

**The Effect of the Memorization Strategy on English Vocabulary Mastery
among Second-Grade Students at SMPN 4 Patampanua**

Safridah

safriidah44@gmail.com

Sam Hermansyah

samhermansyah@pps.umsrappang.ac.id

Sitti Aisa

ichaaaisyahvandy@gmail.com

Syamsu T

syamsutang64@gmail.com

Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang

ABSTRACT

This study examined whether the use of a memorization strategy produced a significant difference in English vocabulary mastery among second-grade students at SMPN 4 Patampanua. The study employed a quantitative approach with a quasi-experimental control-group design. The population consisted of 124 second-grade students, while the sample comprised 60 students from two intact classes selected through purposive sampling. Class VIII.2 was assigned as the experimental group and received vocabulary instruction through a memorization strategy, whereas Class VIII.3 was assigned as the control group and received a conventional teaching strategy. The instructional procedure consisted of a pre-test, three treatment meetings, and a post-test. The memorization treatment required students to work with a target vocabulary list, write the words and meanings, memorize them through repetition and rehearsal, and demonstrate oral recall. Data were collected through a written vocabulary mastery test and analyzed using descriptive statistics, Shapiro–Wilk normality testing, Levene’s test, an Independent-Samples t-test, and Cohen’s d. The experimental group increased from a pre-test mean of 49.93 to a post-test mean of 78.57, whereas the control group increased from 55.57 to 67.07. The post-test comparison produced $t = 4.696$, $df = 58$, $p < .001$, with a mean difference of 11.50 points. The study therefore found a statistically significant difference in vocabulary mastery in favor of the memorization group. The thesis reports Cohen’s $d = 1.21$, interpreted as a large effect. The findings indicate that structured memorization, when systematically combined with writing, repetition, rehearsal, and oral retrieval, can be an effective strategy for developing foundational English vocabulary among junior high school EFL learners.

Keywords: English Vocabulary Mastery; Memorization Strategy; Conventional Teaching Strategy; Vocabulary Teaching; Quasi-Experimental Design

INTRODUCTION

English language learning in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context is expected to develop learners' communicative competence through listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Achievement in these skills depends not only on grammatical knowledge but also on learners' access to a sufficiently developed vocabulary. Vocabulary provides the lexical resources needed to comprehend texts, express ideas, follow classroom interaction, and participate in communication. The thesis underlying this article positions vocabulary mastery as a fundamental component of English proficiency and emphasizes that inadequate vocabulary can restrict comprehension, expression, and students' confidence in using English.

In the Indonesian context, English is mainly learned as a foreign language and students may have limited opportunities to encounter English outside formal instruction. Consequently, vocabulary development often depends heavily on classroom teaching. At the junior high school level, this issue is especially important because students are expected to deal with increasingly demanding learning materials while their lexical foundation is still developing. The thesis reports that second-grade students at SMPN 4 Patampanua experienced difficulties in recognizing, recalling, and understanding vocabulary. These difficulties were associated, in part, with conventional classroom practices that tended to emphasize teacher explanation, textbook definitions, copying, and exercises.

Vocabulary teaching therefore requires instructional strategies that provide students with repeated and organized opportunities to encounter and retrieve target words. Among the strategies discussed in the thesis, memorization is characterized by controlled repetition, rehearsal, and systematic recall. Rather than treating memorization simply as mechanical learning, the strategy used in this study organized memorization as a sequence of teacher presentation, student writing, deliberate rehearsal, and oral retrieval. Such activities are intended to strengthen the connection between word forms and meanings and to make vocabulary more accessible in subsequent recognition and recall tasks.

The conceptual basis of the study is consistent with the view that repeated exposure, deliberate practice, and retrieval can support the consolidation of lexical knowledge. The thesis describes vocabulary mastery at the junior high school level in terms of students' ability to recognize vocabulary items, recall their meanings, and understand the target lexical items presented during instruction. The memorization strategy is consequently connected directly to the measured outcome: the treatment provides systematic opportunities for students to encode and retrieve vocabulary, while the written vocabulary test measures the resulting level of mastery.

Although memorization has long been used in language classrooms, the thesis identifies several gaps. Previous research has often discussed memory strategies as

one component of broader vocabulary learning strategies, while fewer studies have isolated memorization as an instructional treatment using systematic repetition, rehearsal, and oral recall. Evidence has also been more frequently reported with older learners, while empirical evidence involving junior high school students in local Indonesian settings remains comparatively limited. The present study addresses this gap by comparing vocabulary outcomes between students taught with a memorization strategy and students taught with a conventional strategy in two intact classes at SMPN 4 Patampanua.

The research question was: Is there a significant difference in students' English vocabulary mastery between those taught using the memorization strategy and those taught using the conventional strategy? Accordingly, the objective was to determine whether the two instructional approaches produced a statistically significant difference in vocabulary mastery. The study is expected to provide practical information for English teachers who need structured ways to strengthen students' foundational vocabulary and theoretical evidence concerning the role of repetition, rehearsal, and retrieval in vocabulary learning.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Vocabulary and Vocabulary Mastery

Vocabulary refers to the set of lexical items that learners can recognize, understand, and use. The thesis treats vocabulary knowledge as multidimensional, involving both the number of words known and the quality of knowledge associated with those words. Breadth refers to the size of a learner's vocabulary, whereas depth concerns how well individual words are understood and how flexibly they can be used. For the present study, however, the operational focus is intentionally narrower and appropriate to junior high school learners: recognition, recall, and understanding of the meanings of the target English words.

Vocabulary mastery is important because lexical knowledge supports comprehension and production across language skills. Students who possess insufficient vocabulary may struggle to understand reading passages, respond to classroom questions, and formulate spoken or written messages. The thesis therefore conceptualizes mastery as a measurable learning outcome rather than as a general impression of proficiency. Students' performance on the vocabulary test provides evidence of whether target lexical knowledge has been established sufficiently to support recognition and recall.

Memorization Strategy in Vocabulary Teaching

Memorization-based vocabulary teaching in the study is defined as deliberate learning supported by systematic repetition and rehearsal. The teacher first presents a list of target vocabulary items and their meanings. Students then write the items, memorize the words and meanings through repeated practice, and finally

demonstrate oral recall before the teacher or classmates. The sequence is designed to move students beyond passive exposure by requiring active retrieval.

The strategy contains four principal instructional indicators. First, the teacher presents a clear list of target vocabulary so that students know exactly which lexical items are expected to be learned. Second, students write the vocabulary items and meanings, providing visual and motor rehearsal while also creating a record for later review. Third, students memorize the items through repetition and rehearsal, repeatedly strengthening the form–meaning connection. Fourth, students demonstrate oral recall, which provides retrieval practice and allows the teacher to monitor accuracy and provide immediate feedback.

The thesis also recognizes limitations. Memorization can improve recognition and recall of isolated words but may provide less support for contextualized vocabulary use if it is implemented without communicative activities. There is also a risk of mechanical learning when memorization is poorly guided. For this reason, the value of the strategy should be considered in relation to how deliberately the teacher organizes the target vocabulary, repetition, rehearsal, and retrieval. In the present study, the strategy was used as a structured classroom treatment rather than as unsupervised rote learning.

Relationship between Memorization and Vocabulary Mastery

The relationship between memorization and vocabulary mastery in this study is conceptualized as a cause-and-effect instructional relationship. The memorization strategy functions as the independent instructional treatment, while students' vocabulary mastery scores constitute the outcome. Repeated rehearsal gives learners multiple opportunities to strengthen lexical representations, and oral recall requires them to retrieve the target words rather than merely recognize them. This combination is expected to improve performance on tasks that measure foundational vocabulary knowledge. Previous studies cited in the thesis provide a basis for this expectation. Research on repetition, memory strategies, and guided recall has generally reported positive relationships with vocabulary retention and achievement. The present study extends that line of inquiry by examining an intact junior high school sample and by comparing the memorization strategy with a conventional teaching strategy under the same learning materials and general instructional context.

METHOD

Design and Sample

This research employed a quantitative approach using a quasi-experimental control-group design. The design was selected because the researcher worked with existing school classes rather than randomly assigning individual students. One intact class served as the experimental group and received the memorization strategy, while

another intact class served as the control group and received the conventional teaching strategy. Both groups completed a pre-test before instruction and a post-test after the treatment period. The research was conducted at SMPN 4 Patampanua with second-grade students as the target population. The instructional period involved a pre-test, three treatment meetings, and a post-test. The experimental treatment used the learning materials Love Our World, No Littering, and Embrace Yourself, with a total of 30 target vocabulary items. The treatment was designed to give students repeated exposure to the same target lexical items through writing, memorization, rehearsal, and oral recall.

The population consisted of 124 second-grade students distributed across four classes: VIII.1 (28 students), VIII.2 (32 students), VIII.3 (32 students), and VIII.4 (32 students). The sample consisted of 60 students from two intact classes. Class VIII.2 was assigned as the experimental group and Class VIII.3 as the control group, with 30 students in each group. Purposive sampling was used because the classes had to remain intact and the selection considered class availability, administrative approval, curriculum alignment, and comparable learning conditions. Both groups were taught by the same English teacher to reduce differences in instructional delivery.

Table 1
Population and sample of the research

Class	Population	Role	Sample
VIII.1	28	Not selected	—
VIII.2	32	Experimental	30
VIII.3	32	Control	30
VIII.4	32	Not selected	—
Total	124	Two intact classes	60

Instrument and Procedure

The instrument was a written English vocabulary mastery test administered as a pre-test and post-test. The test measured students' knowledge of the target vocabulary and required them to identify the appropriate meanings of English lexical items. The vocabulary set used during treatment contained 30 words distributed across three learning themes. The target words included items such as reduce, environment, recycle, trash, river, problem, flood, litter, oceans, impact, parasite, sea turtle, sea lion, dolphin, clear, wear, advertisement, learn, feeling, nervous, activity, confidence, ability, express, agree, share, skill, opinion, weakness, and mistake. The same general vocabulary content and learning objectives were maintained across the experimental and control groups, while the instructional strategy differed. This arrangement strengthened the comparison

because differences in post-test performance could be examined in relation to the teaching strategy rather than to different target vocabulary.

The procedure consisted of three stages. First, both groups completed the pre-test to establish their initial vocabulary mastery. Second, the experimental group received the memorization treatment and the control group received conventional vocabulary instruction during three treatment meetings. Third, both groups completed the post-test using the written vocabulary mastery instrument. In the experimental group, each lesson began with the teacher presenting the target vocabulary and meanings. Students wrote the items and meanings in their notebooks, memorized them through repetition and rehearsal, and demonstrated oral recall. The teacher monitored students' performance and corrected errors. In the control group, the teacher presented the learning material from the textbook, explained the meanings of target vocabulary, asked students to read and write the vocabulary, and provided exercises related to the material. Both groups therefore received explicit attention to vocabulary, but the experimental group received the additional structured memorization and retrieval sequence.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize students' pre-test and post-test performance through means, standard deviations, minimum scores, and maximum scores. Before hypothesis testing, the normality of the data was examined using the Shapiro–Wilk test and the homogeneity of variance was examined using Levene's test. The thesis reports that the normality assumptions were satisfied for the relevant groups and that the post-test variances were homogeneous (Levene's $F = 0.458$, $p = .501$). An Independent-Samples t -test was then used to determine whether the post-test means of the experimental and control groups differed significantly. The significance level was set at .05. In addition to statistical significance, Cohen's d was used to estimate the magnitude of the difference. The thesis interprets $d \approx .20$ as small, .50 as medium, and .80 or above as large.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Pre-test Performance

The pre-test results indicated that the two groups began the study with different mean scores. The experimental group obtained a mean of 49.93 ($SD = 9.808$), with scores ranging from 27 to 72. The control group obtained a mean of 55.57 ($SD = 13.098$), with scores ranging from 36 to 88. Thus, the control group had a slightly higher starting mean than the experimental group. The pre-test results are important because they show that the experimental group did not begin the treatment with an advantage in average vocabulary score.

Table 2
Descriptive statistics of pre-test and post-test scores

Group	Test	Mean	SD	Min–Max
Experimental	Pre-test	49.93	9.808	27–72
Experimental	Post-test	78.57	8.807	64–100
Control	Pre-test	55.57	13.098	36–88
Control	Post-test	67.07	10.116	47–86

Post-test Performance

After the treatment period, the experimental group obtained a substantially higher post-test mean than the control group. The experimental group's mean increased from 49.93 to 78.57, representing a gain of 28.64 points. The control group's mean increased from 55.57 to 67.07, representing a gain of 11.50 points. The descriptive results therefore show a greater improvement in the group that experienced the memorization strategy. The distribution of scores also indicates improvement in the experimental group. Its post-test scores ranged from 64 to 100, whereas the control group's post-test scores ranged from 47 to 86. These results suggest that the memorization treatment was associated with both a higher average score and a stronger upper range of achievement. Because the control group also improved, the findings do not suggest that conventional instruction was ineffective; rather, the experimental group showed a larger improvement under the conditions of this study.

Hypothesis Testing

Table 3
Independent-samples t-test of post-test scores

t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Decision
4.696	58	< .001	11.500	Reject H ₀

The Independent-Samples t-test produced $t = 4.696$ with 58 degrees of freedom and a two-tailed significance value below .001. Because $p < .05$, the null hypothesis stating that there was no significant difference between the two groups was rejected. The alternative hypothesis was accepted. The mean difference of 11.50 points indicates that the experimental group performed higher than the control group at the post-test stage. The statistical result therefore provides evidence of a significant difference in vocabulary mastery between students taught through memorization and those taught through conventional instruction.

Effect Size

The thesis also reports a Cohen's d value of 1.21, which is interpreted as a large effect. Effect size is important because statistical significance alone does not indicate how substantial a difference is. In this study, the large effect complements the t -test result and suggests that the observed difference was not only statistically detectable but also substantial in magnitude. The combination of a higher experimental post-test mean, an 11.50-point mean difference, $p < .001$, and a large reported effect size strengthens the conclusion that the memorization treatment was educationally meaningful within the research setting.

The central finding is that students taught using the memorization strategy achieved higher vocabulary mastery than students taught using the conventional strategy. This result is consistent with the instructional logic developed in the thesis. The experimental treatment did not rely on a single act of memorizing a word list. Instead, it organized vocabulary learning as repeated exposure followed by active retrieval. Students first saw and wrote the words, then repeatedly rehearsed them, and finally demonstrated oral recall. Each stage reinforced attention to the target lexical items and their meanings.

Writing the target vocabulary may have helped students focus on spelling and word form while creating an additional rehearsal opportunity. The memorization stage then provided repeated contact with the same form–meaning relationship. Most importantly, oral recall required students to retrieve the vocabulary from memory rather than simply recognize it on a page. This retrieval-oriented component is particularly relevant to the definition of vocabulary mastery adopted in the study, which emphasizes recognition, recall, and understanding of word meanings.

The difference between the experimental and control groups can also be understood in terms of instructional structure. Conventional teaching in the control group involved teacher explanation, reading, copying, and exercises. These activities provided vocabulary exposure, but they did not organize repeated retrieval as systematically as the experimental treatment. The memorization strategy therefore added a deliberate sequence for consolidating and retrieving target words. The larger gain in the experimental group suggests that this additional structure may have helped students retain and access vocabulary more effectively.

The finding is broadly consistent with studies cited in the thesis. Andriatmoko (2024) reported significant vocabulary achievement differences associated with a word memorization method. Nurfitriyani et al. (2025) connected memory strategies with vocabulary retention and recall, while Zuhairi and Mistar (2023) reported an association between vocabulary learning strategies and vocabulary mastery among Indonesian EFL learners. The present study adds evidence from junior high school students and an intact-class quasi-experimental design.

The finding also supports the theoretical discussion of repetition and retrieval in vocabulary learning. Webb and Nation (2017) emphasize the role of repeated encounters in vocabulary development, while the thesis draws on the idea that repeated rehearsal and retrieval can make lexical representations more stable and accessible. In the present study, the significant difference between groups is therefore theoretically plausible: the treatment repeatedly directed students' attention to the target words and required them to reproduce the words and meanings.

At the same time, the results should not be interpreted as evidence that memorization should replace all other forms of vocabulary teaching. The thesis acknowledges that memorization may have limited value for contextualized language use if learners only memorize isolated word–meaning pairs. Students may know the meaning of a word on a test without being able to use the word accurately in a sentence or conversation. Memorization is therefore best viewed as a structured foundation that can be complemented by contextualized reading, speaking, writing, and communicative activities.

The findings have several practical implications for English teachers at the junior high school level. First, teachers can use short, manageable vocabulary lists to provide clear learning targets. Second, students can be asked to write the words and meanings before beginning deliberate memorization. Third, repetition should be planned rather than incidental, with opportunities for students to rehearse the same lexical items several times. Fourth, oral recall can be used as a simple retrieval activity through individual, pair, or small-group practice. These steps can be integrated into ordinary lessons without requiring sophisticated technology. Teachers should also combine memorization with contextual practice. After students can recognize and recall target words, they can be asked to use them in sentences, short dialogues, reading tasks, or writing activities. This progression can help bridge the gap between remembering a word and using it communicatively. The strategy may be particularly useful for learners who need to build a basic lexical foundation before they can participate confidently in more complex language activities.

The study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting the findings. The sample was limited to 60 students from two intact classes at one junior high school, so the results are context-specific and should not automatically be generalized to other schools or educational levels. The quasi-experimental design did not involve individual random assignment. In addition, the outcome was measured through a written vocabulary test, which primarily captures the forms of recognition and meaning knowledge represented in the instrument. The study therefore does not establish whether the memorization strategy produces equivalent gains in spontaneous communicative use, long-term retention beyond the post-test, or other language skills.

Finally, future quasi-experimental studies could strengthen group comparability through matching procedures or statistical controls when random assignment is not possible. Such studies would help clarify whether the advantage observed in the present research is replicated when initial vocabulary differences, learner characteristics, and instructional duration are more tightly controlled. The present study provides a useful starting point because it demonstrates a clear and measurable difference between an experimentally structured memorization condition and a conventional classroom condition. A further direction is to broaden the outcome measures. The present study focused on written vocabulary mastery, particularly recognition and meaning knowledge. Future research could examine whether memorization also improves students' ability to use target words accurately in sentences, conversations, reading comprehension, and writing. A mixed-method design could additionally explore students' perceptions of memorization, the difficulties they experience during rehearsal, and the classroom conditions that make repetition engaging rather than mechanical.

Future studies can extend this research in several ways. First, researchers may involve larger samples from several junior high schools to determine whether the same pattern occurs across different school environments. Second, researchers may compare different forms of memorization, such as spaced repetition, mnemonic techniques, flashcards, guided oral recall, or digital vocabulary applications. Third, delayed post-tests could be administered several weeks after treatment to determine whether the gains observed immediately after instruction are maintained over time. The findings also suggest that teachers should monitor the quality of memorization rather than measuring success only by the amount of vocabulary assigned. A smaller list that students can accurately recognize and recall may be more useful than a larger list learned superficially. Repetition should likewise be purposeful: students should repeatedly retrieve the vocabulary, not merely reread the list. Oral recall, quick written checks, pair questioning, and short review activities can provide evidence that vocabulary is becoming accessible from memory.

The strategy can also be differentiated. Students who quickly recall the vocabulary can be challenged to produce short sentences or examples, while students who need additional support can receive another cycle of repetition and paired recall. After foundational recall is established, contextual activities can be added. For example, the environmental vocabulary from *Love Our World* can be used in short statements about recycling or littering, while vocabulary from *Embrace Yourself* can be incorporated into brief speaking or writing tasks about confidence and ability. This extension addresses the limitation identified in the thesis that isolated memorization alone may not develop contextual language use sufficiently. For teachers, the findings suggest that memorization can be incorporated as a short, systematic component of an English lesson rather than treated as an entire pedagogy. A teacher may begin with a small list of high-value vocabulary, clarify meanings, ask students to write the items, provide repeated rehearsal, and finish with an oral recall activity. Such a routine is relatively simple to implement in classrooms with limited

technological resources because it relies primarily on a vocabulary list, board, marker, and students' notebooks the facilities described in the research treatment.

The comparison with the conventional group further clarifies the role of instructional structure. Students in the control group worked with the same broad learning materials and target vocabulary but received teacher explanations, reading, copying, and related exercises. Their post-test mean of 67.07 shows that conventional instruction still supported learning. However, the experimental mean of 78.57 was 11.50 points higher. The difference is therefore better understood as evidence that the additional repetition, rehearsal, and retrieval sequence contributed to stronger vocabulary outcomes under the conditions of the study. The oral recall component is particularly relevant to the outcome measured in the study. A written vocabulary test can show whether students recognize the meaning of a word, but successful oral recall during treatment requires students to retrieve the item from memory without depending entirely on the written list. The thesis therefore treats oral reproduction as a form of retrieval practice that reinforces the connection between lexical form and meaning. Immediate teacher feedback also creates an opportunity to correct inaccurate recall before misconceptions become established.

The three treatment meetings also used a manageable vocabulary load of ten target words per meeting. In the first meeting, the target vocabulary came from *Love Our World* and included words related to environmental topics, such as reduce, environment, recycle, trash, river, problem, flood, litter, oceans, and impact. The second meeting used *No Littering* and introduced words such as parasite, sea turtle, sea lion, dolphin, clear, wear, advertisement, learn, feeling, and nervous. The third meeting used *Embrace Yourself* and included activity, confidence, ability, express, agree, share, skill, opinion, weakness, and mistake. This organization gave students a clear lexical target for each lesson and made the memorization process concrete and measurable.

The treatment sequence is important for interpreting the findings because the experimental condition was defined not simply by asking students to memorize words, but by organizing memorization into a repeated instructional cycle. The teacher presented a limited set of target words, students recorded the words and meanings, students rehearsed the items repeatedly, and students then reproduced the vocabulary orally. The thesis describes this sequence as the operational form of the memorization strategy. Consequently, the treatment gave students several opportunities to attend to the same lexical information through different modes of practice rather than relying on a single exposure.

A balanced instructional model is therefore recommended. Memorization can be used to establish foundational lexical knowledge, followed by contextualized activities that require students to apply the words. Such a sequence can connect the strengths of memorization—structured input, repetition, and recall—with the broader goal of communicative language learning. In practical terms, students can first learn and retrieve words such as recycle, confidence, express, or opinion, and

then use them in sentences, dialogues, short descriptions, or classroom discussions. This progression can help ensure that vocabulary is not only remembered but also gradually integrated into usable English knowledge.

At the same time, the result should be interpreted within the exact scope of the research. The study was conducted at one school with two intact classes and a short treatment period. The vocabulary test represented the target words selected for the lessons and therefore does not measure the whole of students' English vocabulary knowledge. The finding supports the use of structured memorization for the vocabulary learning conditions examined, but it does not establish that memorization is universally superior to every other vocabulary teaching approach. The result is especially meaningful for a junior high school context in which students may still be building a basic lexical repertoire. When learners have difficulty recalling common words, a clearly defined vocabulary list can reduce uncertainty about what they are expected to learn. Repeated rehearsal then gives them multiple opportunities to strengthen memory for those items. The oral recall stage adds a requirement to retrieve the vocabulary actively. In this sense, the strategy creates a coherent learning cycle from presentation to production.

The change also appears in the size of the within-group gains. The experimental group improved by 28.64 points from pre-test to post-test, while the control group improved by 11.50 points. These descriptive gains should not be interpreted as an additional causal test by themselves, but they provide useful context for the Independent-Samples t-test. Together, the descriptive and inferential results show that the group receiving the structured memorization treatment made a considerably larger improvement over the instructional period. An important feature of the results is that the experimental group did not begin with the higher average score. Before treatment, the experimental group had a mean of 49.93, whereas the control group had a mean of 55.57. The control group therefore started approximately 5.64 points higher. After the treatment, however, the experimental group reached 78.57 while the control group reached 67.07. The direction of the difference consequently changed after instruction. Although the study did not employ random assignment, this pattern is relevant because the experimental group's stronger post-test performance cannot simply be described as the continuation of a higher initial level of vocabulary mastery.

CONCLUSION

This study found a statistically significant difference in English vocabulary mastery between second-grade students taught using the memorization strategy and those taught using the conventional teaching strategy at SMPN 4 Patampanua. The experimental group obtained a post-test mean of 78.57, while the control group obtained 67.07. The Independent-Samples t-test yielded $t = 4.696$, $df = 58$, $p < .001$, with a mean difference of 11.50 points. The thesis also reports Cohen's $d = 1.21$, categorized as a large effect. These results indicate that, under the conditions of the study, students receiving structured memorization instruction achieved

significantly higher vocabulary mastery than students receiving conventional instruction. The memorization strategy used in this research was characterized by four connected activities: presenting target vocabulary, writing the vocabulary and meanings, memorizing through repetition and rehearsal, and demonstrating oral recall. The results suggest that this structured sequence can provide a practical way to strengthen foundational vocabulary recognition and recall among junior high school EFL learners. However, memorization should not be used in isolation. Teachers are encouraged to combine it with contextual and communicative practice so that students can transfer memorized vocabulary into meaningful language use. Future studies may examine larger samples, longer treatment periods, delayed post-tests, and outcomes involving contextual vocabulary use and broader English skills.

REFERENCES

- Agustina, T., & Budiyan, K. (n.d.). *The effect of using spelling bee games towards students' vocabulary mastery*. Department of English Education, Universitas Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau, Indonesia.
- Al Ikhsan. (2025). Teaching vocabulary in Indonesian EFL classrooms: A comparative case study of junior high school strategies, challenges, and student responses. *GLOBAL: Education Language and Humanity Journal*.
- Alshumrani, H. A. (2024). Unveiling vocabulary teaching and learning beliefs of teachers and learners in an EFL context. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*.
- Altalhab, S. (2024). Short- and long-term effects of repetition strategies on vocabulary retention. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*.
- Al-Wossabi, S. A. N. (2023). Instructed SLA research and its relevance to classroom practices. *World Journal of English Language*.
- Alzubi, A. A. F., & Singh, M. K. M. (2021). The use of memorization strategies in improving EFL learners' vocabulary knowledge. *International Journal of Instruction*.
- Andriatmoko, A. G. (2024). The effectiveness of word memorization method using digital book to improve students' vocabulary achievement at the sixth grade of SD Katolik Sang Timur Pasuruan. *JIBS: Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa dan Sastra*.
- Artaditya, A., & Purnomo, H. (2025). An analysis of repeating vocabulary of Bhakti Junior High School, Malang. *WIDYALOKA: Journal of English Education*.
- Aziz, I. N. (2024). Leveraging memory strategies to enhance vocabulary acquisition. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*.
- Barcroft, J. (2020). Effects of repetition and elaboration on second language vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*.
- Beck, I. L., Lavigne, A., Allagui, A., & Al Naqbi, H. (2025). Vocabulary instruction for English learners: A systematic review connecting theories, research, and practices. *Education Sciences*.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2021). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (6th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Dagnaw, G. (2023). Revisiting the role of breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge in reading comprehension. *Cogent Education*.
- Gantari, A. (2024). Investigating vocabulary retention in English language learners: A focus on frequency and teaching methods. *Patria Educational Journal*.
- González-Fernández, B., & Schmitt, N. (2020). Word knowledge: Exploring the relationships and order of acquisition of vocabulary knowledge components. *Applied Linguistics*.
- Hermansyah, S., Usman, M., & Syamsu, T. (2026). Developing digital learning media for teaching public speaking to improve English skills of junior high school students. *International Journal of Special Education*, 41(16s), 502–509. <https://internationalsped.com/index.php/ijse/article/view/5027>
- Hermansyah, S., Lababa, L., Asrifan, A., Saleh, F., & Fadhillah, N. (2023). The use of building story games toward students' speaking ability. *LOJ: Language on Journal*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.55678/loj.v8i2.688>
- Herusatoto, H. (2025). Longer EFL vocabulary retention: Learning in context or in isolation? *LiNGUA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra*.
- Hulstijn, J. H. (2021). *Intentional and incidental second language vocabulary learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lin, Y., & Chen, Y. (2023). Effects of guided memorization and oral recall on EFL learners' vocabulary acquisition. *Education Sciences*.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2021). *Second language research: Methodology and design* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Masuku, H., Akib, E., & Ariana. (2025). Enhancing the students' word learning with explicit instruction of specific words at SMPN 3 Pattallassang. *English Language Teaching Methodology*.
- McMillan, J. H. (2022). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Mudinillah, A., Kuswandi, D., Erwin, Sugiarni, S., Winarno, Annajmi, & Hermansah, S. (2024). Optimizing project-based learning in developing 21st century skills: A future education perspective. *Qubahan Academic Journal*, 4(2), 86–101. <https://doi.org/10.48161/qaj.v4n2a352>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2013). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Webb, S. (2020). *Teaching and learning vocabulary in context*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nurfitriyani, A., Cahyaningsih, I., Anora, N., Rahmawati, P. F., & Istianah, R. (2025). EFL learners' memory strategies in vocabulary learning: A psycholinguistic perspective. *Studies in Language, Education, and Culture (SeLEC)*.
- Omolu, F. A., Fariani, & Marhum, M. (2022). Improving vocabulary mastery of junior high school students through contextual teaching and learning strategy. *Journal of Foreign Language and Educational Research*.

- Oxford, R. L. (2020). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Puteri, A. R., Pratama, H., & Widhiyanto, A. (2025). Exploring EFL teachers' experiences using memorization method to enhance students' English vocabulary mastery. *Proceedings of ELTLT*, Universitas Negeri Semarang.
- Putri, A. S. A., & Akhiriyah, S. (2024). The use of web-based vocabulary games to improve junior high school students' vocabulary mastery in reading. *Journal of English Teaching*.
- Rabadi, R. (2023). Examining the role of breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge in reading comprehension of English language learners. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages & Literatures*
- Rousoulioti, T., & Seferiadou, E. (2023). Memorizing vocabulary in multilingual classrooms: Strategies adopted by teachers in distance education. *Societies*.
- Santrock, J. W. (2022). *Educational psychology* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Sardianti, D., Jamiluddin, & Wahyudin. (2023). Enhancing vocabulary mastery through make-a-match technique: A quasi-experimental research. *ELTIN Journal: Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia*.
- Schunk, D. H., Meece, J. L., & Pintrich, P. R. (2021). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Strong, B. (2023). Retrieval, repetition, and retention: Unveiling vocabulary acquisition strategies for ESL learners. *Arts & Humanities Open Access Journal*.
- Sugiyono. (2020). *Metode penelitian: Kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Teng, M. F., & Reynolds, B. L. (Eds.). (2024). *Researching incidental vocabulary learning in a second language*. Routledge.
- Usman, M., Sari, H., Hermansyah, S., Maming, K., Kahar, A., Hasan, & Elfahmi, F. K. (2025). Understanding Indonesian students' reading knowledge in digital literacy within socio-cultural of rural middle schools. *International Journal of Information and Learning Technology*, 42(5), 432–448. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJILT-12-2023-0239>
- Verawati, K., Aruan, R., & Masyhur, M. (2024). The effectiveness of using mnemonics strategy to the students' vocabulary mastery at the eighth grade. *JlIP: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*.
- Webb, S., & Nation, I. S. P. (2017). *How vocabulary is learned*. Oxford University Press.
- Wisniewski, B., et al. (2024). Effect of teachers' teaching strategies on students' learning outcomes. *Frontiers in Psychology*.
- Zuhairi, A., & Mistar, J. (2023). Vocabulary learning strategies and vocabulary mastery by Indonesian EFL learners. *World Journal of English*.