished their beginners' level. The result of the study explained that both types of instruction were good for acquiring the vocabulary. Furthermore, the relation between this research and those previous studies was both vocabulary instruction (FonF and FonFs) was successfully affected L2 learner vocabulary mastery.

Form-focused instruction (FonFs and FonF) also gives choices for teacher to choose. First, teacher has to choose particular language forms to be taught. Teachers explore issues related to the importance of the forms in the input, its function on communicative field, its difficulties implication of the rules by corresponding with learner ability and the students readiness will to be regarded. Second, the teacher need to be choose an appropriate approach, teacher have to prepare some anticipation of students difficulties and have to know the previous design of the learning activity in the classroom. Third, because Form-focused instruction vary in how explicit or implicit they are, it's the teacher capability to choose among the various techniques available.

Furthermore, FonFs instruction elevates student concentration on all formal aspects of the vocabulary and provides immediate feedback, which is a learner is doing an error during the language learning situation, the teacher can correct an error right away. Then the learners know their mistakes as soon as possible and correct them immediately. By implementing both instructions, according to the crop of this research, it can inferred that

the teacher can stimulate learners' productive knowledge and generally enrich students' productive vocabulary knowledge. FonFs instruction improved the students' confidence in their writing because they have already known of the word meaning and the written form.

Conclusion

After analyzing the data, the researcher draws a conclusion related to the problems of this research; Do FonFs and FonF instruction affect learners' productive vocabulary knowledge of junior high school as there was a significant difference of learners' productive vocabulary knowledge mastery before and after using FonFs and FonF instruction. It can conclude that the FonFs and FonF instruction is effective to enhance learners' vocabulary mastery. In addition the result of the data analysis of this study suggest that FonFs instruction that involved intentional learning is superior on productive vocabulary knowledgethan FonF instruction, at least for junior high school.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. R. (1983). *The architecture of cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- De la Fuente, M. J. (2006). *Classroom L2 Vocabulary Acquisition: investigating the role of pedagogical tasks and form-focused instruction*. *Language teaching research*, 10, 263-295. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1362168806lr196oa>
- DeKeyser, R. M. 2007. *Practice in a second language: Perspective from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Laufer, B. 2006. Comparing Focus on Form and Focus on Forms in second Language Vocabulary Learning. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63, 149-166. Doi:10.3138/cmlr.63.1.149
- Nation, I. 2008. *Teaching Vocabulary: Strategies and Techniques*. Boston USA: Sherrise Roehr.
- Shintani, N. 2013. The Effect of Focus on Form and Focus on Forms Instruction on the Acquisition of Productive Knowledge of L2 Vocabulary by Young Beginning-Level Learners. *TESOL QUARTERLY*, 47(1) doi:10.1177/136216881038869