JURNAL MUDABBIR
(Journal Research and Education Studies)
Volume 5 Nomor 2 Tahun 2025
http://jurnal.permapendis-sumut.org/index.php/mudabbir
ISSN: 2774-8391

An Analysis of Syllable Division Rules in English Spelling Patterns

Andien Afrizah[1], Dirza Rizki Purnama[2], Kinanti[3], Yani Lubis[4]

[1,2,3,4]Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

Email: andienafrizahxiia@gmail.com[1] , dirzarezki4@gmail.com[2] , kinanti290505@gmail.com[3] , yanilubis@uinsu.ac.id[4]

ABSTRACT

This study investigates how syllable division rules influence English spelling patterns and their pedagogical implications in language learning. Despite the irregular nature of English orthography, this research finds that consistent patterns particularly VC/CV structures and morphemic boundaries can guide learners in decoding and spelling. Through qualitative analysis of vocabulary samples, student writings, and classroom observations, the study reveals that many spelling errors stem from a lack of syllable awareness. Furthermore, it demonstrates that integrating syllable-based instruction improves decoding strategies, orthographic memory, and reading fluency. Challenges such as individual learner differences and English's etymological complexity are also addressed. Ultimately, the study advocates for explicit syllable instruction to enhance literacy outcomes.

Keywords: Syllable Division, English Orthography, Spelling Errors, Literacy Instruction, Decoding Strategies, Morphological Awareness.

INTRODUCTION

Mastering English spelling is a significant challenge for language learners due to the irregular and unpredictable nature of English orthography. Unlike phonetic languages, where spelling aligns closely with pronunciation, English often deviates from phonological expectations. However, within this complexity lie consistent patterns, one of which is syllable division. Understanding how words are broken into syllables can help learners decode, spell, and pronounce them more accurately. This paper explores

the role of syllable division in English spelling, examining its structural rules and how it shapes learners' understanding of word construction. By recognizing syllable boundaries, students can internalize patterns that aid in writing, reading, and overall literacy development. This study highlights the pedagogical value of integrating syllable instruction in language learning contexts.

The complexity of English orthography stems from its rich etymological heritage, incorporating elements from Germanic, Latin, French, and Greek linguistic traditions. This multilayered historical development has resulted in a spelling system that, while challenging, contains systematic patterns that can be identified and taught effectively. Syllable division serves as a bridge between the phonological and orthographic aspects of English, providing learners with a structured approach to understanding word formation. Research in psycholinguistics has consistently demonstrated that syllable awareness plays a crucial role in reading development, with learners who possess strong syllabic knowledge showing superior performance in decoding unfamiliar words and developing reading fluency. The ability to segment words into syllables not only facilitates pronunciation but also enhances spelling accuracy by helping learners recognize recurring patterns and morphological structures within English vocabulary.

Furthermore, the pedagogical implications of syllable-based instruction extend beyond basic literacy skills to encompass broader cognitive and metacognitive benefits. When learners develop explicit awareness of syllable structure, they acquire a powerful tool for independent word learning and self-correction strategies. This metacognitive awareness enables students to approach unfamiliar vocabulary with confidence, using syllable division as a systematic method for breaking down complex words into manageable components. The integration of syllable instruction into English language teaching represents a research-based approach that addresses the fundamental challenge of English orthographic complexity while providing learners with practical, transferable skills. Contemporary educational research emphasizes the importance of explicit, systematic instruction in phonological awareness, with syllable division serving as a critical component in this comprehensive approach to literacy development.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of syllable has long been a cornerstone in linguistic studies. According to Giegerich (1992), a syllable is a phonological unit consisting of an onset, nucleus, and coda. This structure not only affects pronunciation but also has implications for orthographic representation. Treiman and Kessler (2003) argue that phonological awareness, including syllable segmentation, is crucial in early literacy development. Children who are able to break words into syllables and identify their components are generally more successful in spelling and reading tasks. Venezky (1970) emphasizes that while English spelling is influenced by etymology and morphology, phonological

principles still play a major role. Other researchers such as Caravolas (2004) and Bryant et al. (1990) support the claim that syllable-level processing helps learners decode unfamiliar words. Understanding where one syllable ends and another begins is fundamental not only in speaking but also in the visual recognition and writing of words.

METHODOLOGY

This research applies a qualitative approach focusing on document analysis and textual observation. A set of commonly used English vocabulary items, selected from ESL textbooks and academic word lists, were analyzed in terms of their syllable structure and spelling patterns. The words were categorized based on common syllable division rules such as VC/CV, V/CV, VC/V, and morphemic boundaries. Each category was examined to understand how the division influenced spelling accuracy and potential learner errors. Furthermore, classroom observation notes and learner writing samples were used to cross-check how well students applied these rules in practice. The findings aim to inform teaching practices and material design for syllable-based spelling instruction.

DISSCUSION

General Syllable Division Rules in English

Syllable division in English follows several consistent rules, although exceptions exist due to borrowed words and historical spelling (Kearns, 2020). Qualitative analysis of the corpus of examined words reveals that syllable division rules can be categorized based on structural patterns that can be consistently observed.

This section explores the theoretical and practical foundations of the English syllable division system. Through a descriptive analytical approach, this research identifies dominant patterns that can be used as instructional guidelines. Understanding these regularities is crucial as it provides a predictive framework that can help learners overcome the complexities of English orthography (Treiman & Zukowski, 1991). This analysis also reveals that although English is often considered irregular, there exists a system that can be learned and taught systematically.

Consonant-Vowel Distribution Patterns

Analysis of consonant-vowel distribution in English syllable structures reveals predictable and teachable patterns. This subsection examines how the position and combination of consonants and vowels affect syllable division points. Findings indicate that understanding these patterns not only assists in spelling but also in pronunciation and the development of learners' phonological intuition. The regularities found in these patterns provide an empirical basis for developing effective instructional strategies.

1. VC/CV Rule (Vowel-Consonant/Consonant-Vowel): Words with two consecutive consonants between vowels show a strong tendency to be divided between those consonants. Based on Kearns' (2020) research on a corpus of 14,844 words from grades 1-8 texts, the VC|CV pattern in two-syllable words shows ~79% consistency in producing short vowel sounds, such as:

a. 'hap-py' (double consonant p-p)
b. 'bas-ket' (different consonants s-k)
c. 'win-ter' (different consonants n-t)
d. 'let-ter' (double consonant t-t)

However, this consistency decreases in polysyllabic words to ~63%, with some vowels showing consistency as low as 41% (Kearns, 2020).

2. V/CV and VC/V Rules: Single consonants between vowels show more complex variation. Kearns' (2020) research reveals that the V|CV pattern is only ~47% consistent in two-syllable words and decreases to ~33% in three-syllable words or more. The choice of division point depends on the characteristics of the vowel preceding the consonant:

a. Long vowels tend to be followed by V/CV division: 'ti-ger', 'ma-jor', 'fu-ture'
b. Short vowels tend to be followed by VC/V division: 'lem-on', 'riv-er', 'cab-in'

Division Based on Morphological Structure

This subsection analyzes how the morphological structure of words affects syllable division, with particular focus on the role of prefixes, suffixes, and compound words. Analysis shows that morphological awareness and syllable awareness mutually reinforce each other, creating an integrated system of word understanding (Carlisle, 2000). This finding is important because it reveals that syllable division is not merely a phonological phenomenon but also involves semantic and structural aspects of language.

1. Prefix and Suffix Rules: Morpheme boundaries function as natural syllable separators that can be clearly identified. This pattern shows high regularity in the analyzed data (Nagy et al., 2006):

a. Prefixes: 'un-kind', 're-write', 'pre-view', 'dis-like'
b. Suffixes: 'hope-less', 'care-ful', 'quick-ly', 'teach-er'

1 Compound Word Rules: In compound words, syllable division shows direct correspondence with component word boundaries:

a. 'sun-set' (sun + set)
b. tooth-brush' (tooth + brush)
c. 'fire-place' (fire + place)

Manifestations of Spelling Errors in Syllable Division Context

This section analyzes the causal relationship between misunderstanding syllable division rules and systematic spelling errors. Through qualitative analysis of student writing samples and classroom observations, this research identifies recurring and predictable error patterns (Al-Jarf, 2020). Findings indicate that many seemingly random spelling errors actually reflect gaps in understanding syllable structure.

Analysis of Double Consonant Error Patterns

This subsection investigates the phenomenon of double consonant errors as a direct manifestation of misunderstanding syllable division rules. Analysis shows that these errors are not mere oversights but reflect systemic misunderstanding of the function of double consonants in maintaining phonetic characteristics of syllables (Berninger et al., 2006).

Observation of student writing samples reveals that spelling errors are often related to misunderstanding the function of double consonants in syllable division. Al-Jarf's (2020) research shows that the most common spelling errors involve omitting one or more letters (vowels and consonants). Recurring errors include:

1. Double Consonant Omission Errors:
   a. 'runing' → 'running' (failure to understand the function of nn in run-ning)
   b. 'stoping' → 'stopping' (failure to understand the function of pp in stop-ping)
   c. 'planing' → 'planning' (failure to understand the function of nn in plan-ning)

Analysis indicates that these errors occur because learners do not recognize that double consonants function to maintain the short vowel sound in the preceding syllable (Bear et al., 2015).

2. Unnecessary Consonant Addition Errors:
   a. 'coming' → 'comming' (misapplication of double consonant rule)
   b. 'hoping' → 'hopping' (confusion between different meanings)

Silent E-Related Errors

This subsection analyzes the complexity of errors related to silent 'e' in the context of syllable division. This phenomenon demonstrates the intersection of morphological, phonological, and orthographic rules that often become a source of confusion for learners (Parker & Riley, 2005).

Qualitative analysis identifies error patterns related to understanding the function of silent 'e' in syllable structure:

1. Inappropriate Silent E Omission:
   a. 'lovly' → 'lovely' (not understanding that love remains intact as a syllable)
   b. 'completly' → 'completely' (not understanding the com-plete-ly structure)
2. Retaining Silent E That Should Be Deleted:

a. 'hopeing' → 'hoping' (not understanding the rule of e deletion before -ing)
b. 'writeing' → 'writing' (not understanding the write → writ-ing transformation)

Errors Due to Phonological Interference

This subsection explores the phenomenon of phonological interference as a source of spelling errors related to misalignment between sound representation and orthographic structure. Analysis shows that learners often experience conflict between what they hear and what they should write, exacerbated by misunderstanding syllable boundaries (Cook, 1997).

Analysis indicates that many spelling errors occur because learners rely too heavily on phonological representation without considering orthographic syllable structure:

1. → 'night' (phonetic representation vs. historical structure)
2. 'thru' → 'through' (phonetic simplification vs. conventional spelling)
3. 'lite' → 'light' (phonetic representation vs. established spelling pattern)

Implications of Syllable Awareness on Language Processing

This section analyzes the impact of syllable awareness on various aspects of language processing, from decoding to orthographic memory formation. Analysis shows that syllable awareness functions as a cognitive mechanism that facilitates multiple aspects of language learning simultaneously (Ehri et al., 2001).

Enhanced Word Decoding

This subsection examines how syllable awareness facilitates the word decoding process, particularly for unfamiliar or complex words. Analysis shows that learners with good syllable awareness develop more systematic and effective decoding strategies (National Reading Panel, 2000).

Observations indicate that learners with good syllable awareness show significant improvement in decoding unfamiliar words. The decoding process proceeds systematically:

1. Syllable Boundary Identification: Learners break words into manageable units
2. Phonetic Pattern Application: Each syllable is analyzed based on known sound patterns
3. Meaning **Synthesis**: Syllable combinations are reconstructed into whole words

Example of decoding process for 'information':

1. in-for-ma-tion
2. [ɪn] + [fɔr] + [meɪ] + [ʃən]
3. Meaning reconstruction based on known morphemes

Enhanced Orthographic Memory

This subsection analyzes how syllable awareness affects the formation and organization of orthographic memory. Findings indicate that learners who understand syllable structure develop more organized and accessible mental word representations (Adams, 1990).

Analysis shows that syllable-based learning facilitates more effective orthographic memory formation. Learners develop the ability to:

1. Orthographic Chunking: Grouping letters into meaningful units

Example:

a. beautiful' → beau-ti-ful (not b-e-a-u-t-i-f-u-l)
b. 'necessary' → nec-es-sar-y (not n-e-c-e-s-s-a-r-y)

2. Pattern Recognition: Recognizing recurring spelling patterns

Example:

a. -tion pattern: nation, station, creation
b. -ness pattern: happiness, sadness, kindness

Pedagogical Applications in Language Teaching

This section translates research findings into practical recommendations for classroom implementation. Analysis shows that syllable awareness can be effectively integrated into various aspects of language teaching, from explicit instruction to engaging learning activities (Moats, 2000).

Syllable-Based Instructional Strategies

This subsection presents concrete instructional strategies that can be implemented to develop syllable awareness. Based on National Reading Panel (2000) recommendations and current research, effective strategies integrate multiple learning modalities.

Visual segmentation techniques play a crucial role in syllable recognition, incorporating the use of dividing lines or different colors for each syllable to create clear visual distinctions. Word cards with clear syllable divisions provide students with tangible learning materials, while syllable puzzle activities enhance structural awareness by allowing learners to physically manipulate word components and understand their relationships (Jorayeva, 2024).

Kinesthetic activities engage learners through physical movement and rhythm, making syllable learning more dynamic and memorable. Clapping for each syllable helps students internalize syllable patterns through rhythmic repetition, while incorporating different body movements for each syllable creates multi-sensory learning experiences. Syllable jumping games transform the learning process into an active, enjoyable activity that reinforces syllable recognition through physical engagement (Oliveira et al., 2024).

The morphological approach focuses on understanding the meaningful components of words and their structural relationships. This method involves exploring

prefixes and suffixes as meaningful units, helping students recognize how these elements contribute to word formation and meaning. Through analysis of compound words and word formation processes, learners develop a deeper understanding of how words are constructed. Additionally, establishing connections between meaning and syllable structure enables students to comprehend the relationship between a word's semantic content and its phonological organization, creating a more comprehensive understanding of language structure (Musdalifah & Qamariah, 2024).

Integration into Literacy Curriculum

This subsection analyzes how syllable awareness can be systematically integrated into a comprehensive literacy curriculum. Findings indicate that effective integration requires a gradual approach that builds syllable awareness progressively from basic to advanced levels (Snow et al., 1998).

Analysis shows that syllable awareness must be systematically integrated into the literacy curriculum through a progressive developmental approach. The beginning stage focuses on establishing foundational understanding by introducing syllable concepts through simple words that are easily recognizable and manageable for novice learners. This stage emphasizes syllable segmentation and synthesis activities that help students break down words into their component parts and reconstruct them, while establishing the crucial connection between syllables and language rhythm to develop natural phonological awareness (Novelita, 2023).

The intermediate stage builds upon these foundations by exploring more complex syllable division rules that govern multisyllabic words and irregular patterns. Students engage in syllable-based spelling error analysis, which helps them understand common mistakes and develop strategies for accurate word construction. This stage particularly focuses on the development of independent decoding strategies, empowering learners to approach unfamiliar words with confidence and systematic analytical skills (Hidayat et al., 2023).

The advanced stage represents the culmination of syllable awareness development, incorporating sophisticated linguistic concepts and metacognitive skills. Students explore etymology analysis and its influence on syllable division, understanding how word origins affect their structural patterns and pronunciation. This stage also addresses dialect variation and its influence on syllable structure, helping learners appreciate linguistic diversity and adapt their understanding to different speech patterns. Most importantly, the advanced stage emphasizes the development of metacognitive awareness of word processing, enabling students to consciously monitor and regulate their own word recognition and decoding strategies for optimal reading comprehension and fluency (Pasaribu et al., 2024).

Evaluation and Assessment

This subsection develops a comprehensive evaluation framework for assessing syllable awareness development and its impact on literacy learning. Analysis shows that effective assessment must include multiple dimensions and use various methods to obtain an accurate picture of learner abilities (Good & Kaminski, 2002).

Diagnostic Assessment focuses on identifying learners' levels of syllable awareness, analyzing individual error patterns, and mapping specific instructional needs. These steps are essential for designing instruction that aligns with each student's initial learning condition.

Formative Assessment is used to monitor students' progress in understanding syllable rules, provide immediate feedback on their application, and encourage metacognitive reflection on the strategies employed during the learning process.

Summative Assessment aims to evaluate students' ability to apply syllable rules in authentic contexts, assess the transfer of learning to new situations, and review the overall impact on their literacy skills.

Challenges and Complexities in Implementation

This section analyzes various challenges that may be encountered in implementing syllable awareness-based learning. Analysis shows that although research demonstrates significant benefits, practical implementation faces various complexities that require special consideration (Berninger et al., 2006).

Individual Variability

This subsection explores how individual differences affect syllable awareness learning and responses to instruction. The analysis reveals that individual variability is a complex factor involving multiple dimensions, ranging from linguistic background to learning style preferences (Perfetti, 2007). Learner responses to syllable-based instruction vary significantly due to several influencing factors.

Linguistic background plays a crucial role. Learners whose first languages have different syllable structures tend to exhibit unique adaptation patterns. Interference from the phonological system of the first language may affect their ability to perceive syllable boundaries accurately. Additionally, multilingual learners may either benefit from their metalinguistic awareness or face challenges depending on the depth of that awareness.

Learning styles also influence instructional outcomes. Visual learners tend to respond well to graphic representations of syllable division, while auditory learners benefit more from rhythmic and phonetic activities. Kinesthetic learners, on the other hand, require hands-on activities and physical movement to engage effectively with syllable-related tasks.

English Orthographic Complexity

This subsection analyzes how inherent characteristics of the English orthographic system create special challenges in syllable awareness learning. Kearns (2020) shows that this complexity reflects attempts to "impose regularity on a language in places that do not have highly regular characteristics".

Analysis reveals that several aspects of English orthography pose challenges to the consistent application of syllable rules. One major factor is etymological influence. Words derived from Latin, such as *psychology* (psy-cho-lo-gy), Greek, such as *philosophy* (phi-los-o-phy), and French, such as *restaurant* (res-tau-rant), often retain syllable structures that differ from regular English phonological patterns, making rule-based syllable division less predictable.

Regional variations further complicate syllable awareness. Differences in pronunciation across regions can alter how syllable boundaries are perceived. Additionally, spelling variations between British and American English, as well as the influence of local accents, can affect learners' ability to identify and apply syllable division accurately.

These findings underscore the importance of adopting flexible and adaptive instructional approaches when teaching syllable awareness. Educators should consider both individual learner differences and the broader sociolinguistic contexts in which learners are situated (Cook, 1997).

CONCLUSION

This comprehensive analysis demonstrates that English orthography, despite its perceived irregularity, contains systematic patterns within syllable division that can be effectively taught and learned. The research establishes that syllable division follows consistent rules, with the VC/CV pattern showing approximately 79% consistency in two-syllable words and morphological boundaries demonstrating high regularity as natural syllable separators. The study reveals a strong causal relationship between misunderstanding syllable division rules and systematic spelling errors, including double consonant omissions and inappropriate silent 'e' handling. These findings indicate that spelling errors are not random but reflect specific gaps in syllable awareness, while learners with strong syllable awareness develop more systematic decoding strategies and better organize mental word representations through orthographic chunking and pattern recognition.

The research translates theoretical insights into practical instructional strategies integrating multiple learning modalities through visual segmentation techniques, kinesthetic activities, and morphological approaches. However, the study acknowledges significant implementation challenges, including individual variability in learner responses and the inherent complexity of English orthography influenced by

etymological diversity and regional variations. This analysis contributes empirical evidence that English orthography contains learnable systematic patterns, bridging theoretical knowledge with practical pedagogical applications. Future research should focus on developing sophisticated assessment tools for syllable awareness, investigating technology-enhanced instruction, and conducting longitudinal studies on long-term literacy development impact.

REFERENCES

Adams, M. J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. MIT Press.

Al-Jarf, R. (2020). Exploring spelling errors with relation to the phonological syllable structure in the writings of Saudi ESL learners. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 10(5), 78-89.

Bear, D. R., Invernizzi, M., Templeton, S., & Johnston, F. (2015). *Words their way: Word study for phonics, vocabulary, and spelling instruction* (6th ed.). Pearson.

Berninger, V. W., Abbott, R. D., Nagy, W., & Carlisle, J. (2006). Growth in phonological, orthographic, and morphological awareness in grades 1 to 6. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 35(2), 141-163.

Carlisle, J. F. (2000). Awareness of the structure and meaning of morphologically complex words: Impact on reading. *Reading and Writing*, 12(3), 169-190.

Cook, V. (1997). *Inside language*. Arnold.

Ehri, L. C., Nunes, S. R., Willows, D. M., Schuster, B. V., Yaghoub-Zadeh, Z., & Shanahan, T. (2001). Phonemic awareness instruction helps children learn to read: Evidence from the National Reading Panel's meta-analysis. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 36(3), 250-287.

Good, R. H., & Kaminski, R. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Dynamic indicators of basic early literacy skills* (6th ed.). Institute for the Development of Educational Achievement.

Hidayat, R., Asyhar, Moch., Jafar, S., & Musaddat, S. (2023). Penyuluhan bentuk kesalahan berbahasa skripsi bagi mahasiswa prodi pendidikan bahasa dan sastra indonesia. *Darma Diksani: Jurnal Pengabdian Ilmu Pendidikan, Sosial, Dan Humaniora*, *3*(1), 36–48. https://doi.org/10.29303/darmadiksani.v3i1.2788

Jorayeva, S. (2024). Syllable concept in primary classes. *International Journal of Advances in Scientific Research*. https://doi.org/10.37547/ijasr-04-02-14

Kearns, D. M. (2020). Does English have useful syllable division patterns? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(4), 513-531.

Moats, L. C. (2000). *Speech to print: Language essentials for teachers*. Paul H. Brookes.

Musdalifah, M., & Qamariah, Z. (2024). The Effect Of Teaching Basics Of English Morphology On EFL Students' Vocabulary Mastery. *Fonologi Jurnal Ilmuan Bahasa Dan Sastra Inggris*, *2*(2), 97–103. https://doi.org/10.61132/fonologi.v2i2.654

Nagy, W., Berninger, V. W., & Abbott, R. D. (2006). Contributions of morphology beyond phonology to literacy outcomes of upper elementary and middle-school students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(1), 134-147.

National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Novelita, N. (2023). Upaya meningkatkan kemampuan membaca permulaan menggunakan media kartu suku kata di sekolah dasar. *Didaktik: Jurnal Ilmiah PGSD STKIP Subang*, *9*(2), 1633–1652. https://doi.org/10.36989/didaktik.v9i2.888

Oliveira, A. B., Cardoso, C. S., Saldanha, F. F., Schmaedecke, F., Rosa, G. J. M., Mendes, G. O., Silva, J. J. N. da, Colman, K. G. R., Lammel, K., Tittello, M. C. M., Miranda, M. da S., & Giordani, R. (2024). *Aprendizagem cinética: integrando movimento na sala de aula*. 01–02. https://doi.org/10.69849/revistaft/fa10202407311501

Parker, R., & Riley, J. (2005). *Linguistics for non-linguists* (4th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.

Pasaribu, D., Faisal, M., Nasir, H. B., Regar, N., Putri, N. A., Lubis, Y., William, Jl., IskandarPs., V., Baru, K., & Tuan, S. (2024). Identify and Analyze Various Types of English Syllables. *Sintaksis*. https://doi.org/10.61132/sintaksis.v2i4.747

Perfetti, C. (2007). Reading ability: Lexical quality to comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 11(4), 357-383.

Snow, C. E., Burns, M. S., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. National Academy Press.

Treiman, R., & Zukowski, A. (1991). Levels of phonological awareness. In S. Brady & D. Shankweiler (Eds.), *Phonological processes in literacy* (pp. 67-83). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.