

# STUDENTS' MASTERY OF SEMANTIC FIELD (A SEMANTIC RESEARCH AT NONENGLISH DEPARTMENT)

**Kharisma Puspita Sari**  
Puspita.kharisma@yahoo.com  
FITK UIN Walisongo

## ABSTRACT

This study aimed at investigating categories of semantic field by nonenglish department students. The researcher designed this research as explanatory qualitative research.

There are three steps in holding this research. The first step is to collect the data. The data card is considered as the appropriate data. The nonenglish students' aspirations of semantic field are the only data. The next step is to analyze the data. The researcher used the Riemer's theory (the semantics of categorization) to analyze the data. The students' aspiration would be classified according to Riemer's theory. The last step is to present the analysis. The researcher classified the data into two categories: a) classical categorization, and b) prototype categorization. The dominant classical categorization could be find in the lexical items like **house, bathroom, tree, concert, holiday, library, hospital, football competition, and aircraft**. The researcher investigated dominant prototype categorization in the lexical items as follows; **car, ship, mountain, post office, and minimarket**.

**Key words:** students' mastery, semantic field, nonenglish department

## INTRODUCTION

Hurford et,al. explained that semantics is the exploration of meaning in language (2007:1). The language teachers need semantics to understand and to identify the meaning of words that have been revealed by people. For further explanation, those words have been conceived by meaning relation. One word has linked to other words so that they built meaning relationship namely lexical relation (Riemer, 2010: 138).

Besides, one of the lexical relations is semantic field or lexical field. Harimurti (1982) stated that semantic field is that relationship among one word and its components (cf Chaer, 2009: 110). As the example, the word 'class' could be related to student, teacher, subject, and knowledge. Every word could have some components (as semantic field). Nevertheless, the related components are depend on personal experiences (cf Tamn, 2008: 29).

From those explanations, the researcher assumes that the research on students' mastery on semantic field will be interesting investigation. In this research, the researcher wants to know the significant components of semantic field by the students. The researcher will investigate the categories of semantic field.

The question answered through this study is How many categories of semantic field by nonenglish department students? The subject of this study is the students of English Intensive Class conducted by Walisongo Development Center UIN Walisongo Semarang. All members of the class come from nonenglish department background.

The result of this study may be significant for teachers as reference to know the students' mastery on vocabulary and meaning. It may also inspire the next researchers to develop semantic research in classroom interaction.

## BACKGROUND LITERATURE

### 1. Previous Studies

Some studies on the same field which inspired the researcher are:

- a. A research by Raymond W. Gibbs and Teenie Matlock (1997) entitled *Psycholinguistic Perspectives on Polysemy*. Based on this research the research on polysemy was complex research. The researcher would explain the polysemy on lexicons (*just, stand, and make*) based on categorizations behaviour. The researchers investigated these lexicons based the roles of linguistic context, embodied experience, conceptual knowledge, and lexico grammar constructions. My study differed from this research in having research focus and research data. The polysemous application was regarded as the research focus while the current research used categories of semantic field. The previous researchers considered practical experiment or behavioral note as the data while my study regard the students' data card as the research data.
- b. The second study was a research by Willy Martin (1997) entitled *Psycholinguistic Perspectives on Polysemy*. According to the previous researcher, the stereotype could influence word meaning. The researcher determined that the lexicon stereotype could shape semantic frame and conceptual meaning categories. My study differed from this research in having research data. The previous research used novel transcription as the data while the current research collect the data from the nonenglish students' data card.

## 2. Theoretical Concept

### a. Semantic Study

As coined by Zimmermann, et.al., semantics is the structural exploration of meaning of linguistic expression as examples morphemes, words, or text. (2013:1). The semantics is needed to explore not only word's definition but also meaning and influential components like context and environment. The reason is that the word could reveal different meaning in different context (Papafra-gou, 2000:1).

This research is considered as semantic research because the research investigate two components (Wray, et.a., 1998: 112) . First component is that the researcher investigates how people reveal

meaning (by using words). The second one is that the researcher determines how people use languages vary through strings of words.

### **b. Lexical Meaning**

Hurford et.al., lexical meaning is word meaning that has been conceptualized as sentence and words mean (2007: 3). The meaning of the word is as like as language concerned. The deep exploration would be stated by Chaer & Agustina. Based on them, lexical meaning is the meaning that is caught by human senses and approved of real condition and fact (2009: 60).

### **c. Semantic Field**

The deep explanation of semantic field will be stated by some linguists. The first explanation is related to the lexical features. Hatch, et.al. describe that semantic field is relationship among lexical items (1995: 33). This relationship is included in certain field or domain. As the example, the word 'rose' has related to words 'woman', 'girl', 'love', 'wedding', 'romantic', or even 'happy'. These words are linked in structural relationship namely lexical field.

The second exploration is about arrangement. Harimurti (1982) explained that semantic field is arrangement of several words from same culture and field (cf Chaer, 2009: 110). These words have same lexical relationship so that the words are built of certain field or domain. As another example, the word 'family' has related to the words 'father', 'mother', 'daughter', and 'son'.

The last explanation will be stated by Vanhove. This linguist explained that semantic field is that lexicalization patterns (2008: 13). The patterns have been built by basic, personal, and daily situation. From this explanation, the linguist wants to conclude that semantic field is related to daily activities by humans. So, semantic field could be universal, acceptable, and common features.

### **d. Semantics of Categorizations**

In order to explore the categories of semantic field, the researcher needs to elaborate the semantics of categorizations. There

are two categorizations of semantics: 1) classical categorization, and 2) prototype categorization.

The first categorization is classical categorization. Riemer stated that classical categorization must be exact and truly real (2010:225). He stated that this categorization is related to human classical view. Briefly, human (with all the senses) could check and identify the classical categorization easily. As the simple example, the 'flower' must have classical categorization within the words 'fragrant', 'beautiful', and even 'plant'.

The second categorization is that prototype categorization. Riemer explained that prototype categorization is conceptualized by necessary and sufficient condition (2010: 230). From this description, the prototype categorization may be understood by only particular situation and condition. Nevertheless, the categorization has built similarities, relationship, and certain pattern. As coined the example, the 'flower' could relate to 'death' and 'farewell' (for particular situation) because these relationship may be partly true in one side and partly false for another.

## **METHODS**

### **1. Research Setting and Time**

I held the research on May 04, 2015. I took the data at certain schedules (English intensive class)

### **2. Research Subject**

I collected the data from the 15 various major students. The subjects were the members of English Intensive Class Walisongo Development Center UIN Walisongo Semarang.

### **3. Data & Data Resource**

The data were taken from the data card by the students of English Intensive Class Walisongo Development Center UIN Walisongo Semarang. The researcher gives several lexical items (as the example data) like 'mosque', 'holiday', 'mountain', 'aircraft', 'bathroom', 'library', 'post office', 'minimarket', 'hospital', 'tree', 'concert', 'ship', 'car', and 'football competition'. The further step was that the students have to identify the words that could be semantic field of those lexical items.

#### 4. Data Collection Technique

The researcher took the data card in order to collect students' aspiration. Muhammad said that the researcher needs to collect data card in order to investigate the brief, clear, and purposive data (2011: 200). The researcher gives one lexical item for only one student. So, every student got his/her different or single lexical item. The researcher chooses the data purposively.

#### 5. Data Analysis Technique

In order to get appropriate result, the researcher decided to use unitizing for analyzing data as formulated by Krippendorff (2004: 97). The researcher could use unitizing to get data distinctions. The researcher uses this method to get exact investigation of semantic field level that have been built by the students.

There are three steps of unitizing. The first step is to decide the sampling unit. The researcher take the sampling units purposively. The second step is to make coding units. In the second step, the researcher decide to make three categories of coding: a) macro level categorization, b) intermediate level categorization, c) micro level categorization. In the last step is to define unit or to get distinctions. The researcher classifies the data based on the three previous categories. In order to encounter the distinction, the paraphrasing as stated by Sudaryanto is also needed (1993). Through this process, I briefly explain the level of semantic field that have been built by nonenglish department students.

### FINDING

In this subchapter, the researcher found two categorizations of semantic field: a) classical categorization, and b) prototype categorization. The complete and whole description would be formulated as follows.

#### 1. Data card 1: Lathifah Noor Hidayah

Lexical item: library, **has linked with semantic field;** book, librarian, computer, book rack, and reading room. Classical category: book, librarian, reading room, book rack

Based on classical view, in the library, people have to find **book, librarian, reading room, book rack.**

Prototype category: computer

In the term prototype, **computer** could be instead of, but in another lexical item, there could be **computer** as like as in the office.

2. Data card 2: Jamalaton Savitri

Lexical item: post office **has linked with semantic field;** letter, stamp, postman, envelope

Classical category: letter and postman

In the classical sense, the post office should have **postman** and people should find **letter** there.

Prototype category: stamp and envelope

People may find **stamp** in the post office, but in the stationery store recently people also could find **stamp** (as **envelope** does).

3. Data card 3: Fitri Kurnia Dewi

Lexical item: minimarket **has linked with semantic field;** cashier, buyer, snack, and drink.

Classical category: cashier, buyer

In the classical mode, minimarket should have **cashier** and **buyer**.

Prototype category: snack and drink

People may find **snack** and **drink** in minimarket contrary people could find snack and drink in restaurant.

4. Data card 4: Finaidamatussalimi

Lexical item: hospital **has linked with semantic field;** ambulance, medicine, pharmacist, icu, emergency unit, doctor, and nurse.

Classical category: ambulance, icu, emergency unit, doctor, and nurse.

For the classical point of view, in hospital human must find **ambulance, icu, emergency unit, doctor, and nurse**.

Prototype category: pharmacist and medicine

Based on the prototype, beside hospital, drug store also has **pharmacist** and **medicine**.

5. Data card 5: Kholifatul Khusna

Lexical item: air craft **has linked with semantic field;** pilot, passenger, windows, female attendant, toilet, and door.

Classical category: pilot, passenger, female attendant

In the classical sense, people exactly find **pilot, passenger, female attendant** in aircraft.

Prototype category: windows, toilet, door

According to the prototype, people could find **windows, toilet, door** in house, office, and other places.

6. Data card 6: Nailis saadah

Lexical item: class **has linked with semantic field;** table, whiteboard, blackboard, chair, student, teacher, and tip marker.

Classical category: whiteboard, blackboard, student, teacher

In the classical field, those things (**whiteboard, blackboard, student, teacher**) must be in the class.

Prototype category: table, chair, tip marker

For the prototype, people could find but those things (**table, chair, tip marker**) also would be find in stationery store.

7. Data card 7: Laila Akbar

Lexical item: football competition **has linked with semantic field;** ticket, striker, referee, coach, ball, goal, keeper, and yard.

Classical category: striker, referee, coach, ball, goal, keeper, and yard

Based on the classical mood there will be **striker, referee, coach, ball, goal, keeper, and yard** in football competition.

Prototype category: ticket

People would find **ticket** not only in football competition but also in tennis match or other sport match.

8. Data card 8: Azimatus Syarifah

Lexical item: car **has linked with semantic field;** driver, garage, seat belt, tire, and passenger.

Classical category: seatbelt, tire

For the classical sense, people have to find **seatbelt** and **tire** in



his/her car.

Prototype category: driver, garage, and passenger

People could meet **driver** and **passanger** not only in car but also another vehicle like bus.

9. Data card 9: Nihayatul Mutholibiyah

Lexical item: ship **has linked with semantic field**; fish, passenger, captain, restaurant, toilet, and bedroom.

Classical category: captain

Based on the classical sense, a ship must have **captain** and **passenger**.

Prototype category: fish, passenger, restaurant, toilet, and bedroom.

People will meet fish not only in a ship but also in a sea. People could find **restaurant, toilet, and bedroom** not only in a ship but also in a hotel.

10. Data card 10: Nabilah

Lexical item: holiday **has linked with semantic field**; beach, zoo, museum, experience, souvenir, and travelling.

Classical category: beach, zoo, museum, travelling

For the classical sense, holiday always related to **beach, zoo, museum, travelling**.

Prototype category: experience and souvenir

People could find **experience and souvenir** not only in holiday but also in other activities or field like market, wedding party, and seminar.

11. Data card 11: Tri Yanuar

Lexical item: mountain **has linked with semantic field**; tree, cliff, valey, sunrise, lava, and magma

Classical category: larva and magma

According to the classical view, mountain should have **lava and magma**

Prototype category; tree, cliff, sunrise

Those things (**tree, cliff, sunrise**) would be existed not only in

a mountain but also in a beach and jungle.

12. Data card 12: Widi Astutik

Lexical item: concert **has linked with semantic field;** singer, audience, lamp, stage, ticket

Classical category: singer, audience, stage

In a concert people absolutely find **singer, audience, stage.**

Prototype category: lamp and ticket

Based on the prototype, **lamp and ticket** will be found not only in a concert but also in a sport match.

13. Data card 13: umi rizqiah

Lexical item: tree **has linked with semantic field;** root, seed, stem, fruit, flower, and branch

Classical category: root, stem, fruit, flower, and branch

Based on classical mode, a tree should have **root, stem, fruit, flower, and branch**

Prototype category: seed,

For the prototype, few numbers of tree could have **seed.**

14. Data card 14: Andy Setyawan

Lexical item: bathroom **has linked with semantic field;** soap, bathtub, shower, and shampoo

Classical category: soap, bathtub, and shampoo

According to classical sense, in a bathroom, people will meet **soap, bathtub, and shampoo**

Prototype category; shower

For the prototype, **shower** could be find not only in a bathroom but also in a swimming pool.

15. Data card 15: Intan Khumairoh

Lexical item: house **has linked with semantic field;** dining room, living room, bathroom, bedroom, garden, and swimming pool

Classical category: dining room, living room, bathroom, bedroom.

For the classical view, in common house, people set some rooms like **dining room, living room, bathroom, bedroom.**

Prototype category: garden, and swimming pool

People could find **garden and swimming pool** not only in a house but also in a hotel.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the data analysis the researcher formulates the conclusion as follows.

1. The researcher finds two categories of semantic field: 1) classical categorization, 2) prototype categorization. Every lexical item has its classical and prototype categorization.
2. For some lexical items, the classical categorizations are dominant like **house, bathroom, tree, concert, holiday, library, hospital, football competition, and aircraft.**
3. The prototype categorizations are dominant like **car, ship, and mountain, post office, and minimarket.**
4. For some lexical items like (**house, football competition, tree, class, hospital**), the nonenglish department students could explore highest number of semantic field.
5. The nonenglish department student only explore low number of semantic field for the lexical items like **car, concert, and mountain.**

## REFERENCES

- Chaer, Abdul. 2009. *Pengantar Semantik Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Cuyckens, Hubert & Britta E. Zawada (Ed.). 1997. *Polysemy in Cognitive Linguistics: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hatch, Evelyn & Cheryl Brown. *Vocabulary, Semantics, and Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hurford, James R., et.al. 2007. *Semantics: A Coursebook Second Edition*. Edinburgh: Cambridge University Press.
- Krippendorff, Klaus. 2004. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology Second Edition*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication Inc.
- Muhammad. 2011. *Metode Penelitian Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Ar Ruzz Media
- Papafragou, Anna. 2000. *Modality: Issues in The Semantics-Pragmatics Interface*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Riemer, Nick. 2010. *Introducing Semantics*. Edinburgh: Cambridge University Press.
- Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Vanhove, Martine. 2008. *From Polysemy to Semantic Change*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Wray, Alison, et.al. 1998. *Projects in Linguistics: A Practical Guide to Researching Language*. London: Oxford University Press.

Zimmermann, Thomas Ede & Wolfgang Sternefeld. 2013. *Introduction to Semantics: An Essential Guide to The Composition of Meaning*. Gottingen: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG