

# STRATEGY OF LEARNING VOCABULARY AND THE STUDENTS' VOCABULARY MASTERY

Ahmad Lalu Zainuddin Alfani<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Alfian Zuhairi, M.Pd<sup>2</sup>, Eko Suhartoyo,  
S.Pd., M.Pd<sup>3</sup>

Universitas Islam Malang<sup>1,2,3</sup>

laluahmadalfani@gmail.com<sup>1</sup>, alfian.zuhairi@unisma.ac.id<sup>2</sup>

**Abstract:** Vocabulary is an important factor in language learning that considered as the blocks of a language and without vocabulary, expressing the intended meaning is impossible. Therefore, it is necessary to learn vocabulary as basic need of learning language. Therefore the researcher aims to explore the students' vocabulary learning strategies and vocabulary mastery. This study implements quantitative research with questionnaire and web-based vocabulary test as the instrument. The data for this research are collected from 81 students of English department from University of Islam Malang. The data was collected from the result of online questionnaire using google form, the questionnaire is adapted from Gu (2018) and web based vocabulary test are from <http://testmyvocab.com> by Wittgenstein (2016). The data analyzed using SPSS 21 using pearson correlation and independent sample t test. The study used quantitative Pearson correlation and independent sample t test to analyses the data. The result of the study shows a significant and strong relationship between vocabulary learning strategies and vocabulary size, this indicated that the more vocabulary learning strategies implemented by students, the better their vocabulary size. Moreover, the study also indicated that there is a significant difference between high and low achiever students in vocabulary learning strategies, especially in determination and memorization strategies. But the result shows no significant difference in cognitive and metacognitive strategies. The result also shows that high achiever students are higher in all aspects of vocabulary learning strategies.

**Key Words:** Listening skill, extensive listening, activities.

## INTRODUCTION

Mulai dengan teori tentang vocabulary, terus diskripsikan dengan learning vocabulary dan learning strategies of vocabulary), tulis gap dan kontribusinya keapda teori VLS dan V Masterynya

Vocabulary is a vital element of language that plays a significant role in determining the mastery of other language skills. Vocabulary is described as the blocks of language building as it labels object, action, idea without proper knowledge of vocabulary, people cannot express the intended meaning (Nation, 2006). Xia (2018) also claimed that expressing the meaning without vocabulary is not possible, nevertheless conveying the meaning without grammar might be possible. Moreover, Janitra, (2020) stated that Vocabulary is the most essential element in every language and mastering vocabulary comes first before to the learners continue to learn four English skills. According to Nation (2006) learners need to know at least 6,000 to 7,000 common and word families to comprehend spoken English and 8,000 to 9,000-word families to understand written English material. In addition, Webb and Chang (2012) suggested that understanding 3,000 word families might be enough to understand of spoken language, it is indicates that most learners in the (EFL) context are have difficulties to learn 3,000 words let alone 8,000 to 9,000 words. This proposes the significance of finding new ways to fill the needs of vocabulary growth for target language. Based on Schmitt (2010), vocabulary is an indispensable constituent of language, that makes the new words learning as a crucial component of language teaching. Furthermore, Webb and Nation (2017) stated that acquiring new vocabulary through exposure to large quantities of comprehensible L2 input in various types of material might yields stronger potency in increasing the growth of target language vocabulary.

Learning vocabulary does not only about understand the meaning of a word but also understanding its spelling, and knowing how to pronounce, collocations and relevance (Nation, 2001). Major problems regarding Indonesian students regarding to English vocabulary teaching and learning are vocabulary classroom-limited activity, vocabulary is too vast to be learnt only within the classroom activity that is limited to context, learning period and exposures (Damari, 2019). Inadequate practice of English in daily communication by Indonesian learners might results insufficient

English exposure to language use and lack of input, resulting in lack and limited mastery of word meaning (Moir & Nation, 2002). In regards to the EFL learning, like English learning in Indonesia, the capability of learners' language mastery is about identifying English words, understanding its meanings, and suitably implement the vocabulary in contextual use is unavoidable but also difficult (Lestari,2020). In regards to this problem, Nunan (2000) suggested that it is important to expose the learner with vocabulary outside the school, allowing them to learn independently.

According to Benson (2001), learner's autonomy is the ability to carry out one's own learning without the direct influence of the teacher in the learning process. Moreover, Nunan (2000) supports that independent learner learns autonomously beyond classroom, teacher's instruction or books. However, Tuan (2011) points out that autonomous learners does not necessarily absent from any dependencies on information or sources, instead it means being conscious of using sources independently. Additionally, Nation (2001) stated that it is very prominent to foreign language learning well as more prospects for language learning in a non-native language environment. In regards to this, Tuan (2011) stated that learner autonomy allows students to learn vocabulary independently and gives the learner privileges such as motivation and flexibility which leads to further effective language and vocabulary learning, as autonomous vocabulary acquisition. Janitra (2020) added that, students might encounter difficulties in deciding the right material that suits their level of proficiency, thus, the role of teacher in planning and monitoring as well as the evaluation is still necessary.

There are several vocabulary learning strategies, according to Moir and Nation (2002) memorization strategies such as drills and memorizing vocabulary directly. Moreover, Schmitt (1997) also mentioned determination strategies that are used when students discover the meaning of a new word without using the experience of another person. In this strategy, students try to guess and discover the meaning of the new words with the help of context, structural knowledge and reference material.

Moreover, Web and Chang (2012) divided vocabulary learning strategies into cognitive and meta cognitive strategies. Cognitive strategies are one type of learning strategy that learners use in order to learn more successfully. These include repetition, organising new language, summarising meaning, guessing meaning from context, using imagery for memorisation, while Metacognitive strategies relate to how learners control their learning processes and manage tasks by 'planning, monitoring, and evaluating both language use and language learning.

English vocabulary is complex and unique to every single person, with three main aspects related to form, meaning, and use, as well as layers of meaning connected to the roots of individual words, therefore, teaching vocabulary is not just about words; it involves lexical phrases and knowledge of English vocabulary and how to go about learning and teaching it. (Nation & Meara, 2010). Previous study by Nie and Zhou (2017) attempt to identify various strategies in vocabulary learning applied by outstanding English learners and also attempts to identify the correlation between the quantity of strategies implemented in vocabulary learning and the mastery of vocabulary. result shows that the level excellent language learners' vocabulary inclined in a positive proportion to the quantity of strategies used in vocabulary learning. The most common metacognitive strategies are selective attention and the cognitive strategies are recurrence and the social mediation strategies that the learners have is self-stimulation. All the three English learners implement a variation of strategies in language learning including social meditation. metacognitive, and cognitive strategies. Moreover, Haddad (2016) explore the use of learner autonomy in English vocabulary learning context for language students. It also suggests the significance of autonomy in vocabulary learning strategies. The result shows that reading plays a vital role in vocabulary development, and teachers act as facilitator by teaching strategies for independently vocabulary learning, including the application of reference works, such as dictionary and books to explore

the connection between spelling and vocabulary learning seems to be effective way to develop students vocabulary.

Considering the result of the prior studies, this study aims to investigate the correlation between vocabulary learning strategies and vocabulary size as well as investigating the difference between high and low achiever students in terms of the implementation of four vocabulary learning strategies that includes, memorization, determination, cognitive and metacognitive vocabulary learning strategies.

## **METHOD**

This study conducted by applying quantitative method. In this study the researcher chose correlational quantitative research model to describe the correlation between vocabulary learning strategies and vocabulary size as well as to describe the difference between high and low achiever students in implementing vocabulary learning strategies. The data were collected using online questionnaire via google form with multiple choice questions to get the data from the participants for further data analysis for the presentation in the finding. The data analysis was carried out using SPSS descriptive statistic to grasp the data of students' vocabulary learning strategies. The researcher also uses split data to compare high and low achiever students then use SPSS bivariate correlation to measure the correlation between two variables. The data of this study taken from students fifth semester students from English department students at University of Islam Malang. The sampling of the research will be random sampling as the population covers all classes in fifth semester.

To collect the data, the researcher used questionnaire about vocabulary learning strategies and web based vocabulary test to collect the size of students' vocabulary. Moreover, the researcher also implements online vocabulary mastery test through online test using <http://testmyvocab.com> by Wittgenstein (2016) to get the students vocabulary size. This method is chosen is due to each individual have

different assortments of vocabulary, therefore the researcher believe that testing vocabulary based on own's vocabulary assortments in not a valid way to measure other people vocabulary capacity. In regards to the instrument about vocabulary learning strategies, the researcher adapted the instrument fom Gu (2018), the instrument development is by tryout process and selecting suitable items from 62 items and the researcher sorted into 50 items. The instruments are distributed to 128 students as the population of the study.

Data collection was carried out by using questionnaires adapted from Gu (2018) related to students' strategies in vocabulary learning as well as vocabulary learning test distributed from the link provided by the researcher to the participants after completing vocabulary learning strategies questionnaire. The researcher administered the questionnaire through online media of Google form and link due to Covid-19 pandemic and consideration of social distancing to ensure health and safety for both researcher and participants. The data were collected from three classes of fifth semester students. The data analyzed by using SPSS 2.1. At first, the researcher use descriptive statistic to get the data of students' vocabulary learning strategies. Secondly, the researcher split data based on students' achievements in four English skills. The next step is analyzing the correlation between students' achievements and vocabulary size using bivariate correlation two tailed.

## **FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

The results of this study are acquired through data collection and data analysis which aimed to answer the research question. The data were collected from students' response in online form about the relationship between students' vocabulary size and vocabulary learning strategies. The intended number of participants as sample is 50 and during the data collection the researcher received 81 responses. The result is presented in the following descriptive statistic.

| Descriptive Statistic |    |         |         |         |               |
|-----------------------|----|---------|---------|---------|---------------|
|                       | N  | Minimum | Mazimum | Mean    | Std.Deviation |
| VMastery              | 81 | 2690    | 16200   | 8260,74 | 3489,228      |
| Vstrategy             | 81 | 2,42    | 4,44    | 3,7983  | ,40341        |
| Valid N (listwise)    | 81 |         |         |         |               |

**Table 4.1 The descriptive statistic of students' vocabulary size and learning strategies**

The result in descriptive statistic shows that the number of participants consists of 81 students (N=81), The students score of vocabulary size shows the mean of 8260.74 with the minimum score of 2690 and maximum score of 16200 as well as standard deviation of 3489.228. In terms of vocabulary learning strategies, the mean is 3.7963 with the score ranging from 2.42 to 4.44 and the standard deviation of 0.40341. The data shown in the descriptive statistic then further analyzed using Pearson Product Moment Correlation. The two-tailed indicator was used based on the need to confirm the hypothesis from this research. The result is presented as follows.

| Correlation |                 |          |           |
|-------------|-----------------|----------|-----------|
|             |                 | VMastery | VStrategy |
| VMastery    | Pearson         | 1        | ,775**    |
|             | Correlation     |          |           |
|             | Sig. (2-tailed) |          | ,000      |
|             | N               | 81       | 81        |
| VStrategy   | Pearson         | ,775**   | 1         |
|             | Correlation     | ,000     |           |
|             | Sig. (2-tailed) |          |           |
|             | N               | 81       | 81        |

**Figure 4.2 The correlation between vocabulary size and learning strategies**

From the figure 4.2, it can be seen that there is a positive correlation between vocabulary size and vocabulary learning strategies, since the value is at  $r = 0.775^{**}$  with the level of significance of 0.000 which indicates that the two variables are strongly correlated at  $< 0.01$ . Moreover, the statistic shows that the low achiever students are higher in number with 47 students than those of high achiever with 34 students. In answering the first research problem, the researcher found strong, positive and significant relationship between vocabulary learning strategies and

vocabulary mastery. Therefore, alternative hypothesis (Ha1) is confirmed and it can be assumed that “The better students’ vocabulary learning strategies are the better their vocabulary size.”. The result is congruent with the result of the study conducted by Damari (2019) that shows lower frequency of high achiever students. The data also shows that high achiever students utilize more strategies in learning vocabulary. This indicated that vocabulary learning strategies does influence language learning achievements. This is in line with Gu and Johnson (1996) who also found positive effect of learning strategies used by the students to learn vocabulary towards learning outcomes in language learning. As stated by Webb and Nation (2017) that the students’ use of strategies and preference in vocabulary learning determines how vocabulary is learned.

In terms of the strong correlation coefficient between vocabulary learning strategies and vocabulary mastery with the score of 0.775 shows that the implementation of vocabulary learning strategies highly contribute in the development of vocabulary mastery. This is in line with the study of Ghazal (2011) that also found very significant correlation between vocabulary learning in EFL context and vocabulary learning strategies. Moreover, this result is supported by the statement by Damari (2019) that vocabulary learning strategies helps the learners to utilize learning strategies suitable for their own specific needs. This result is also congruent with Nie and Zhou (2017) who found that exceptional language learner’s level of vocabulary is positively related to the quantity of implemented vocabulary learning strategies. Moreover, this also in line with Nation (2001) that stated to learn vocabulary effectively it is necessary for the learner to select suitable strategies that fits their own capability.

In terms of significant difference, it is found that high achiever students are dominant in the mean score of all aspects of vocabulary learning strategies. However, the significant value is only found in determination and memorization strategies. The

two-tailed indicator was used based on the need to confirm the hypothesis from this research. The result is presented as follows.

| <b>Group Statistics</b> |               |    |        |                |                 |
|-------------------------|---------------|----|--------|----------------|-----------------|
|                         | Achiever      | N  | Mean   | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Memorization            | High Achiever | 34 | 4,0501 | ,40471         | ,06941          |
|                         | Low Achiever  | 47 | 3,5773 | ,51664         | ,07536          |
| Determination           | High Achiever | 34 | 4,1267 | ,24755         | ,04245          |
|                         | Low Achiever  | 47 | 3,5728 | ,41107         | ,05996          |
| Cognitive               | High Achiever | 34 | 4,0588 | ,33111         | ,05678          |
|                         | Low Achiever  | 47 | 3,5609 | ,45428         | ,06626          |
| Meta-cognitive          | High Achiever | 34 | 4,0695 | ,28666         | ,04916          |
|                         | Low Achiever  | 47 | 3,6480 | ,33462         | ,04881          |

**Figure 4.3 The difference between high and low achiever students in learning strategies**

The figure 4.3 shows that there is significant difference between high achiever and low achiever students in vocabulary learning strategies. The data showed that there are 34 high achiever students and 47 mid to low achiever students. According to the data, high achiever students have higher mean score in all aspects of vocabulary learning strategies. This is in line with Damari (2019) that indicates significant difference between high achiever students in determination, memorization and cognitive strategies but not in metacognitive. Moreover, this is also in line with Noprianto and Purnawarman (2019) research, the most frequently used by students are determination strategies and the least frequently strategies are cognitive strategies. This result is also in line with the finding of the Haddad (2016) where determination strategies requires more support from the teacher and more facilities as the students might have difficulties in the application of reference works, and need more resources to connect vocabulary to the context and producing correct pronunciation correctly without the sufficient support from the facilities and the teacher. In terms of significant difference, the researcher found that high achiever score is higher than low achiever students in all strategies of learning vocabulary. the data are as follows.

### Independent Sample Test

|                |                         | F     | Sig. | T     | df     | Sig.(2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% confidence interval of the difference |             |
|----------------|-------------------------|-------|------|-------|--------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------|
|                |                         |       |      |       |        |                |                 |                       |                                           |             |
|                |                         |       |      |       |        |                |                 |                       |                                           | Lower Upper |
| Memorization   | Equal variances assumed | 5,947 | ,017 | 4,447 | 79     | ,000           | ,47368          | ,10652                | ,26166                                    | ,68569      |
|                | Equal variances assumed |       |      | 4,623 | 78,452 | ,000           | ,47368          | ,10245                | ,26973                                    | ,67762      |
| Determination  | Equal variances assumed | 4,234 | ,043 | 6,986 | 79     | ,000           | ,55387          | ,079928               | ,39607                                    | ,71166      |
|                | Equal variances assumed |       |      | 7,539 | 76,783 | ,000           | ,55387          | ,40756                | ,40756                                    | ,70017      |
| Cognitive      | Equal variances assumed | 3,212 | ,077 | 5,429 | 79     | ,000           | ,49790          | ,09172                | ,31533                                    | ,68046      |
|                | Equal variances assumed |       |      | 5,706 | 76,989 | ,000           | ,49790          | ,08727                | ,32420                                    | ,67159      |
| Meta-cognitive | Equal variances assumed | ,415  | ,521 | 5,935 | 79     | ,000           | ,42155          | ,07103                | ,28018                                    | ,56292      |
|                | Equal variances assumed |       |      | 6,085 | 76,675 | ,000           | ,42155          | ,06928                | ,28359                                    | ,55951      |

**Figure 4.4 Independent sample t test of vocabulary learning strategies**

According to the data, in term of memorization strategies, high achiever students are dominant with the mean difference of 0.47368, and for determination strategies the high achiever leads at 0.55387 mean difference, in terms of cognitive and metacognitive strategies, high achiever also dominant at mean difference of 0.49750 for cognitive and 0.42155 for meta cognitive strategies.

In answering the second research problem, the researcher found significant difference between high and low achiever in vocabulary learning strategies that includes memorization, determination, cognitive and meta cognitive strategies. It is found that high achiever students have higher score in all learning strategies with the significance lower than 0.01. Moreover, the study shows significant difference between high and low achiever students in memorization and determination strategies, but in terms of cognitive and meta cognitive strategies, there is no significant difference between high and low achiever students. Therefore, alternative hypothesis (Ha2) is confirmed and it can be assumed that “There is significant difference between vocabulary learning strategies of high and low achiever students.” Moreover, it might have more potential for these strategies to be implemented in teaching vocabulary for instance, memorization strategies that have been widely

practiced at schools can be improved by giving instruction to the students to apply memorization outside the school from any English sources they like. For cognitive strategies. According to Yang (2012), traditional memorization strategies have common limitation in a long-term retention, most learners remember to the extent of classroom activities. Moreover, Sozler (2012) stated that extensive vocabulary learning is important for effective memorization of words as it easier for the students to memorize vocabulary from their own preferred sources. In this case, this strategy can be improved for a long-term retention by giving the students' instruction to memorize vocabularies from any English sources they prefer.

In term of cognitive strategies, the teacher can teach their students on how to pay attention to the detail in identifying new vocabularies such as identification of context, tone, concept and setting. Yao (2020) stated that teaching cognitive strategies requires three steps, those are attention, cognition and output. Moreover, Setiadi (2012) found that the cognitive processes practiced by students are mostly cognition that involves paying attention to detail and interpretation of main idea to guess new vocabulary. Regarding to meta-cognitive vocabulary strategies, the teacher can teach how to manage their vocabulary learning from planning, monitoring and evaluation by noting difficult words, and taking note on their learning progress. According to Solano (2020) meta-cognitive strategies allows the students to control thinking and learning decision related to the development of their own learning. Moreover, Entesari and Zohrabi (2016) stated that teaching vocabulary can be implemented effectively by facilitating students to take control of their own learning.

The result of this study is congruent with the first previous study by Nie and Zhou (2017) in terms that the use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies contributes to the vocabulary learning results. This supports the finding of this study as the high achiever students implements more those strategies and get more satisfactory result compared to the low achiever students. However, the difference is Nie and Zhou (2017) did not mention memorization strategies despite of its wide use

in classroom setting and the previous study also did not mention determination strategies that is considered as independent learning strategies that mostly done when the students learns vocabulary outside the classroom. Moreover, the result is also different with the second previous study by Haddad (2016) that focuses more on teaching and how the teacher facilitates students in their vocabulary learning, and the strategies that the teacher teach is only about memorization and determination strategies and how to facilitates them well.

This implicates that these kinds of strategies can benefit vocabulary learning. In term of memorization strategies, Schmitt (2008) frequent L2 vocabulary, are very effective for learning new vocabulary as it involves procreative use, perceiving and retrieval that are helpful for effective memorization of vocabulary. Moreover, in term of cognitive and determination strategies, Schmitt (2010) stated that cognitive process and determination is necessary to carry out implicit learning, which allows the learners to comprehend written and spoken word and identify its contextual use successfully. In term of meta-cognitive strategies, Barcroft (2007) mentioned that retrieval is meta-cognitive process of accessing stored information during the encounter of new words, by the indication of prior knowledge via retrieval, the learner might enhance their contextual understanding and and eases the retention of new words.

## **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS**

The result indicated that there is significant correlation between vocabulary learning strategies and vocabulary size which is in line with the theory and previous studies that indicated vocabulary size is determined by learning strategies. Moreover, the study also indicated that there is significant difference between high and low achiever students in vocabulary learning strategies especially in determination and memorization strategies. But high achiever students are higher in all aspects of vocabulary learning strategies. Consideration the conclusion of the study, the researcher suggested for the students learning vocabulary to select suitable learning

strategies to suits their needs. Moreover, for instructors, it is suggested to introduce the students with vocabulary learning strategies for them to utilize based on their needs. And for the next researchers it is suggested based on the limitation of the study is to get equal quantity of sample from high and low achiever students. Moreover, this study also limited to the data that is dominated by female students, therefore, the researcher suggests to sort the gender in equal number,

## REFERENCES

- Barcroft, J. (2007). Effect of opportunities for word retrieval during second language vocabulary learning. *Language Learning*, 57(1), 35–56. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00398.x
- Benson, S.I. (2001). *Freedom, autonomy and the concept of the person*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Damari, T.P (2019). *A Survey of Vocabulary Learning Strategies in Madrasah Aliyah*. Unpublished Thesis. Islamic University of Indonesia.
- Entesari, E., Zohrabi, M (2016). Metacognitive Strategy Preference in Vocabulary Learning among Iranian EFL Learners. *International Journal on Studies of English Language and Literature*, 4(3). 44-49
- Ghazal, L. (2011). Learning Vocabulary In Efl Contexts Through Vocabulary Learning Strategies, *Novitas-ROYAL*, Vol.: 1(2), pp.84-91. ISSN: 1307-4733
- Gu, Y., & Johnson, R. K. (1996). Vocabulary learning strategies and language learning outcomes. *Language Learning*, 46, 643–697.
- Janitra, T. I., (2020) Exploring Autonomous and Self-Regulation in Vocabulary learning. *Journal of Education and Learning*, Vol. 15 (28) 2020. [riset.unisma.ac.id/Index.php/jp3/article/view/9774](http://riset.unisma.ac.id/Index.php/jp3/article/view/9774).
- Lestari (2020) Vocabulary Learning Autonomy through Incorporation of English Songs: Indonesian EFL Students' Perspectives, *The Southeast Asian Journal*

of English Language Studies – Vol 26(2): 94 – 104  
<http://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2020-2602-07>

Moir, J., & Nation, I. S. P. (2002). Learners' use of strategies for effective vocabulary learning. *Prospect Journal*, 17, 15–35.

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). Learning vocabulary in another language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Nation, I. S. P. (2006). How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63,1 –12.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.63.1.59>.

Nation, I. S., & Webb, S. A. (2011). Researching and analyzing vocabulary. Heinle: Cengage Learning

Nunan, D. (2000). Autonomy in Language Learning. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press. Professional Series. (33-42). New York, NY: Routledge.

Schmitt, N. (2010) Researching Vocabulary: A Vocabulary Research Manual, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Solano, P.C (2020). Using Visual Vocabulary App as a Metacognitive Strategy in EFL Learning: A Case of Pre-service Teachers. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 18(12)

Sozler, S. (2012). The Effect of Memory Strategy Training on Vocabulary Development of Austrian Secondary School Students. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46(8)

Tuan, L.T. (2011). An Empirical Research on Self-learning Vocabulary. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 12, pp. 1688-1695, December 2011© 2011 ACADEMY PUBLISHER Manufactured in Finland.  
doi:10.4304/tpls.1.12.1688-1695

Webb, S. A. , & Chang, A. C-S, (2012). Second language vocabulary growth. *RELC Journal*, 43, 113–126. doi: 10.1177/0033688212439367

- Yang, W. (2012). Vocabulary Memorizing Strategies by Chinese University Students. *International Education Studies*, Vol. 5(1)
- Yao, L. Cognitive Process of English Learners in Vocabulary Learning. *Revista Argentina Clinica Psicologica*, Vol.29 No. 2

Malang, January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2022

Advisor I,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a large loop followed by a horizontal line and a vertical stroke.

**Dr. Alfian Zuhairi, M.Pd**

**NIP/NPP.0729096501**