“Bottom-up” approach in making verb entries in a monolingual Indonesian learner’s dictionary

Dora Amalia

Received: 30 December 2013 / Accepted: 11 April 2014 / Published online: 15 May 2014
© Springer Berlin Heidelberg 2014

Abstract This research is primarily focused on how to make verb entries in a monolingual Indonesian learner’s dictionary and expected to provide the principles of making such entry. A “bottom-up” approach was applied by drawing up a multiple-choice questionnaire for *Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing* learners to confirm the type of verb entries they prefer. The questionnaire was divided into two parts, for productive and receptive purposes. Each part included four different types of entries: substitutional type with synonym, traditional ‘*genus + specifica*’ type, contextual type with valency pattern, and *jika* (‘when’) definition. The result of the survey indicated that, for receptive function, most of the participants preferred traditional *genus + specifica* type and contextual with valency pattern type of definitions, whereas for productive function, most of the participants chose valency pattern type of definitions. The score distribution in productive task confirmed the result that participants who chose contextual with valency pattern definitions largely gained high scores (3 or 4 points). A detailed analysis of sentences produced by participants revealed several common errors that fell into three categories, i.e. improper context, wrong collocation, non-typical usage, that have to be taken into account to set the principles in making verb entries. The finding suggests that the grammatical information should be more specific and using more common words (synonyms or quasi-synonyms) as *genus proximum* could be of benefit to potential users. It also recommends to conduct broader surveys involving more participants from more various sources for each part of speech.

Communicated by Yukio Tono.

D. Amalia (✉)
The Agency of Language Development and Cultivation, The Ministry of Education and Culture,
Jakarta, Indonesia
e-mail: yayak_amalia@yahoo.co.id

Keywords Definition type · Learner’s dictionary · Productive function · Receptive function

1 Introduction

Free market policies opened up Indonesia for foreigners, whether it is for a short visit as tourists, businessmen, and journalists, or to live in a relatively long period of time as researchers, diplomats, students, and so on. On the one hand, foreign languages, especially English, are increasingly used to facilitate communication with foreigners. On the other hand, there are more and more foreigners learning Indonesian. In response to that, teaching material for learning *Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing* ‘Indonesian for Foreign Speakers’ (henceforth abbreviated as BIPA) has developed. There are more and more learning institutions or BIPA courses established in major cities. According to The Agency of Language Development and Cultivation reports (*Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing* (BIPA) 2010), there are at least 92 BIPA courses conducted in Indonesia.

If a dictionary, i.e. learner’s dictionary, is used as language learning tool, as pointed out by Summers (1988) and Lew (2004), BIPA materials should be accompanied by such dictionaries. Pedagogical lexicography has well developed in EFL context, and learners’ dictionaries have received a great deal of attention from many scholars, such as Bogaards (1996) and Kernerman (2007) among others. The big five English MLDs have become center of interest for decades. Unfortunately, in BIPA context, the situation is not so encouraging. Although BIPA teaching materials have been developed in such a way and brought into seminars to discuss, BIPA learners’ dictionaries do not receive the same treatment.

There are only two learner’s dictionaries (as indicated by the dictionaries’ titles) that are most commonly used by BIPA learners and both are bilingual. They are *A Learner’s Comprehensive Dictionary of Indonesian* by Atmosumarto (2004) and *The Learner’s Dictionary of Today’s Indonesian* by Quinn (2001). Both were published outside Indonesia. In other words, there are no monolingual learners’ dictionaries available in BIPA context so far. Consequently, the learners often consulted KBBI (*Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* ‘Indonesian Big Monolingual Dictionary’) which is actually aimed at native speakers of Indonesian. Therefore, it is difficult for foreign students to understand the definitions.

Most of BIPA learners usually used bilingual dictionaries, but these are difficult to offer for BIPA. That is the reason why a monolingual learner’s dictionary is chosen to serve the needs of BIPA learners from different language backgrounds. Although an MLD, by its nature, caters to advanced level learners, but most of BIPA learners are actually below advanced level (as seen in the sentence analysis in productive section cases).

One of the most problematic issues in learning Indonesian is verb affixation. There are 40 affixes used in word formation in Indonesian (Sugono 2008: xxxviii) that the learners should know. More than half of those are verb-forming affixes. Unfortunately, an affix usually has more than one function or meaning,

not to mention the various morphophonemic processes they undergo when combined with a base. All of these create problems for the BIPA learners, especially in using the right verbs in appropriate contexts. Some researchers have investigated the problems faced by BIPA learners in handling verbs (Madia 2001; Widawati 2002). Some have thrown new light on efforts to develop innovative ways, among others, Sulistiono (2000) suggested using interactive CD to teach verb affixation.

Several studies have been conducted to determine how to compose ideal BIPA teaching materials. Similarly, various evaluations have also been made to the available BIPA textbooks. Markus et al. (2011) compared the vocabulary contained in BIPA course books with a list of Indonesian words by frequency. Kwary (2013) has made a first base of Indonesian High Frequency Word List from two big Indonesian corpora; each consists of more than 100 million words. However, this is merely a list, not analyzed further to produce a dictionary as a language teaching and learning tool. The role of dictionaries in this case has not been considered as important as textbooks, consequently there are only a small number of researches on the use of dictionaries in the context of learning Indonesian. The lexicography tradition in Indonesia has not been characterized by theoretical studies. The dictionary making is not preceded by initial research to identify the target users and their needs. Therefore, this paper is expected to contribute to theoretical studies to produce dictionaries which are suitable to the needs of the target users.

In line with a user-oriented study, Bogaards (2003: 26) stated that “dictionary have to be designed for special groups in response to specific needs”. There are two key concepts from the statement, i.e. special user group and their specific needs. Both concepts are very instrumental in determining the input to and the output of the dictionary. Therefore, it is fundamental to know the user groups and their specific needs. In connection with this, it is important to build a user’s profile. In their guideline, Atkins and Rundell (2008) have put forward a set of principal questions to answer to understand the potential user and their needs. The questions are about who will use the dictionary, what they will use it for, and what kinds of skill they will bring to the task.

Based on the principles, the primary target user of this Indonesian learner’s dictionary is advanced learners of BIPA. The secondary target users are high school students in Indonesia, especially with Indonesian as their L2. Although the members of this secondary group can fluently communicate in informal Indonesian, their formal language skills have not shown the same thing. Meanwhile, as it is well known that dictionaries are hardly ever used for spoken communication (Bogaards 1996), the study only concentrates on language learning, especially in reading and writing contexts. Because the target users are advanced learners with a relatively wide linguistic knowledge, it is assumed that they are already familiar with dictionary conventions. To sum up, the potential users of this dictionary are adult language learners with relatively high level of proficiency to use dictionary for learning language.

2 Previous studies

In EFL context, there have been many pedagogical lexicography studies conducted in connection with the compiling process and use of learners' dictionaries. Among others, Lew (2004) tried to probe a range of questions related to receptive dictionary use by Polish learners of English by combining questionnaire surveys and controlled experimental tests, called The Dictionary Effectiveness Test, with the same participants. By doing this test, Lew found that types of information that learners seek from dictionaries were basic reference needs, i.e. finding word meanings and forms, whereas the peripheral information, such as synonyms, style and register, collocation, sentence structure, part of speech, and pronunciation were sought less often. This study also showed learners' clear and persistent preference for bilingual dictionaries over monolingual dictionaries.

A research on user-friendly features of the English verb syntax is done by Dziemianko (2006). This study aims to assess aspects of usefulness and usability of the various systems used in MLD of English to describe the syntactic behavior of verbs. Dziemianko supported syntax-coding system in verb patterns to inform the syntactic information to the dictionary users. The coding system used alphanumeric codes (in LDOCE) or valency patterns (in OALD). The code system is very diverse and complex that users who use the dictionary must learn the given codes first to get the syntactic information.

Another research was also carried out on the effectiveness of definition formats. Lew and Dziemianko (2006) examined the role of different types of definition placed in a MLD microstructure to convey syntactic class of nominal headwords. In this study, a single clause *when*-definitions were contrasted with the analytical definitions in the dictionary entry. The participants involved in the research are Polish learners of English at intermediate level. They were asked to choose entry from various alternatives. The finding showed that there was no significant difference found between participant's performance with entries with analytical definitions and with single clause *when*-definitions.

A more recent study on learner's dictionary in BIPA context is done by Amalia (2011) who evaluated and compared the two learners' dictionaries mentioned previously, i.e. Quinn's *The Learner's Dictionary of Today's Indonesian* (2001) and Atmosumarto's *A Learner's Comprehensive Dictionary of Indonesian* (2004). In her study, Amalia adopted a frame work proposed by Bogaards (1996) in evaluating the top four MLDs in EFL by applying findability, comprehensibility, and usability aspects. Findability aspect is applied twofold: in receptive and productive contexts. In receptive context, it is related to number of meanings explained, accessibility of single forms, accessibility to multi-word expressions, and the structure of entries. In productive context, it includes finding unknown meanings and choosing between options. The aspect of comprehensibility deals with comprehensibility of definitions, illustrations and other meaning clarification devices, and examples for receptive purposes. Meanwhile, in applying usability aspect, there are several things to discuss, i.e. grammatical information, other information on use, and examples for productive purposes. The evaluation indicated that the two LDs had several shortcomings in terms of lemma selection, entry structure, access to information in

the entry, and numbers of example. In short, to some extent, LDTI is better than LCDI in terms of special features of MLD applied.

3 Methodology

Mixed-methods approach is adopted in data collection and analysis in this research. As Lew (2011) notes that “dictionary use is a complex activity, with some aspects more quantifiable,..., others more qualitative, attitudinal, less tangible and thus not ready reducible to simple numbers”, this research used the mixed-method for two different aspects. Quantitative approach is used in dealing with questionnaire testing and its interpretation, whereas qualitative approach is adopted in dealing with sentence analysis. This procedure is what Creswell (2006) called “sequential procedures”.

In this study, a controlled experiment is employed. It involved learners of BIPA at advanced level as experimental subjects. It should be underscore here that the term ‘advanced’ does not necessarily mean very high proficiency in the second language. This term can be related to the use of the term ‘advanced’ in an English monolingual dictionary (e.g. *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary*) that actually includes learners from the intermediate level until the advanced level. They are asked to fill a questionnaire. Data collected from the questionnaire are then quantified to measure the participants’ preferences of some alternative entries proposed. The quantified results are then interpreted and also function as a confirmation of the MLD principles that have been applied to the preparation of the verb entries at the time of making the research instrument.

The second step is to analyze the sentences produced by participants. In this analysis, the sentences are evaluated by identifying and classifying the errors. Identification and classification may give empirical evidence about common errors made by learners, and in turn, can contribute to provide potential lexicographical information in entry. The outcome expected from this research is the ideal model of verb entries that can meet the learners’ lexicographic needs in MLD of Indonesian. According to Nielsen (2010), this kind of research can be regarded as transformative branch of learner’s lexicography, as it “aims to develop a theoretical and practical framework of generally applicable principles that can be used to develop and propose new and better principles for the design and production of future lexicographic products”.

3.1 The design of the questionnaire

As stated above, the questionnaire was conducted to confirm what type of definition the participants prefer in receptive and productive contexts. For the reason, the questionnaire is divided into two sections, receptive and productive parts, with four items each.

In the first section, there were four sentences presented. Each sentence contained a hard word underlined. Below this sentence, there were four types of definition of the underlined words and participants were simply asked to choose one definition

which was the most helpful for them to understand the meaning of the word. The four types of definitions were ordered with a certain permutation pattern to ensure probability distribution.

In the second section, the participants were asked to compose a new sentence using the information provided in the previous definitions and to write a letter (**a**, **b**, **c**, or **d**) at the end of each new sentence indicating type of definitions they referred. The new sentences should not use the same words as in the exemplified sentences. The grammatical correctness and originality were the main criteria in scoring system (ranging from 4 to 1). The highest score (4 points) was given to a grammatical and original sentence. A grammatical but less original sentence was given 3 points. The second lower score (2 points) was given to an ungrammatical but original sentence, whereas the lowest score (1 point) was given to an ungrammatical and example-like sentence. The zero score was given to a non-response item.

There are four types of definitions examined in this survey. They are (a) substitutional type with synonym, (b) traditional ‘*genus + specifica*’ type, (c) contextual type with valency pattern, and (d) *jika*-definition type. The verb affixation involved is mostly complex, i.e. (1) {*meng-*} intransitive-active prefix as in verb *menyabur* ‘to masquerade (as)’; (2) {*meng-/kan*} benefactive-active confix as in verb *menggelontorkan* ‘to pour into/to flood with’; (3) {*meng-/i*} repetitive-active confix as in verb *menggerogoti* ‘to gnaw (at)/to embezzle’, and (4) {*memper-/kan*} transitive-active confix as in verb *mempersembahkan* ‘to present’.

The verbs selected to be tested are the words with very low frequency (as found in *IndonesianWaC* corpus) or with zero frequency, i.e. *menyabur* ‘to masquerade’. In addition, three of the four verbs tested are also absent from the wordlist of a small corpus created from the available BIPA courses books, which implies that the learners do not know the words. Meanwhile, the other word, i.e. the word *mempersembahkan* may have been known by the participants, but it is also chosen because it contains very complex affixes, especially when compared with the other three.

The four types of definitions tested in the survey are the most commonly used in EFL dictionaries, although in Indonesian lexicographic tradition, the two contextual definitions (valency pattern and *-jika*-definition) are fairly new. In any Indonesian dictionaries, especially Indonesian LDs, these contextual definitions have not been applied yet. The results of this study should be regarded as a preliminary study of the effectiveness of the four types of definitions in BIPA learning context. This survey results give a quick overview of scores gained by each type of the definitions which implies the participants’ preference.

3.2 Research participants

The survey involved 73 participants from four different BIPA courses. They are BIPA courses from University of Indonesia (Jakarta), State University of Malang (Malang), Wisma Bahasa (Yogyakarta), and Cinta Bahasa (Denpasar). All of participants are advanced learners of BIPA with various first language background. They are native speakers of Korean, Mandarin, French, Italian, and Spanish. All of

them can speak English, either as L1 and L2. Since the dictionary is monolingual, the participants' language background was not taken into account.

The four BIPA courses have a different band score of proficiency. According to criteria of BIPA UI, for example, advanced learners are "... participants (who) learn to participate in discussion, write essay in Indonesian, and study topics related to Indonesian society and culture" (BIPA Program, available at <http://www.ui.ac.id/en/academic/page/bipa-programs>). Meanwhile, the other BIPA course classified advanced learners as "... learners with the skills needed to use the language effectively and effortlessly in most situations" (as described in Wisma Bahasa, http://www.wisma-bahasa.com/?page_id=1059). A different term is used to categorize such learner, "functional" learners, i.e. learners who are able to converse with native speakers, understand and write most social conversation and TV and radio news broadcasts plus a range of specialist profession-related conversations (Cinta Bahasa, accessed from http://www.cintabahasa.com/ESTIMATED_COURSE_DURATION_FOR_EACH_LEVEL.pdf). According to band score proposed by UKBI (*Uji Kemahiran Berbahasa Indonesia* 'Indonesian proficiency test'), advanced learners should be classified into *unggul* 'exceptional' with a score range of 525–900. To accommodate all different categories, it is useful to go to CEFR band score. All the criteria about "advanced" learners fell into a range of B2–C2 (independent user-proficient user) of classification. In short, the label "advanced" in this research follows the sense in English learner's dictionaries (e.g. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*) that actually includes any learners from intermediate to advanced learners.

Most participants of the survey came from University of Indonesia (46 participants), and the rest shared by the other three courses, nine participants from State University of Malang, 16 from Wisma Bahasa, and only two from Cinta Bahasa. The different learning methods applied by the BIPA courses caused an uneven distribution of participant recruitment. Advanced BIPA learners of University of Indonesia and Wisma Bahasa received classroom instruction that makes the recruitment process reasonably easy. As for the other two, they applied one-to-one private lessons for advanced learners and that made the recruitment process to be carried out individually. The survey was conducted during March–August 2013 in four different cities, namely Jakarta, Yogyakarta, Malang, and Denpasar.

4 Findings and discussions

This section will outline the findings of the receptive context (Sect. 4.1) and productive context (Sect. 4.2). A detailed description and analysis of sentences made by the participants in productive task will be presented in Sect. 4.3. The analysis includes identification and evaluation of sentences. This section will be concluded by giving suggestions for improvement.

Fig. 1 Definition preference in receptive context

4.1 Receptive context

As stated previously, the participants' preference of definition type for receptive purpose is measured by assigning a multiple-choice task. A sentence with a difficult word is presented and the participants were asked to choose one of the four alternative definitions provided. The numbers of participants' responses on the definition chosen are shown in Fig. 1.

The findings showed that in response to question 1, valency pattern definition obtained the highest percentage (42 %), whereas the second higher percentage was obtained by traditional *genus + specifica* definition (37 %). The same thing occurred to question 4 where the highest percentage was gained by valency pattern definition (37 %) and the second higher definition is gained by traditional *genus + specifica* definition (33 %). There is a tight competition between traditional definition (*genus + specifica* type) and definition with valency pattern in response to question 2 and 3. The two definitions shared the same percentage in responses to question 2 and 3, i.e. 37 and 33 %, respectively. The two lowest percentages were gained by *jika*-definition (16 %) and synonymous definition (11 %) of all responses.

It can be concluded that for receptive purpose, there is only a slight difference between the top two definitions selected. The participants preferred traditional *genus + specifica* definition and valency pattern type to the other two types of definitions. In choosing the traditional definition, there are at least two reasons behind this choice. Firstly, a traditional definition is chosen since it is the most familiar type of definition that can be found in any dictionaries. Secondly, this definition is also found very understandable with a *specifica* that gives concise and clear information about the context. The more concise definition, synonym type, seems unlikely to give enough information. In other words, the participants prefer the concise information, but not too short.

On the other hand, an eye-catching valency pattern placed at the end of definition in bold type can immediately attract the users' attention. Besides, it gives additional information about the context, although the wording is quite long. The valency patterns are not the only benefit that the users can obtain from the definition, but the use of mostly common words in wording also gives added advantage. A longer explanation appears unlikely to trouble the users as long as the words used in

Fig. 2 Definition preference in productive context

Fig. 3 Score distribution in sentence making

Table 1 Breakdown of score distribution of sentences referring to valency pattern as a model

	Score for sentence referring to valency pattern				Count
	1	2	3	4	
Question 1	0	8	11	9	28
Question 2	0	6	12	10	28
Question 3	0	4	4	17	25
Question 4	0	3	15	6	24
Overall	0	21 (20 %)	42 (40 %)	42 (40 %)	105

explanation are easy to understand. Seemingly, the problems of understanding are greatly alleviated using these common words.

4.2 Productive context

As mentioned previously, there are two things that the participants have to do in this productive section. First, they have to make a new sentence using the words assigned, and then they have to refer to a certain definition that has helped them in

making the sentence, by writing a letter (**a**, **b**, **c**, or **d**) that indicates the type of definition that they referred to. Figure 2 below illustrates the definition preference and Fig. 3 shows the score distribution of sentences. A more detailed description of score distribution in each sentence referring to valency pattern is presented in Table 1.

As shown clearly in Fig. 2, the valency pattern definition is numerically superior to that of the other definitions in all items (questions). In response to the questions 1 and 2, this definition got the highest number, i.e. 28 responses of 73, or 38.3 % of all responses in the item. Whereas in question 3, this definition got 25 responses (34.2 %) and in question 4 it got 24 responses (32.8 %). The second higher number is contested by traditional definition and *jika*-definition. In questions 1 and 4, traditional definition got a higher number than the *jika*-definition (22 over 8 for question 1 and 21 over 10 for question 4), whereas in questions 2 and 3, the situation is reversed. *Jika*-definition got a higher percentage than the traditional type (18 over 16 for question 2 and 17 over 16 for question 3). Meanwhile, the synonym definition is always at the lowest level of response in all questions, with only 7, 3, 6, and 9 responses to question 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively.

It is interesting that the *jika*-definition was used as frequently as the *genus + specifica* type in half of the productive section cases. This is quite different from the case in the English language where *jika*-definition (or the if-definition) is also preferable for text reception. As Rundell (2008: 198) states that when we ask any fluent speaker of English to tell us the meaning of a word, nine out of ten will state its definition starting with the word ‘if’.

To summarize the result of the survey, a more general description can be used. The overall response given to the definition with valency pattern is 36 % (105 of 292 of overall responses). With 26 % of overall responses, the traditional definition with *genus + specifica* is placed in the second highest level, whereas *jika*-definition is placed in the third position with 18 % of overall responses. The synonym definition only got 9 % of overall response, lower than the percentage of non-response number. It is noteworthy that 12 % of the overall responses did not choose any of the definitions. In this scoring system, such a response is counted by giving a score of 0. These no-response items may be caused by lack of clarity in or lack of attention to the instruction given in the questionnaire. The instruction given might be too long, that some participants find it quite difficult to understand to read its entirety.

What can be concluded from the Fig. 2 above is that for productive purpose, the participants prefer contextual definitions to other types of definitions. The findings have shown very convincingly about the tendency. Between the two contextual definitions, the valency pattern is the most preferred one. In other words, it seems likely that this type of definition well accommodates what learners need to know about how to make a proper sentence or to produce a text. A more detailed discussion of the score distribution among the sentences in relation to the types of definitions chosen is given below.

Figure 3 below illustrates the score distribution among sentences produced by the participants. As the scoring system explained in Sect. 3.1, the scores range from 4 to

1 based on degree of grammaticality and originality of the sentences. The score of 0 is given to no-response item.

Figure 3 shows varied score distribution. In question 1, of 65 sentences produced, there are 26 that obtained the highest score (4 points), 22 obtained 3 points, 16 obtained 2 points, and only 1 sentence that obtained 1 point, beside 8 no-response items. In question 2, there are more sentences which got 3 points (30 of 65 sentences produced), whereas 4 points are gained by 23 sentences, 11 sentences got 2 points, and only 1 sentence got 1 point. The surprising result is shown in question 3 result where the highest point is gained by more than half of overall responses (38 sentences or 52 %), while the other two points (2 and 1 point) are successively gained by 13 sentences and 1 sentence. The score distribution in question 4 is broadly similar to that in question 2. A large proportion of the distribution is made up of 3 points (31 sentences) and 4 points (21 sentences). The score of 2 points is gained by 10 sentences and only 1 sentence got 1 point.

At a glance, the result shows an even and constant distribution of 1 point score in all items, that there is only 1 sentence got the score 1 point. Also, the 2 points score distribution is not so wide, as it is only 17 % of overall distribution. What can be inferred from the result is that most participants are able to produce, at least, the grammatical sentences with varied degree of originality. This result strongly supports the participants' level of proficiency to be classified 'advanced learners'.

It is more interesting to examine the score gained from question 3. It is shown that over half of all sentences (38 of 73, or 52 % of overall) got the highest score (4 points). It is understandable because in this question participants were asked to make a sentence using simple prefix {meng-}. It appeared quite an easy task to do for advanced learners, although few sentences were less original and creative in terms of diction. A more detailed information of the words used in the sentences is discussed further in Sect. 4.3 of this paper.

The result of sentence-making task has clearly shown that most of the participants got the highest score (4 points) as been obtained by 108 of 292 sentences (about 37 %). The second highest score (3 points) was gained by 94 sentences (32 %), whereas the two lowest scores, 2 and 1 points received by 50 and 4 sentences, or only 17 % and 1 % of overall distribution. There are quite a lot of participants who made no-responses to this sentence task. They made 36 no-responses or 12 % of overall.

As concluded in the discussion about definition preference, most participants chose contextual definition, i.e. definition with valency pattern, for productive purpose. A more detailed score distribution of sentences referring to valency pattern may give a better understanding about correlation between definition preference and score distribution. Table 1 below lists the scores gained by sentences referring to valency pattern.

Total of 105 sentences are produced by participants by referring to valency pattern. These numbers make 36 % of overall sentences (105 of 292 sentences). It means that there are 105 sentences produced using valency pattern as a model. It is quite easy to conclude from Table 1 above that no participants get the lowest score (1 point). The second lowest score (2 points) is received by a small number of sentences, not more than ten sentences in each question, or 20 % of overall

Table 2 Descriptive statistics of scoring

	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4
Mean	2.780822	2.808219	2.90411	2.712329
Standard error	0.147592	0.14289	0.16571	0.150443
Standard deviation	1.261024	1.220855	1.415827	1.285382
Sample variance	1.590183	1.490487	2.004566	1.652207
Sum	203	205	212	198
Count	73	73	73	73
Confidence level (95.0 %)	0.294219	0.284847	0.330337	0.299902

Table 3 The top five words occurring before the verb assigned

Rank	Verb 1 <i>mempersalahkan</i>	Verb 2 <i>menggerogoti</i>	Verb 3 <i>menyabur</i>	Verb 4 <i>menggelontorkan</i>
1	saya	itu	saya	saya
2	itu	saya	dia	dia
3	dia	yang	itu	Indonesia
4	bisa	dia	setelah	itu
5	akan	korupsi	Pras	siap

percentage. The highest score is shared by score of 3 and 4 points with percentage of 42 or 40 % for each item.

The distribution of the highest score above provides evidence to confirm that valency pattern is useful in assisting learners to produce grammatical sentences. This evidence is reinforced by a fact that there is no lowest score gained by referring to this definition. In other words, there is a positive correlation between valency pattern definition with higher score. To give a general description of statistics of the score, the overall data are presented in Table 2.

Data in Table 2 reveal that the highest average score (2.90411) is gained for question 3, while the lowest one (2.712329) is for question 4. In response to question 3, almost all of the participants produced grammatically correct sentences. The result made the mean of score gained in question 3 to become the highest one compared to the other three questions. The value that has the highest frequency within scoring is 3 for question 2 and 4, while for question 1 and 2 the mode is 4. It means that most of the sentences produced get 3 points of score in response to question 2 and 4. The highest score (4 points) mostly gained in response to question 1 dan 4. The range or difference between the minimum (0) and the maximum (4) value is 4.

4.3 Sentence analysis

A small learner's corpus was built to facilitate the sentence analysis by collecting 235 sentences produced by the participants during the test. Based on the corpus, the

sentence analysis is conducted by identifying and evaluating errors. As expected, the valency pattern provided in contextual definitions was used by the participants as a model to create a new sentence. Using the pattern, the participants could produce grammatically correct sentences. However, analysis of the sentences reveals that subjects of the sentence tend to be modeled upon ones in the example sentence or used in the entry. In choosing words, i.e. diction aspect, the participants showed less creativity. Most of the sentences produced were in simple form, not in complex sentences. The subjects and the objects were mostly filled by a single pronoun or noun. The personal pronouns *saya* ‘I’ and *dia* ‘he/she’ were the most commonly used.

Below is a distribution table of the most frequently used words in sentences. Taking only the five highest frequency in the list, the words can be divided into two broad categories, namely the free forms and dependents. Two high-frequency personal pronouns *saya* ‘I’ and *dia* ‘he/she’ are grouped together into free form category along with *Pras* (probably a teacher’s name) and *Indonesia*. Another category is shared by demonstrative pronoun *itu* ‘the/that’; relative pronoun *yang* ‘who/which’; adverb *siap* ‘ready’; preposition *setelah* ‘after’; auxiliary verbs *bisa* ‘can’ and *akan* ‘will’. All of them are regarded as dependent elements that are placed before and after the head element of a phrase or clause Table 3.

Following the above grouping, the words that come after the assigned verbs can also be classified into two major groups, free forms and dependents. Free forms consist mostly of nouns or noun phrases (such as *badannya* ‘his/her body’ in sentence 2) with the word *uang* ‘money’ as the most frequently used. As for the dependent category, there are two word classes included, namely the determiner *banyak* ‘many’ and the prepositions *di* ‘at/in’, *sebagai* ‘as’ and *seperti* ‘like’.

A lack of creativity is also demonstrated regarding the words used after verbs assigned. The word *medali* ‘medal’ in the sentence 1, *uang* ‘money’ in the sentence 2, and the *dana* ‘fund’ in the sentence 3 are the same words used in definitions and example sentences. In sentence 3, however, the word *sebagai* ‘as’ cannot be assessed as imitative since it collocates with *menyabur* as stated in valency pattern. Nevertheless, there is little innovation as indicated by changing the preposition *sebagai* ‘as’ with a more or less synonymous preposition *seperti* ‘like’ Table 4.

Based on the data collected, the errors were identified and evaluated. The errors fell into several categories as follows. Firstly, if the context in the sentence is not suitable or appropriate with the word used, it may result in improper context. For

Table 4 The top five words occurring after the verb assigned

Rank	Verb 1 <i>mempersalahkan</i>	Verb 2 <i>menggerogoti</i>	Verb 3 <i>menyabur</i>	Verb 4 <i>mengelontorkan</i>
1	piala	uang	sebagai	uang
2	medali	hart	di	dana
3	uang	politik	saya	banyak
4	banyak	badannya	seperti	informasi
5	sesuatu	baju	tidur	air

example, the word *mempersembahkan* ‘present’ which indicates an action done by someone from lower social position to honor the person (parents, king etc.) or thing (country, etc.) of high status or position by giving something special or valuable, like to present a gift to the king (KBBI, 2008) usually takes place in a formal situation. This improper context showed as in the following sentences: *Indonesia mempersembahkan piala kepada para mahasiswa* ‘Indonesia presents a trophy to the students’. This sentence should be composed the other a way around and becomes *Mahasiswa mempersembahkan piala kepada Indonesia* ‘the students present a trophy to Indonesia’ since *Indonesia* is considered of high status and *mahasiswa* is of lower status. The same case also exists in the word *menggelontorkan* as in *Dosen menggelontorkan Anto dari kelompok* ‘the teacher excluded Anto from the group’. The word *menggelontorkan* has a subtle nuance of meaning that things excluded are in a large number (not only one entity). Besides, the noun after *menggelontorkan* should be inanimate, so Anto (a man’s name) is apparently not suitable for this context.

Secondly, the wrong collocation occurs when two or more words are used together but the occurrence is not common. From the corpus, there is a phrase like *menggelontorkan masalah* ‘to pour problems’ (*sic*). Although the sentence from which the phrase placed is grammatically correct as the verb is followed by an inanimate noun, but the verb *menggelontorkan* typically collocates with *uang* ‘money’, *dana* ‘fund’, or *informasi* ‘information’. Meanwhile, *masalah* ‘problems’ well collocates with another verb, i.e. *membeberkan*. The similar case is also found in verbal phrases *menggelontorkan gas* ‘to emit gas’ and *mempersembahkan pendapat* ‘to give opinion’. The word *gas* well collocates with the verb *mengeluarkan*, whereas *pendapat* ‘opinion’ is usually used together with a verb *mengajukan*.

Thirdly, errors are classified as non-typical usage. This linguistic phenomenon is usually related to a lack of knowledge about the concept of the word and its cultural background. To take an example, the sentence *ayah mempersembahkan uang pokok kepada ibu* ‘father gave his salary to mother’ is not typically used in Indonesian. The verb *mempersembahkan* implies that something given is special, not daily routine. Giving money to a wife is a matter of routine in Indonesia, especially when the wife is a housewife or does not have a job. Similarly, the sentence *pencuri menggerogoti mobil saya* ‘the thief gnawed at my car’ is not typical usage, because something gnawed is usually *kayu* ‘wood’, *tulang* ‘bone’, or any hard objects (KBBI, 2008). Rat or mouse usually gnaws, not people. Thus, the verb *menggerogoti* is not suitable for the context.

There are several minor errors found in the analysis. These errors occur mostly in spelling, like **ditanggap*, **penyanyi*, **kemengan*, and **pengamis*. The words should be spelled *ditangkap* ‘caught’, *penyanyi* ‘singer’, *kemenangan* ‘victory’, and *pengemis* ‘beggar’. Another error occurs in word formation by affixation. The participants use words like **kecurian*, **ditahu*, **pelawan*, and **kelolosan* instead of *pencurian* ‘stealing’, *diketahui* ‘known’, *lawan* ‘enemy’, and *lolos* ‘pass’. There are errors in using confix {ke-/an} in *kecurian* and prefix {di-} in *ditahu* because the correct affixes are {pe-/an} and {di-/i}. Meanwhile, the words **pelawan* and

Table 5 Entry structure

Entry		
Topic	Comment	
	Formal comment	Semantic comment
Headword/ lemma	Spelling, pronunciation, grammatical information	Definition, etymological information, contextual examples, gloss

**kelolosan* reflect an excessive use of affixes. The words should be used in their base form, i.e. *lawan* and *lolos*.

5 Principles in making a verb entry

The concept of entry in this study follows the concept proposed by Hartmann and James (2002: 50). They stated that an entry is “basic reference unit in a dictionary or other reference system”. It is the most important part in microstructure since in it the lexicographic information are placed. An entry is divided into two broad groups: topic and comment. Topic is filled by headword or lemma, whereas comment is divided further into two subgroups: formal comment and semantic comment. Each subgroup includes several categories, such as spelling, pronunciation, grammatical information that are grouped into formal comment. Meanwhile, definition, etymological information, examples and definition are members of semantic comment group. Table 5 below serves to illustrate the entry structure.

From various categories in the comment slot, grammatical information, definition, and examples are the main consideration in this study. They are essentially important in learner’s dictionary since they are the mostly sought information, whereas spelling, pronunciation, and etymological information are less sought. Gloss is not included in this study because it is mainly discussed in bilingual dictionary.

Some scholars have researched about the learner’s dictionary in the EFL context. Among others, Bogaards (1996) recommended a framework to evaluate the learner’s dictionaries that consisted of three aspects, namely findability, comprehensibility, and usability. As mentioned earlier in Sect. 2, these three aspects are dealing with number of meanings explained, accessibility of single forms, accessibility to multi-word expressions, and the structure of entries (findability aspect in receptive purpose); finding unknown meanings and choosing between options (findability aspect in productive purpose); comprehensibility of definitions, illustrations and other meaning clarification devices, and examples (comprehensibility aspect); and grammatical information, other information on use, and examples for productive purposes (usability aspect). In line with the Bogaards’ framework, Rundell (2006) also proposed what he called as the main features of the MLD. He divided special features for receptive function which include using simple language and controlled vocabulary in writing definition, devoting special attention to phraseology, and

providing aids to navigation. In terms of the dictionary's productive function, syntactic information provides users with a full account of the valency patterns, example sentences are used extensively, considerable attention is paid to sociolinguistic features, and usage notes provide supplementary guidance. Kernerman (2007) also made eight suggestions for improving learner's dictionary. However, his suggestions are somewhat different from the two above-mentioned scholars in terms of dictionary format (he suggested bilingualized dictionary as the best dictionary format for language learners) and selecting example sentences which, according to him, should be based on didactic importance instead of corpus frequency.

All of the researches undertaken, essentially, are attempts to meet the needs of users as foreign learners. In line with this point, Tarp (2009: 160) stated that one of the genuine purposes of a learner's dictionary is "to satisfy the punctual and lexicographically relevant information needs that learners may have in a range of situations in connection with the foreign-language learning process". Regarding all the innovations, there is still room for improvement, especially in BIPA context. This study only takes one small aspect of the overall issues that were discussed by the scholars above. It is a small aspect that is central in the dictionary, i.e. the definition of verbal word class. This study started from the same starting point, by distinguishing the receptive and productive context.

Firstly, for traditional definition in receptive context, there is a slight modification to be applied. The *genus proximum* should not always be the hypernym of the verb defined. As already known, *genus proximum* in noun definition is usually hard words, especially if the lemma is a technical term. In defining a verb, this should be avoided using a more common word as hypernym. If this is impossible, then synonym or quasi-synonym could replace the *genus proximum*. At the risk of using the synonym, *differentia specifica* will keep the accuracy of meaning. This approach has already applied in the instrument. The verb *mempersembahkan* is defined using hypernym *memberi* 'to give'. Meanwhile, *sebagai penghormatan* 'as an honour' is used as the *specifica*. Using synonym as *genus proximum* was applied in defining *menyabur*. A more common word, i.e. *menyamar* 'masquerade' is used as *genus proximum*, whereas *sebagai orang lain* 'as somebody else' is used as *differentia specifica*. A more detailed description of using common words as *genus proximum* is shown in Table 6 below.

Table 6 Common words used as *genus proximum*

Headword	<i>Genus proximum</i>	<i>Differentia specifica</i>	English equivalent
<i>mempersembahkan</i>	<i>memberi</i> 'to give'	<i>sebagai penghormatan</i> 'as an honour'	To present
<i>menggerogoti</i>	<i>mengambil</i> 'to take'	<i>dengan diam-diam dan sedikit demi sedikit</i> 'silently and little by little'	To embezzle
<i>menyabur</i>	<i>menyamar</i> 'to masquerade'	<i>sebagai orang lain</i> 'as somebody else'	To masquerade
<i>menggelontorkan</i>	<i>mengeluarkan</i> 'to spend'	<i>dalam jumlah besar</i> 'in a large number'	To pour

Secondly, although not specifically discussed here, the organization of polysemous entry is usually based on its typical usage. In this survey, there is only one meaning displayed to the participants, and it has been chosen based on its most common meaning found. For example, the word *menggerogoti* is always found in its secondary figurative meaning. It is hard to find its original meaning ‘to gnaw’ in the corpus. If any, it is certainly used less than the secondary meaning. This secondary meaning has a more typical usage, whereas the original one does not. This is somewhat in line with what by Rundell (2006: 741) said that the MLD should “emphasizes what is typical over what is possible”.

Since the context is paramount in the definition, particularly for productive purposes, thus contextual definitions should be developed in such a way that by only reading the definition the users will be able to know the context. The context itself should reflect the typical usage of the verb as to avoid potential mistakes in producing text. By taking into account the results of tests and the sentences in the corpus, there are some suggestions for improvements.

In the first place, the context should be more detailed in explanation. Symbols of the word classes, for example, are not only limited to N or V alone, but can be expanded as Npers. (animate noun) or Vtr (transitive verb). A second suggestion is that valency pattern as the core information about the contexts, should be easily visible. Therefore, rather than putting it at the end of the definition, it could be placed at the beginning of an explanation.

Lastly, superiority of valency patterns in MLD has been proven by the highest scores gained by the participant in productive task. But it will not be able to give the maximum advantages if not equipped with an example sentence. The most typical example sentences should be included, and most importantly, the examples should be culturally associated with the place where the language is used.

6 Conclusion and recommendation

It can be concluded from the survey that for the receptive purposes, participants chose either the *genus + specifica* traditional definition or contextual definition with valency patterns. The traditional definition is still considered suitable for this purpose since it is the type of definition that the users are most familiar with. The findings imply that, on the one hand, most of the participants need concise and quickly understandable definitions when faced with difficult words. On the other hand, a longer explanation is preferred as long as the words used in the explanation are easy to understand. Apparently, the problems of understanding are greatly alleviated using the common words, especially the words with high frequency in the corpus.

As for the productive purpose, participants prefer the contextual definitions which give more grammatical information. A full sentence or a longer clause is preferred because the sentence or the clause that is used to explain the word meaning has already had the contextual usage. Therefore, the users can infer how to use the word based on the definition or explanation given. The valency pattern and

examples provide an additional grammatical information that also help the users in producing a text.

The sentence analysis applied in the learner's corpus results in three types of common error. They are improper context, wrong collocation, and non-typical usage of sentence. These errors are accompanied by minor ones. All of the findings from these analysis could be used as useful information to be taken into account when making the entry of a new Indonesian MLD. It suggests that the grammatical information should be more specific to avoid making the same mistakes in producing sentences. Using more common synonyms or quasi-synonyms as *genus* could also be of benefit to the potential users.

By paying attention to the different lexicographical needs for each context, it is definitely a difficult task of a lexicographer to compile such an entry to meet both the receptive and the productive needs, since the process of making the dictionaries for both needs will use two different approaches. While some scholars, especially who have the notion of monofunctional dictionary, suggested to make two different dictionaries, one for each context or function, some other scholars may prefer attending to the two functions in a single dictionary. Basically, the improvement could be the combination of traditional definition with *genus + specifica* and contextual type of definition with valency pattern.

Based on several shortcomings of methodology applied, especially number of participants, it is suggested that the survey is ideally followed up with broader surveys and involves more participants from more various BIPA courses. The same survey should be conducted for each part of speech as to complement what have been done already with verbs in this paper, to provide a full-scale description of definition preferences.

Appendix 1. Questionnaire

I. Beri tanda () di depan definisi yang paling membantu Anda memahami arti kata yang digarisbawahi.

1. *Ayahnya berencana mempertunangkan anak gadisnya dengan pemuda pilihannya.*

	a.	mempersalahkan <i>v</i> menjodohkan; meminangkan
	b.	mempersalahkan <i>v</i> menjadikan seseorang bertunangan dengan orang lain
	c.	mempersalahkan <i>v</i> jika jika orang tua mempertunangkan anaknya, berarti dia membuat anaknya bertunangan dengan seorang gadis atau pemuda (mempertunangkan + <i>N pers.</i> + dengan + <i>N pers.</i>)
	d.	mempersalahkan <i>v</i> dikatakan mempersalahkan jika memberikan sesuatu (piala, kemenangan, dsb) untuk menghormati orang/sesuatu

2. *Dalam hal ini, partai diharapkan bukan sebagai wadah pencetak para koruptor yang **mengerogoti** harta negara dan memiskinkan masyarakat.*

	a.	mengerogoti <i>v</i> mengambil milik orang sedikit demi sedikit
	b.	mengerogoti <i>v</i> jika seseorang mengerogoti uang orang lain, dia mengambil uang itu sedikit demi sedikit, biasanya tanpa diketahui orang yang memiliki uang tersebut (mengerogoti + <i>N</i>)
	c.	mengerogoti <i>v</i> dikatakan mengerogoti jika mengambil milik orang lain (uang, barang, dsb) sedikit demi sedikit, biasanya tanpa diketahui pemiliknya
	d.	mengerogoti <i>v</i> mengikis; mengambil

3. *Ia berhasil memasuki daerah musuh setelah **menyabur** sebagai kuli kasar.*

	a.	menyabur <i>v</i> jika seorang penjahat sedang menyabur , berarti ia menjadikan dirinya seperti orang lain supaya tidak dikenali (menyabur + sebagai + <i>N</i>)
	b.	menyabur <i>v</i> dikatakan menyabur jika menjadikan diri seperti orang lain supaya tidak dikenali
	c.	menyabur <i>v</i> menyamar; berpura-pura
	d.	menyabur <i>v</i> menyamar seperti orang lain

4. *Investor siap **menggelontorkan** dana triliunan rupiah untuk membangun pabrik semen baru.*

	a.	menggelontorkan <i>v</i> dikatakan menggelontorkan jika mengeluarkan sesuatu (uang, tenaga, dsb) dalam jumlah besar untuk sesuatu yang lain
	b.	menggelontorkan <i>v</i> menyiramkan; mengucurkan
	c.	menggelontorkan <i>v</i> mengeluarkan sesuatu (uang, tenaga, dsb) dalam jumlah besar
	d.	menggelontorkan <i>v</i> jika seseorang menggelontorkan uang untuk sebuah kegiatan, berarti dia mengeluarkan uang dalam jumlah besar supaya kegiatan tersebut dapat terlaksana (menggelontorkan + <i>N</i> + untuk + <i>N</i>)

II. Berdasarkan definisi di atas, buatlah satu kalimat yang mengandung kata yang didefinisikan. Kalimat tersebut tidak boleh sama dengan kalimat contoh. Di belakang kalimat yang Anda buat tersebut, tuliskan huruf (a, b, c, atau d) sesuai dengan jenis definisi yang Anda anggap paling membantu Anda membuat kalimat.

1. **mempertunangkan:**

2. **mengerogoti:-**

3. **menyabur:**

4. **menggelontorkan:**

Appendix 2. Questionnaire: English translation

I. Tick () in front of the definition that you think the most helpful in understanding the meaning of the underlined word.

1. *Ayahnya berencana mempertunangkan anak gadisnya dengan pemuda pilihannya.*

	a.	mempersalahkan <i>v</i> menjodohkan; meminangkan
	b.	mempersalahkan <i>v</i> menjadikan seseorang bertunangan dengan orang lain
	c.	mempersalahkan <i>v</i> jika jika orang tua mempertunangkan anaknya, berarti dia membuat anaknya bertunangan dengan seorang gadis atau pemuda (mempertunangkan + <i>N pers.</i> + dengan + <i>N pers.</i>)
	d.	mempersalahkan <i>v</i> dikatakan mempersalahkan jika memberikan sesuatu (piala, kemenangan, dsb) untuk menghormati orang/sesuatu

2. *Dalam hal ini, partai diharapkan bukan sebagai wadah pencetak para koruptor yang menggerogoti harta negara dan memiskinkan masyarakat.*

	a.	menggerogoti <i>v</i> mengambil milik orang sedikit demi sedikit
	b.	menggerogoti <i>v</i> jika seseorang menggerogoti uang orang lain, dia mengambil uang itu sedikit demi sedikit, biasanya tanpa diketahui orang yang memiliki uang tersebut (menggerogoti + <i>N</i>)
	c.	menggerogoti <i>v</i> dikatakan menggerogoti jika mengambil milik orang lain (uang, barang, dsb) sedikit demi sedikit, biasanya tanpa diketahui pemiliknya
	d.	menggerogoti <i>v</i> mengikis; mengambil

3. *Ia berhasil memasuki daerah musuh setelah menyabur sebagai kuli kasar.*

	a.	menyabur <i>v</i> jika seorang penjahat sedang menyabur , berarti ia menjadikan dirinya seperti orang lain supaya tidak dikenali (menyabur + sebagai + <i>N</i>)
	b.	menyabur <i>v</i> dikatakan menyabur jika menjadikan diri seperti orang lain supaya tidak dikenali
	c.	menyabur <i>v</i> menyamar; berpura-pura
	d.	menyabur <i>v</i> menyamar seperti orang lain

4. *Investor siap menggelontorkan dana triliunan rupiah untuk membangun pabrik semen baru.*

	a.	menggelontorkan <i>v</i> dikatakan menggelontorkan jika mengeluarkan sesuatu (uang, tenaga, dsb) dalam jumlah besar untuk sesuatu yang lain
	b.	menggelontorkan <i>v</i> menyiramkan; mengucurkan
	c.	menggelontorkan <i>v</i> mengeluarkan sesuatu (uang, tenaga, dsb) dalam jumlah besar
	d.	menggelontorkan <i>v</i> jika seseorang menggelontorkan uang untuk sebuah kegiatan, berarti dia mengeluarkan uang dalam jumlah besar supaya kegiatan tersebut dapat terlaksana (menggelontorkan + <i>N</i> + untuk + <i>N</i>)

II. Based on the above definition, create a sentence containing the word defined. The sentence should not be the same as the example sentence. At the of the sentence, write a letter (a, b, c, or d) in accordance with the most helpful definition in making sentence.

1. **mempertunangkan:**

2. **menggerogoti:-**

3. **menyabur:**

4. **menggelontorkan:**

References

- Amalia, D. 2011. Pedagogical Lexicographic Review of Two Learners' Dictionaries of Indonesian. In *The 2nd Annual International Symposium of Foreign Language Learning*. Jakarta: QITEP in Language.
- Atkins, B.T.S., and M. Rundell. 2008. *The Oxford Guide for Practical Lexicography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing (BIPA). 2010. http://badanbahasa.kemdikbud.go.id/lamanbahasa/info_bipa. Accessed May 15 2013.
- BIPA Program. <http://www.ui.ac.id/en/academic/page/bipa-programs>. Accessed March 15 2014.
- Bogaards, P. 1996. Special feature: dictionaries for learners of english. *International Journal of Lexicography* 9(4): 277–320.
- Bogaards, P. 2003. Uses and users of dictionaries. In *A practical guide to lexicography*, ed. P.V. Sterkenburg, 26–43. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cinta Bahasa. http://www.cintabahasa.com/ESTIMATED_COURSE_DURATION_FOR_EACH_LEVEL.pdf. Accessed March 15 2014.
- Creswell, J.W. 2006. *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Dziemianko, A. 2006. *User-friendliness of verb syntax in pedagogical dictionary of English*, Lexicographica Series Maior 130 Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Hartmann, R.R.K., and G. James. 2002. *Dictionary of Lexicography*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Kernerman, A. 2007. Eight suggestions for improving learner's dictionaries. 21–23. Kernerman Dictionary News, July 2007.
- Kwary, D. 2013. *Creating and testing the Indonesian High Frequency Word List*. Konferensi Linguistik Tahunan Atma Jaya. Jakarta: Unika Atma Jaya.
- Lew, R. 2004. *Which dictionary for whom? Receptive use of bilingual, monolingual and semi-bilingual dictionaries by Polish learners of English*. Poznan: Motivex.
- Lew, R. 2011. User studies: Opportunities and limitations. In *ASIALEX2011 Proceedings Lexicography: Theoretical and practical perspectives* eds. Kaoru Akasu and Satoru Uchida. Kyoto: Asian Association for Lexicography.
- Lew, R., and A. Dziemianko. 2006. A new type of folk-inspired definition in English monolingual learner's dictionary and its usefulness for conveying syntactic information. *International Journal of Lexicography* 19(3): 225–242.
- Madia, I.M. 2001. *Kejutan Pembelajar Asing Menggunakan Kata Berafiks dalam Bahasa Indonesia: Kasus Kata Berafiks ber- dan meng-(kan)*. <http://www.ialf.edu/kipbipa/papers/Imademadia.htm>. Accessed May 1 2013.
- Markus, I.M., Hananto, Kurnia, N. 2011. Vocabulary in BIPA course-books and the frequency-based Indonesian word lists. Atma Jaya Conference on Corpus Studies (Concorps). Jakarta: Unika Atma Jaya.
- Nielsen, S. 2010. *What is this thing called learner's lexicography? Learner's Lexicography and Second Language Teaching*, 89–108. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Rundell, M. 2006. Learner's dictionaries. In *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Vol. 12. 739–743. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Rundell, M. 2008. More than one way to skin a cat: why Full-Sentence definitions have not been universally adopted. In *Practical lexicography: a reader*, ed. T. Fontenelle. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sulistiono. 2000. Model Pembelajaran Afikasi melalui Media CD Interaktif dalam Keterampilan Menulis untuk Pembelajar Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing (BIPA). <http://ucubipa.wordpress.com/model-pembelajaran-bipa/>. Accessed May 1 2013.
- Summers, D. 1988. The role of dictionaries in language learning. In *Vocabulary and Language Learning*, ed. Carter and McCarthy, 111–125. London: Longman.
- Tarp, S. 2009. The foundation of a theory of learner's dictionary: Lexicographica. In *International Annual for Lexicography*, No. 25., 155–169. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Uji Kemahiran Berbahasa Indonesia. <http://badanbahasa.kemdikbud.go.id/ukbi/v2/index.php/sertifikat>. Accessed May 15 2013.

- Widawati, R. 2002. Kesalahan Afiksasi dalam Pembelajaran BIPA. [http://file.upi.edu/ Direktori/FPBS/JUR_PEND_BHS_DAN_SASTRA_INDONESIA/-IKA_WIDAWATI/artikel_KESALAHAN_AFIKSASI_DLM_PEMB_BIPA.pdf](http://file.upi.edu/Direktori/FPBS/JUR_PEND_BHS_DAN_SASTRA_INDONESIA/-IKA_WIDAWATI/artikel_KESALAHAN_AFIKSASI_DLM_PEMB_BIPA.pdf) Accessed May 1 2013.
- Wisma Bahasa. HYPERLINK “http://www.wisma-bahasa.com/?page_id=1059” http://www.wisma-bahasa.com/?page_id=1059. Accessed March 15 2014.

Dictionaries cited

- Atmosumarto, S. 2004. *A Learner's comprehensive dictionary of Indonesia*. London: Atma Stanton.
- Quinn, G. 2001. *The learner's dictionary of today's Indonesia*. St. Leonards: Allen and Unwin.
- Sugono, D. 2008. *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*, 4th ed. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.