

THE USE OF HOMOPHONES AMONG UPPER
SECONDARY MALAY STUDENTS

ASHA LATHA A/P B.S. MANIAM

A dissertation submitted in partial
fulfilment of the requirement for the
Degree of Master of Modern Languages

Faculty of Languages and Linguistics

University of Malaya

Kuala Lumpur

1999

Perpustakaan Universiti Malaya



A509839607

Acknowledgement

Knowledge always desires increase;
it is like fire, which must first be
kindled by some external agent, but
which will afterwards propagate itself.

(Johnson)

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to the following people who have been the “external agent” that kindled the fire within me to quench my thirst for knowledge and who have made it possible for me to complete this dissertation:

- . My mother and father
- . Mara Institute of Technology, Shah Alam
- . Ms Jagdish Kaur – my supervisor
- . The staff and students of Sek. Men. Taman Medan,
Old Klang Road (especially Pn. Hema Latha, the former Head of
the English Department)
- . Pn. Azura Razak
- . Ramani Ganesan
- . Reshna Reem Ganesan

Abstract

Lexis can be defined as the vocabulary of a language in contrast to its grammar. In the English language class, greater emphasis has always been placed on grammar. The finer points of language involving lexical items like homophones which require higher order thinking are not usually exploited.

The researcher has chosen to do a study of the use of homophones among upper secondary Malay students, specifically the ability of these students to understand and distinguish homophones lexically and semantically. In this study only 20 pairs of homophones have been tested. They were chosen randomly based on the lexical items in the curriculum specifications taught to the upper secondary Malay students of Sekolah Menengah Taman Medan, Petaling Jaya. Some of the objectives of this study are to identify the homophones which are correctly and incorrectly used by these students, to obtain quantitative data vis-a-vis the former, to establish the level of difficulty of the various homophones tested, to categorize the types of errors and to identify the causes of these errors. The Error Analysis framework was used to analyse these errors in tandem with Semantic Theories.

From the four tests administered, it is possible to discern that most of these students do not understand these homophones or their correct usage in a given context. Thus, they are generally ignorant of the existence of such finer elements of the language. There is also obviously a lack of exposure to such words.

Most of the errors recorded were intralingual errors. Many of the homophone errors were local or global errors that rendered the erroneous sentences nonsensical, awkward and totally distorted in meaning.

It can be concluded that homophones are definitely difficult language items for many of the Malay students in this research. Therefore, English language teachers need to emphasize the meaning, form and function of lexical items such as homophones.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement	i
Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vii

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Statement of the Problem	
1.1.1 The English Language in Pre-Independent Malaya and Post-Independent Malaya	1
1.1.2 The Current Status of English in the Malaysian Education Domain	2
1.1.3 English Language Competency and Proficiency Among Malaysian Students	3
1.2 Background to the Study	7
1.2.1 Lexis	7
1.2.2 Words	9
1.2.3 Meanings	10
1.2.4 Different kinds of Meaning	11
1.3 The Importance of Homophones in the Learning of English	13
1.4 Homophones	15
1.5 The Homophones Investigated in this Study	18
1.6 The Pilot Study	20
1.7 Types of Errors Made by Students in the Pilot Study	23
1.8 Significance of the Study	25
1.9 Limitations of the Pilot Study	26
1.10 Objectives of the Study	27

Chapter 2 Literature Review

2.0 Introduction	28
2.1 Second Language (L2) Learning and Acquisition	28
2.1.1 The Importance of Lexis in L2 Acquisition /Learning	30
2.2 Semantic Theory and L2 Lexical Development	32

2.2.1	Theories of Lexical Semantics	32
2.2.2	Katz's Semantic Theory	33
2.2.3	The Jackendoff Theory	34
2.2.4	The Fuzziness of Word-Meaning	36
2.3	Cross-Linguistic Differences in Word-Meaning Perception	39
2.4	Theoretical Framework	41
2.4.1	Introduction	41
2.4.2	Errors	41
2.4.3	Errors in Second Language Acquisition	42
2.5	Error Analysis	43
2.6	Types of Errors	44
2.6.1	Intralingual Errors	44
2.6.2	Interlingual Errors	46
2.6.3	Global and Local Errors	46
2.7	Studies of Lexical Errors in L2 Acquisition	46
2.7.1	Studies of Lexical Errors in L2 Acquisition in Malaysia and South East Asia	48
2.8	The Study of Homophones Using the EA Framework	52

Chapter 3 Research Design and Methodology

3.0	Introduction	53
3.1	Methodology	54
3.1.1	Data Collection	55
3.1.2	Sample Respondents	55
3.1.3	Test Instruments	55
3.1.3.1	Test 1	56
3.1.3.2	Test 2	56
3.1.3.3	Test 3	56
3.1.3.4	Test 4	57
3.1.4	Administration of the Test Instruments	57
3.1.5	The Homophones Tested	58
3.1.6	Questionnaire	60

Chapter 4 Data Analysis

4.0 Introduction	61
4.1 Analysis of Test Results	62
4.1.1 Analysis of Test 1 Results	62
4.1.2 Analysis of Test 2 Results	65
4.1.3 Analysis of Test 3 Results	68
4.1.4 Analysis of Test 4 Results	71
4.2 Analysis of the Use of Each Homophone	76
4.3 Types of Errors	87
4.4 Causes of Errors	89

Chapter 5 Pedagogical Suggestions and Conclusion

5.0 Summary	92
5.1 Pedagogical Implications	93
5.2 Conclusion	99

Bibliography **100**

Appendix A - Pilot Test 1	104
Pilot Test 2	107
Pilot Test 3	111
Appendix B - Test 1	114
Test 2	116
Test 3	119
Test 4	121
Appendix C - Questionnaire	127
Appendix D - The Homophone Page	130
Appendix E - Enrichment Exercises	141

List of Tables

Table 1	The Characteristics of Ambiguous Words	17
Table 2	List of Homophones and the Grammatical Classes They Belong to	19
Table 3	The Structure of the Pilot Test	20
Table 4	Homophones Tested in Pilot Study	21
Table 5	Frequency of Errors in the Use of Homophones in the Pilot Tests	22
Table 6	KBSM Syllabus for the English Language	26
Table 7	Krashen's Monitor Hypothesis	30
Table 8	Jackendoff's Preference Rule Framework	38
Table 9	Labov's Cup and Bowl Concept	38
Table 10	Homophones and the Tests in which They Appear	58
Table 11(a)	Percentage of Correct and Incorrect Responses in Test 1	63
Table 11(b)	Response Graph for Test 1	64
Table 12(a)	Percentage of Correct and Incorrect Responses in Test 2	66
Table 12(b)	Response Graph for Test 2	67
Table 13(a)	Percentage of Correct and Incorrect Responses in Test 3	69
Table 13(b)	Response Graph for Test 3	70
Table 14(a)	Percentage of Correct and Incorrect Responses in Test 4	72
Table 14(b)	Response Graph for Test 4	73
Table 15	Homophones Sorted by Degree of Difficulty by Test	74
Table 16	Homophones Sorted by Overall Degree of Difficulty	75