

FROM 'BURGER' TO 'TACO': UNVEILING STUDENT ARGUMENTATION SHIFTS IN SEMANTIC MASTERY THROUGH CULINARY MNEMONICS

Nurul Aini¹, Mila Krivokuća², & Octa Pratama Putra³

¹UIN Syarif Hidayatullah, Indonesia

²Alfa BK University, Serbia

³Bina Sarana Informatika, Indonesia

DOI: 10.23917/humaniora.v27i2.18922



Citation:

Aini, N., Putra, O. P., & Informatika, B. S. (2026). From 'Burger' To "Taco": Unveiling Student Argumentation Shifts in Semantic Mastery Through Culinary Mnemonics. *Jurnal Penelitian Humaniora*, 27(2), 148–158.
<https://doi.org/10.23917/humaniora.v27i2.18922>

Article History:

Received : 7-July-2026
Revised : 23-July-2026
Accepted : 23-July-2026
Published : 1-August-2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Keywords

Semantic Menu
Mnemonic strategies
Cognitive load theory
EFL semantics learning
Scaffolding in linguistics

Abstract

Due to the high cognitive load associated with complex language jargon, understanding semantics frequently presents a substantial obstacle for EFL students, especially when it comes to differentiating subtleties between polysemy, hyponymy, and homonymy. Grounded in cognitive load theory, mnemonic strategies are theoretically well-suited to address this challenge, as they reduce extraneous cognitive burden by anchoring abstract semantic categories to familiar, concrete schemas. This qualitative case study examines the efficacy of the Semantic Menu, an original instructional framework using culinary-themed mnemonics individually assigned to students based on their specific diagnosed semantic learning difficulties. Over the course of six weeks, two stages of interviews and written assignments were used to gather data from six undergraduate students, each purposively selected based on notable difficulty articulating semantic relations and subsequently paired with a mnemonic, such as B.U.R.G.E.R, N.A.C.H.O.S, or C.H.I.P.S, tailored to their diagnosed conceptual gap. The findings suggest substantial qualitative improvement in students' performance: structured, logical, and accurate argumentation replaced the initial conceptual ambiguity ('the terminological fog'), with each participant's progress closely aligned with the semantic sub-domain targeted by their assigned mnemonic. By using culinary anchors as an individualised cognitive scaffold, learners' anxiety levels decreased and their capacity to classify complex sense relations

Corresponding Author

Nurul Aini
UIN Syarif
Hidayatullah
Indoensia
Email:
nurul.aini@uinjkt.ac.id

stabilised. These findings suggest that connecting abstract theoretical concepts to familiar, personally relevant schemas increases confidence in academic analysis while also improving retention. This study implies that individualised, creative scaffolding is an essential teaching strategy for closing the gap between passive theoretical knowledge and active analytical proficiency in linguistics.

Keywords: *Semantic Menu, Mnemonic strategies, Cognitive load theory, EFL semantics learning, Scaffolding in linguistics*

INTRODUCTION

Semantics is a key component of English Language Teaching (ELT) since linguistic proficiency is fundamentally reliant on the speaker's ability to negotiate several levels of meaning. While syntax provides the fundamental structure of a language, semantics enables communication by ensuring that assertions are not only grammatically correct but also conceptually, culturally, and coherently understood (Haverkamp & Hoeltje, 2021). However, the pedagogical transition from theoretical abstractness to practical comprehension remains a significant challenge in modern language training. This difficulty is further amplified in the digital era, where the rapid integration of Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) tools and artificial intelligence demands that students possess strong, active conceptual frameworks rather than relying on passive memorisation (Abdolmaleki & Saeedi, 2024).

Regarding this matter, EFL students typically perceive semantics as a challenging subject with intricate sense connections and abstract language that frequently results in cognitive overload, despite its crucial importance mentioned above (Warrick, 2021). In higher education, students sometimes struggle to distinguish between closely related concepts, such as the nuanced distinctions between homonymy and polysemy or the logical intricacy of binary oppositions. This learning issue is sometimes made worse by traditional teaching techniques that primarily concentrate on rote memorisation of theoretical definitions from textbooks, which fail to build a fundamental, intuitive grasp of how meaning works (Bahari *et al.*, 2023). When learners are exposed to too much technical jargon without sufficient cognitive anchors, their ability to construct logical semantic arguments is heavily compromised. Therefore, this conceptual gap not only hinders academic comprehension in linguistics courses, but it also lowers their confidence in applying semantic analysis to real-world discourse (Grodniewicz, 2021).

According to Cognitive Load Theory by Azhari & Chen (2025), learners possess a limited working memory capacity; when abstract linguistic jargon is introduced without meaningful cognitive anchors, extraneous cognitive load increases, impairing both comprehension and long-term recall. Grounded in this principle, mnemonic devices offer a powerful teaching alternative to bridge this conceptual gap, as they reduce such load by anchoring difficult content to associative memory structures (Qizi, 2023). Functioning as cognitive scaffolding, mnemonic devices transform abstract language theories into identifiable, manageable patterns that align with the brain's natural tendency for organisational encoding. Meaningful anchors, such as acronyms or structured visualisations, further optimise the mental effort required to process new material, thereby improving long-term retention.

This study introduces the *Semantic Menu*, an original instructional framework developed by the researchers rather than adapted from existing mnemonic models. The framework emerged from the observation that food-related associations, being universally familiar and cognitively low-threshold, could serve as effective anchors for retaining abstract semantic categories. Grounded in these cognitive principles, this comprehensive collection of culinary-themed mnemonics is intended to clarify semantic difficulties

among EFL students. In order to classify basic sense relations in semantics, this framework strategically maps complex linguistic concepts onto well-known food-related acronyms. Rather than being applied uniformly across all learners, each mnemonic was purposively assigned to individual students based on their specific semantic learning difficulties, identified through baseline interviews. For instance, students struggling with lexical ambiguity were introduced to *C.H.I.P.S* (*Connotation, Homonym, Implication, Polysemy, and Sense*), while those grappling with argument reconstruction were guided by *B.U.R.G.E.R* (*Background, Underlying meaning, Reference, Grounding, Evidence, and Result*). This individualised approach reflects the framework's core premise: that mnemonic scaffolding is most effective when tailored to a learner's specific conceptual gap, rather than delivered as a one-size-fits-all intervention. The *Semantic Menu* seeks to transform the classroom from a rote-learning environment to an interactive session where students may confidently articulate complex language ideas by placing abstract academic jargon into a relevant and interesting lexical set (Twomey & Kroneisen, 2021).

The previous studies have extensively examined the efficacy of mnemonic devices in the context of general vocabulary acquisition by Hill (2022) and second language retention by Belleca *et al.* (2025), while other research has focused on conventional mnemonic strategies such as the loci approach and the keyword method Lantolf *et al.* (2021). However, no previous studies have investigated culinary-themed mnemonic frameworks for facilitating semantic argumentation among EFL learners, nor have they examined how such thematic, socioculturally familiar acronyms might streamline the mastery of formal semantic theory. Furthermore, existing research has predominantly relied on quantitative measures of retention and recall, leaving a dearth of qualitative data on how innovative mnemonic interventions reshape EFL students' argumentation structures when explaining intricate sense relations such as polysemy and hyponymy.

Thus, by analysing the qualitative shift in students' critical discourse and presenting a framework with a culinary theme, this study seeks to bridge this gap. By focusing on the *Semantic Menu* as a novel teaching tool, this study provides fresh insights into how themed mnemonics (Conderman, 2020) could enhance students' conceptual clarity and argumentation precision in a linguistics-focused classroom.

The primary objective of this study is to determine how the *Semantic Menu* influences the conceptual comprehension and argumentation structure of intermediate EFL students. Using a qualitative case study methodology, this study examines how students' reasoning clarity changed before and after being introduced to an individually assigned culinary-themed mnemonic, focusing on six selected students as they reassembled their justifications for intricate semantic connections. Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: How does the *Semantic Menu* influence intermediate EFL students' conceptual understanding of formal semantic relations (*e.g.*, polysemy, hyponymy, homonymy)?

RQ2: How does the *Semantic Menu* affect the structure and coherence of students' semantic argumentation?

The findings should eventually have educational implications for linguistics teachers, offering a creative yet demanding alternative to traditional teaching methods in order to encourage deeper semantic acquisition.

METHOD

This section describes the methodological techniques used in this research to assess how the *Semantic Menu* affects students' conceptual mastery. A structured *before-and-after* (Lim, 2024) intervention was used to capture the subtle changes in the participants' argumentation clarity using a qualitative framework developed by Qiu *et al.* (2021). The next subsections outline the research methodology, participant selection, and particular analytical tools used to record students' language growth by concentrating on a methodical comparison of student responses.

Research Design

To fully understand how the *Semantic Menu* affects students' cognitive processing of acquiring semantic theories, this study uses a qualitative case study design. This design is deemed most appropriate rather than a quantitative or experimental approach, as the study's core concern, capturing shifts in the structure, coherence, and logical depth of students' argumentation, is inherently interpretive and cannot be adequately reduced to numerical measurement. Furthermore, following Njie & Asimiran (2021), the conceptualisation of case study as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, particularly when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident, this method is especially suitable since it enables the in-depth study of a particular phenomenon, namely, mnemonic-assisted learning, within a constrained academic setting involving six participants over six weeks. Additionally, the study examines changes in participants' argumentation using a descriptive-comparative lens. The study records the developmental trajectory of the students' conceptual clarity by contrasting baseline performance (pre-intervention) with post-mnemonic performance (post-intervention). This design ensures that the results focus on the qualitative development of the students' critical discourse rather than just final grades.

Participants

The participants of this study consisted of six second-year EFL (English as a Foreign Language) students enrolled in an introductory semantics course at a private university in Jakarta, Indonesia. Participants were selected through purposive sampling (Amponsah et al., 2018), based on preliminary classroom observations indicating that they experienced notable difficulty articulating complex semantic relations, particularly in distinguishing between closely related concepts such as polysemy and homonymy. This criterion was deemed essential, as the study specifically sought to examine whether the *Semantic Menu* could support students who initially struggled with conceptual clarity, thereby directly addressing the research questions concerning shifts in comprehension and argumentation. Following the Week 1 baseline interviews, each participant's specific area of semantic difficulty was identified, and a single culinary-themed mnemonic was purposively assigned accordingly: HWW (argument reconstruction) received *B.U.R.G.E.R*; SLX (sense relations and opposition) received *N.A.C.H.O.S*; WMA (lexical ambiguity) received *C.H.I.P.S*; YDK (figurative language) received *M.U.F.F.I.N*; FES (denotative-connotative meaning) received *S.A.L.A.D*; and WWW (contextual terminology analysis) received *T.A.C.O*. This individualised assignment allowed the intervention to target each student's diagnosed conceptual gap directly, rather than applying a uniform mnemonic across all participants. As is typical of qualitative case studies, this small-scale cohort was selected to guarantee a detailed and high-quality investigation of their argumentation movements. Data were collected through two stages of interviews and written assignments across six weeks, generating a substantial volume of longitudinal data for each participant. This is consistent with the principle of information power, whereby rich, in-depth data from a small, purposively selected sample can adequately address the research questions without requiring a larger cohort (Friday & Leah, 2024). The students' involvement was voluntary, and their identities were kept private to uphold ethical standards.

Data Procedure

The intervention was conducted over four weeks (Weeks 2–5), preceded and followed by one week each dedicated to data collection (Week 1 and Week 6, respectively), for a total study duration of six weeks. Each weekly session lasted 45 minutes and was held in a single classroom setting attended by all six participants together. Week 2 served as an

introductory session, in which the overall *Semantic Menu* framework and its rationale were presented to the class as a whole. Across Weeks 3 and 4, the six culinary-themed mnemonics were introduced collectively to all participants, at a rate of two mnemonics per session, with the researcher explaining each acronym's corresponding semantic subtopics and demonstrating its application to sample sentences. However, following each collective presentation, participants engaged in individualised practice activities, in which each student applied only the specific mnemonic previously assigned to them based on their diagnosed area of semantic difficulty (see Participants). Week 5 served as a consolidation session, during which participants further practiced and refined their use of their assigned mnemonic through additional classification exercises. Each session concluded with an open discussion, during which students raised questions and clarified their understanding of the concepts covered, with individual attention given to each participant's specific mnemonic where needed. Data were collected at two stages: baseline data were gathered in Week 1, prior to the introduction of any mnemonic, to establish participants' initial understanding and argumentation patterns; post-intervention data were gathered in Week 6, following the completion of the full mnemonic sequence, to assess participants' resulting performance. At each stage, data were gathered through individual interviews and written assignments, in which participants were asked to explain and justify their understanding of specific semantic relations.

Table 1. Profile of the Research Participants

Students' Initial	Gender	Semester	Initial Linguistic Challenge (The Fog)	Baseline Performance
HWW	F	4 th	Terminological confusion (Polysemy/Homonymy)	Fragmented
SLX	F	4 th	High anxiety during theoretical retrieval	Inconsistent
WMA	F	4 th	Vague conceptual boundaries	Low
YDK	M	4 th	Difficulty in structuring semantic arguments	Fragmented
FES	M	4 th	Limited vocabulary for technical analysis	Minimalist
WWW	F	4 th	Cognitive overload with complex theories	Defensive

Data Collection

During the first semester of the academic year, six weeks were dedicated to the data collection procedure, structured into two stages. Baseline interviews and written assignments were completed during Week 1, prior to any instructional intervention. Across Weeks 2 through 5, the *Semantic Menu* framework was progressively introduced and practiced in regular classroom sessions—beginning with a general introduction in Week 2, followed by the collective presentation of two mnemonics per week in Weeks 3 and 4, and concluding with a consolidation week in Week 5. Post-intervention interviews and written assignments were then conducted in Week 6 to document changes in students' argumentative clarity. Participants were introduced to a customised mnemonic framework called the *Semantic Menu* throughout this process, with each participant subsequently practicing the specific mnemonic individually assigned to them (see Participants) as the main tool for organising their linguistic analysis. Table 2 below lists the six acronyms comprising the menu, each designed to classify a particular semantic feature relevant to the participant to whom it was assigned. To ensure methodological transparency, data collection instruments followed specific prompt patterns. Semi-structured interview protocols included questions such as '*How do you mentally separate the concepts of polysemy and homonymy when analysing an ambiguous sentence?*' and '*Which specific element of the culinary menu helped you resolve cognitive blockages during text*

analysis?' For written tasks, prompts were tailored to each participant's assigned mnemonic; for instance, HWW, who was assigned the *B.U.R.G.E.R* framework, was asked to apply the *B.U.R.G.E.R* model to evaluate the multiple meanings of the word 'run' in a three-paragraph analytical essay, ensuring each structural layer corresponded to an acronym component.

Table 2. The Semantic Menu Mnemonic Framework

No.	Mnemonic Item	Breakdown of Components	Primary Analytical Focus
1.	M.U.F.F.I.N	Metaphor, Understatement, Figurative, Focus, Implication, and Nuance	Figurative language and contextual depth
2.	C.A.K.E	Connotation, Antonym, Keyword, and Equivalence	Core semantic relations and word properties.
3.	S.A.L.A.D	Synonym, Antonym, Lexical Meaning, Ambiguity, and Denotation	Lexical choices and meaning boundaries
4.	C.H.I.P.S	Connotation, Homonym, Implication, Polysemy, and Sense	Sense relations and ambiguity resolution
5.	N.A.C.H.O.S	Nuance, Antonym, Connotation, Hyponymy, Opposition, and Synonymy	Detailed classification of sense relations.
6.	B.U.R.G.E.R	Background, Underlying meaning, Reference, Grounding, Evidence, and Result	Structural scaffolding for oral/written arguments

Data Analysis

Data from written assignments and interview transcripts were examined using thematic analysis, following a six-phase framework, to trace the development of students' argumentation clarity. Analysis proceeded through familiarisation with the data, generation of initial codes, searching for and reviewing potential themes, and defining and naming final themes. Three main indicators guided the analysis: conceptual depth, logical structure, and terminological precision. The researcher conducted coding as the sole coder; to mitigate potential subjectivity, interpretations were cross-checked against participants' own confirmations obtained through member checking, as described above. Using a comparative coding procedure, baseline (pre-intervention) responses were compared against post-intervention discourse for each participant, revealing specific patterns in how individual students organised their reasoning using their respective assigned mnemonic. The resulting themes were ultimately synthesised to characterise the transition from disjointed explanations to organised linguistic arguments, ensuring that conclusions were firmly grounded in participants' written and spoken testimony.

RESULT

The study's empirical findings are presented in this part, emphasising how students' argumentation clarity changed with the introduction of the *Semantic Menu*. The results are arranged to compare the participants' performance after the intervention with their early conceptual difficulties. The effectiveness of culinary-themed mnemonics as cognitive scaffolds is interpreted in the discussion that follows by combining data from written assignments and interviews. These results are then correlated with well-established pedagogical theories of mnemonic training.

Baseline Performance (Pre-Intervention): The Terminological Fog

Prior to the implementation of the *Semantic Menu*, there was a notable discrepancy between students' theoretical understanding and their actual analytical application, as evidenced by data collected from preliminary interviews and written tasks. Each

participant exhibited a distinct manifestation of what may be termed a 'terminological fog', difficulty translating abstract semantic theory into coherent analytical practice corresponding to the specific conceptual gap that would later inform their individualised mnemonic assignment.

Participants struggling with sense relations and lexical ambiguity described feeling overwhelmed by overlapping terminology. SLX, for instance, admitted:

"If asked about the difference between regular antonyms, graded opposition, or hyponymy relations, to be honest, I was extremely confused. The academic terminology in the textbook is dense and repetitive, so when analysing texts, I often failed to distinguish between connotation and actual semantic nuance."

Similarly, WMA reflected on the disconnect between theoretical knowledge and practical application:

"I knew the theory, but when it came to writing the analysis, I was confused about where to start. My flow became disorganised, and my arguments weren't strong."

Other participants reported difficulty with more abstract dimensions of meaning. YDK explained that interpreting figurative and implied meaning remained largely intuitive rather than analytical:

"I knew there were underlying meanings or understatement, but I struggled to explain them academically. The theory of implication felt highly abstract, leaving my analysis to rely on mere general guessing."

FES similarly described cognitive strain when distinguishing denotative from connotative meaning:

"My cognitive load was at its highest when I had to separate literal dictionary meanings (denotation) from ambiguous contextual connotations in a sentence."

Meanwhile, WWW struggled to connect terminology with context, noting:

"I often lost sight of my analytical objective because I was too overwhelmed just trying to figure out the definitions of the terms." Finally, HWW's difficulty centered on argument construction itself: "I knew the theory, but when it came to writing the analysis, I was confused about where to start."

Across all six participants, this baseline period was marked by heavy reliance on memorised definitions rather than critical examination, resulting in arguments that were typically disjointed and lacking in logical depth. This pattern reflects a broader cognitive distress in which students felt overwhelmed by the abstract nature of linguistic jargon, resulting in a defensive and cautious style of argumentation.

Post-Intervention: The Mnemonic of Scaffolding Effect

Following the intervention, all six participants exhibited a marked shift toward systematic, terminology-precise reasoning, replacing the fragmented explanations characteristic of the baseline period. Each participant's transition was closely tied to the specific mnemonic assigned to address their diagnosed conceptual gap.

SLX, previously confused by overlapping sense relations, reported that the N.A.C.H.O.S framework enabled concrete visualisation:

"After studying with the N.A.C.H.O.S menu, these semantic relations became far more concrete. The acronym is easy to remember, allowing me to visually map out hyponymy and opposition in my mind, almost like layering nachos."

WMA, who had struggled with ambiguity between polysemy and homonymy, described the C.H.I.P.S framework as clarifying:

"The CHIPS framework helped me distinguish more easily between words with branching meanings (polysemy) and words that sound the same but have different meanings (homonymy)."

Participants working with more abstract semantic dimensions also reported increased structural clarity. YDK noted that the M.U.F.F.I.N framework transformed the analysis of figurative language into a structured process:

"Now, when analysing figurative language, I can break down the aspects from metaphor to nuance in a highly structured manner. Analysing implied implications no longer feels overwhelming."

FES similarly described the S.A.L.A.D framework as resolving prior confusion around denotation and connotation:

"The concept of denotation, which used to be confusing, is now incredibly easy to isolate using this menu guide."

WWW reported that the T.A.C.O framework provided a systematic analytical sequence:

"I start with the terminology, move into deep analysis, and link it to the actual context to achieve the writing objective. The process has become much more tactical."

Finally, HWW, whose difficulty had centered on argument construction, described how the B.U.R.G.E.R framework restructured their analytical writing:

"I just followed the layers from B-U-R-G-E-R—starting with the background, finding the underlying meaning, then connecting it to the evidence and result. My analysis became more organised because the structure of the menu was clear."

Table 3. Comparative Analysis of Student Performance (Pre vs. Post Intervention)

Student's Initial	Assigned Mnemonic	Baseline Performance (Pre-Intervention)	Post-Intervention Performance	Primary Indicator of Change
HWW	B.U.R.G.E.R	Fragmented	Structured	Logical structure
SLX	N.A.C.H.O.S	Inconsistent	Structured	Terminological precision
WMA	C.H.I.P.S	Low	Structured	Conceptual depth
YDK	M.U.F.F.I.N	Fragmented	Structured	Conceptual depth
FES	S.A.L.A.D	Minimalist	Structured	Terminological precision
WWW	T.A.C.O	Defensive	Structured	Logical structure

As illustrated in Table 3, participants' baseline and post-intervention performances showed a marked qualitative shift across all six cases. Collectively, these findings suggest that when a culinary-themed mnemonic is purposively matched to a student's specific conceptual gap, it can serve as an effective cognitive scaffold, supporting a transition from fragmented, guess-based reasoning to structured, terminology-precise argumentation.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study indicate that the *Semantic Menu's* efficacy stems from its capacity to serve as both a psychological anchor and a cognitive scaffold. The paradigm successfully addressed the problems of cognitive load theory by projecting abstract semantic relations onto well-known culinary notions. The baseline phase's terminological fog was probably caused by intrinsic cognitive overload, where students were immobilised by the high element interaction of linguistic jargon (Dragomir *et al.*, 2026). This complex material was broken down into relatable, retrievable schemas through mnemonics ranging across all six frameworks, from B.U.R.G.E.R to T.A.C.O, each purposively matched to a participant's specific diagnosed difficulty. This is consistent with the principles of mnemonic instruction, which hold that long-term retention and retrieval are improved by making meaningful and important associations, even with seemingly light-hearted themes (Lallali, 2024).

Notably, the individualised nature of this matching process appears to be a key driver of the intervention's effectiveness. Rather than applying a single, uniform mnemonic across

the cohort, tailoring each acronym to a participant's specific conceptual gap, such as *C.H.I.P.S* for lexical ambiguity or *M.U.F.F.I.N* for figurative language, allowed the scaffold to target the source of each student's cognitive overload directly. This diagnostic-instructional alignment directly addresses RQ1, demonstrating measurable gains in participants' conceptual understanding of their respective semantic sub-domains, and RQ2, evidenced by the shift from fragmented, guess-based reasoning to structured, evidence-supported argumentation observed across all six cases.

Furthermore, integrating these schemas serves as an internal filter that complements digital learning spaces. In an educational landscape increasingly dominated by automated feedback and AI-generated text, students often lack the structural metacognition to evaluate linguistic nuances independently. The *Semantic Menu* addresses this gap by fostering internal critical control. Additionally, the food-acronym strategy's movement from fragmented to organised argumentation demonstrates the effectiveness of scaffolding in a Vygotskian sense (Pradesh et al., 2017); the menu gave students the short-term assistance they needed to advance to a higher level of analytical competence. Upon completion, the change in student confidence suggests that students are more inclined to participate in the high-stakes cognitive work of defending complicated language arguments when relatable analogies lower the affective filter (Raju & Joshith, 2018). This implies that the *Semantic Menu* functions as a structural bridge that converts theoretical knowledge into active, communicative ability, particularly when its application is calibrated to the individual learner's diagnosed needs, rather than serving merely as a generic memory aid.

CONCLUSION

This study examined how the *Semantic Menu*, a culinary-themed mnemonic framework, influences the conceptual understanding and argumentation structure of intermediate EFL students. Drawing on data from six purposively selected participants, each diagnosed with a distinct semantic learning difficulty and assigned an individualised mnemonic, the findings show a marked shift from fragmented, guess-based reasoning to structured, terminology-precise argumentation. This addresses RQ1 through improved conceptual understanding of participants' respective semantic sub-domains, and RQ2 through more coherent and logically structured argumentation following each mnemonic's analytical sequence. The study's central contribution lies not merely in the culinary-themed acronyms themselves, but in the individualised approach through which each mnemonic was matched to a student's specific conceptual gap, suggesting that mnemonic scaffolding is most effective when tailored to learners' particular needs rather than applied uniformly. This offers linguistics educators a creative, theoretically grounded alternative to conventional semantics instruction.

These findings should be interpreted in light of several limitations: participants were purposively selected based on initial difficulty, which may limit generalizability to students with stronger baseline clarity; coding was conducted by a single researcher, partially mitigated through member checking and triangulation; and the small, single-institution sample constrains broader transferability. Future research could test this framework with larger, more diverse cohorts and incorporate inter-coder reliability. Overall, the study suggests that anchoring abstract semantic theory to familiar, individually relevant schemas helps EFL students move from passive memorisation toward active, confident linguistic argumentation.

AI Disclosure Statement

The authors used a generative AI tool, Claude, solely for language editing, proofreading, and structural refinement. The tool was employed to improve the grammar, clarity, and readability of the manuscript. The authors reviewed and edited all AI-assisted content. No

generative AI was used for data collection, data analysis, interpretation of results, or conclusion. The authors take full responsibility for the content of this article.

REFERENCES

- Abdolmaleki, N., & Saeedi, Z. (2024). Brain-based CALL in flipped higher education GE courses held through LMS: Boosting vocabulary learning and reading comprehension. *International Journal Education Technology for High Education*, 21(11), 27. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00442-9>
- Amponsah, M. O., Milledzi, E. Y., & Ampofo, E. T. (2018). Relationship between Parental Involvement and Academic Performance of Senior High School Students: The Case of Ashanti Mampong Municipality of Ghana. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 6(1), doi. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-6-1-1>
- Azhari, D., & Chen, S. (2025). Managing Cognitive Loads in Linguistics Learning through Augmented Reality: A Mixed-Methods Study. *IATED Digital Library Home*, 1(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.21125/edulearn.2025.1559>
- Bahari, A., Wu, S., & Ayres, P. (2023). Improving Computer-Assisted Language Learning Through the Lens of Cognitive Load. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35(53), 1–13. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09764-y>
- Belleca, F. C. D. G., Caampued, K. R., Caballas, R. B., Guiruela, J. M. N., & Ocampo, D. M. (2025). Effectiveness of Mnemonic Method on Students' Language Information Retention. *Journal of English Language and Pedagogy (JELPA)*, 3(2), 49–58. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.51826/jelpa.v3i2.1578>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2020). Can I use TA? Should I Use TA? Should I not Use TA? Comparing Reflexive Thematic Analysis and Other Pattern-Based Qualitative Analytic approaches. *Counseling and Psychotherapy Research*, 21(1), 37–47. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12360>
- Conderman, G. (2020). Mnemonics: A Fun and Effective Way to Remember. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 56(3), 139–142. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/00228958.2020.1770008>
- Dragomir, I.-A., Niculescu, B.-O., & Tudorache, P. (2026). Building Intercultural Leaders in Bani Military Contexts: The Evolution of Elt Beyond Linguistic Accuracy. *International Conference Knowledge-Based Organization*, 2(32), 1–13. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2478/kbo-2026-0049>
- Friday, N., & Leah, N. (2024). Types of Purposive Sampling Techniques with Their Examples and Application in Qualitative Research Studies. *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies*, 5(1), 90–99. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.0196>
- Grodniewicz, J. P. (2021). The Process of Linguistic Understanding. *Synthese*, 198(1), 11463 – 11481. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-020-02807-9>
- Haverkamp, N., & Hoeltje, M. (2021). Semantic Theories, Linguistic Essences, and Knowledge of Meaning. *Synthese*, 199(1), 14459 – 14490. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-021-03429-5>
- Hill, A. C. (2022). The Effectiveness of Mnemonic Devices for ESL Vocabulary Retention. *Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 15(4), 10. <https://doi.org/doi:10.5539/elt.v15n4p6>
- Lallali, H. (2024). *The Contribution of Mnemonics in Enhancing Students' Phonemic Awareness* [University of Biskra]. http://archives.univ-biskra.dz/bitstream/123456789/29044/1/Hania_LALLALI.pdf
- Lantolf, J. P., Xi, J., & Minakova, V. (2021). Sociocultural Theory and Concept-Based Language Instruction. *Language Teaching*, 54(3), 327–342. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000348>
- Lim, W. M. (2024). What Is Qualitative Research? An Overview and Guidelines. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 33(2), 1–13. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/14413582241264619>
- Njie, B., & Asimiran, S. (2021). Case Study as a Choice in Qualitative Methodology. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 4(3), 1. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.29408/edumatic.v5i1.2544>
- Pradesh, A., Hemalataha, & Kuppam. (2019). Vygotsky's Socio Cultural Theory: A Study. *International Journal of English, Language, and Humanities*, 4(12), 12. <https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/53825695/40.-Smt.-S.-Hemalataha-paper-final->

- with-cover-page-
v2.pdf?Expires=1647860497&Signature=ceM9IC2nM82cs6yHF9khaO~cdU-
xWFjiG5eoN2A0~07Bd3CJQOAoq4FwDzsc6WLVy2A~kYKdflAXwhFlb5h6zrLBXhuI
ofom2OgHAmFn2hWiEq7gOQCWJCgDB
- Qiu, Q., Xie, Z., Xiong, Y., & Zhou, F. (2021). Belief Change Before and After the Teaching Practicum Among Chinese Pre-Service ELT Teachers. *Sage Open*, 11(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211004934>
- Qizi, S. R. Q. (2023). Mnemonics and Its Usage in Teaching and Learning English Language. *International Journal Of Literature And Languages*, 3(06), 13. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.37547/ijll/Volume03Issue06-04>
- Raju, N., & Joshith, V. P. (2018). Krashen's Theory of Second Language Acquisition: A Practical Approach for English Language Classrooms. *International Journal of Innovative Knowledge Concepts*, 6(12), 77. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Paramita-Roy-2/publication/334732910_International_Journal_of_Innovative_Knowledge_Concepts/links/5d3dfef94585153e592a9f3e/International-Journal-of-Innovative-Knowledge-Concepts.pdf#page=186
- Twomey, C., & Kroneisen, M. (2021). The Effectiveness of the Loci Method as a Mnemonic Device: Meta-analysis. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 74(8), 1317–1326. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1747021821993457>
- Warrick, A. (2021). Strategies for Reducing Cognitive Overload in the Online Language Learning Classroom. *International Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 1(2), 25 – 37. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33422/ijsfle.v1i2.124>