

Vocabulary Education & Research Bulletin

Fall 2015

Volume 4, Issue 2

Hello everyone,

With so much happening in the world of vocabulary research, we are excited to be bringing you the autumn issue of the VERB. In this issue, we have four poster synopses from the 4th Annual Symposium on Vocabulary Learning and Testing this past June. **Peter Harrold** starts us off with vocabulary games that can easily be implemented in the classroom. **Mark Howarth** and **Andrew Thompson** explore learner perceptions of writing mastery sentences. **Kimberly Klassen** studies the potential burden of proper names for L2 learners. Finally, **Darrell Wilkinson** takes a look at peer-to-peer testing with students using deliberate vocabulary study strategies.

We hope you keep in mind January 12 as the deadline for the next VERB. With the short format, we hope this publication will continue to act as a tool to keep members informed of important discoveries and ongoing research. Looking forward to your next submissions!

The VERB editors
Magda Kitano & Stuart McLean

Table of Contents

Poster Synopses

Peter Harrold_____	2
Word play – using games to review and recycle vocabulary	
Mark Howarth & Andrew Thompson_____	6
Moving beyond meaning-level of knowledge to a usage-level of knowledge	
Kimberly Klassen_____	11
What’s a Jack? Proper nouns and L2 reading comprehension	
Darrell Wilkinson_____	16
Peer testing to increase motivation for deliberate vocabulary study	
SIG News _____	23

Poster Synopsis

Word Play – Using Games to Review and Recycle Vocabulary

Peter Harrold

harrold@ip.kyusan-u.ac.jp

In order for learners to successfully retain and use new vocabulary they must encounter the words in different contexts. This increases their familiarity with the spelling, pronunciation, collocations, synonyms, and any visual association that each word may have (Nation, 2001). One way to reinforce the learners' understanding of a word and recycle it is to incorporate vocabulary games and activities into the lesson (Koprowski, 2006). This additional exposure to the vocabulary can provide an enjoyable way for learners to test their own comprehension of the words, and potentially motivates learners through friendly competition with their peers (Huyen & Nga, 2003). Furthermore, playing games may lead to improvements in both immediate and delayed retention of vocabulary (Tuan, 2012).

Learners in the Fundamental English Program at Kyushu Sangyo University meet once a week for Listening and Speaking class. Between classes, they are required to learn 40 new words that are recorded in their vocabulary notebook. These words are primarily recycled and reviewed outside of class by completing E-learning activities hosted on the Moodle Learning Management System. In class, learners again encounter the words through a weekly quiz, and learners may also be provided with review activities, such as gap-fill sentences, anagrams, and crosswords, all of which are taken from an in-house resource book (Cameron & Anderson, 2014).

This paper describes a range of games that were played in class to further recycle and review the words in the learners' weekly vocabulary lists. The games were played in five lower-tier English classes consisting of first year learners who had achieved on the entry test for the program a level of proficiency equivalent to A1 (basic user) of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages.

Learners generally respond positively to the use of games in class. The games encourage them to review their vocabulary notebooks for answers and share their findings. Learners appear to enjoy the variety of games offered and the games become easier to set up and play as learners become familiar with the format. The games help motivate learners to review vocabulary as a lead-in activity to the weekly vocabulary quiz. Overall,

vocabulary games are an enjoyable and motivational way for learners to review and reuse vocabulary.

Game procedures

This next section will describe the games used within class. Some of the games required the teacher to prepare pictures of the vocabulary. In this study the teacher collected images of the target vocabulary on PowerPoint slides before class, but alternatives such as flashcard pictures could be used.

1. Hot Seat

The teacher divides the class into two teams. Two *Hot Seats*—one for each team—are placed at the front of the class facing away from the whiteboard. One learner from each team sits in a *Hot Seat*. A picture of a target word is then projected onto the board. The learner's teammates describe the target word using synonyms and definitions. Gestures and first-language explanations are permitted if the learners have low language proficiency. The first learner in a *Hot Seat* to correctly guess the word wins a point for their team.

2. Word Search Race

Before class, the teacher creates a word search of the vocabulary list using the free online puzzle maker at puzzlemaker.discoveryeducation.com. The word clues are then removed and one copy of the puzzle is enlarged onto A3 paper for each team of three learners. The learners are then shown a picture of the target word and must race to identify the word and find it in the puzzle. The first to find the word wins a point for their team.

3. Board Race

For this game, the class is divided into teams. A learner from each team is given a whiteboard marker. They are then shown a picture of the target word. The first learner to identify and correctly spell the word on the board wins a point for their team. The markers are then given to the next players on the teams.

4. Charades

In this game learners act out the word in a picture for a teammate who cannot see the picture. The learners who are acting are not allowed to speak. Social anxiety can be reduced by having one person guess while the rest of the team acts out the word at the same time.

5. Pyramid

Similar in format to Hot Seat, Pyramid does not require the teacher to prepare pictures. The teacher first divides the class into two teams. The teacher then draws on the whiteboard a pyramid with a bottom row of 5 bricks. A learner from each team sits at the front of the class facing away from the whiteboard. The teacher then writes a target word in a brick at the bottom of the pyramid. The other learners must describe the word to their sitting teammate. Once the word has been guessed correctly, the sitting learners swap places with a teammate and a new word is written in another brick in the bottom row. To keep the game competitive, one point is awarded for a word in the bottom row, two for the next row up, etc., with five points awarded for the top brick. Thus, the last few words can significantly affect the outcome of the game.

6. Bingo

The learners draw a grid of six squares. In each square, they write a different word from their vocabulary list. The teacher then reads the words aloud in random order. If a learner hears a word from their list, they cross it out. Once they cross out all six words, they shout “Bingo!”

7. Hangman

Learners are asked to take turns guessing the letters of a word represented by dashes on the whiteboard. Although this game is familiar to learners, the teacher starts by drawing the full picture of a man on the gallows to show how each incorrectly guessed letter adds another piece to the drawing. The learners then form groups and play the game.

8. Pass the Bomb

The teacher projects a stopwatch image from a computer onto the whiteboard, or writes a series of numbers representing minutes on the whiteboard, to be ticked off by the teacher during the game. Next, the teacher hands a learner a softball that represents the bomb. The learner must recall and correctly spell a word from the vocabulary list and then pass the bomb to the next learner. Learners must recall a specified number of words without repetition in order to *diffuse the bomb* before the timer runs out. A rate of approximately three words per minute is a reasonable challenge for a low-level class playing this game for the first time.

9. Pictionary

Learners are asked to draw as many pictures of words from the vocabulary list as

possible for their teammates to guess within a time limit. This activity is done as a whole-class game on the whiteboard, but can be made even more effective by providing the learners with mini-whiteboards and having them work in groups.

References

- Cameron, A. & Anderson, C. (2014). *Top 2000 – A Vocabulary Workbook: Y1S1, Y1S2, Y2S1, Y2S2*. Kyushu Sangyo University.
- Huyen, N. & Nga, K. (2003). Learning Vocabulary Through Games. *Asian EFL Journal*. Retrieved on 12 June, 2015 from <http://asian-efl-journal.com/1493/quarterly-journal/2003/12/learning-vocabulary-through-games-the-effectiveness-of-learning-vocabulary-through-games/>
- Koprowski, M. (2006). Ten Good Games for Recycling Vocabulary. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 12(7) Retrieved on 12 June, 2015 from <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Koprowski-RecyclingVocabulary.html>
- Nation, P. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tuan, L. (2012). Vocabulary Recollection through Games. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(2) 257-264.

Poster Synopsis

Moving Beyond Meaning Level of Knowledge to a Usage Level of Knowledge

Mark Howarth

markwhowarth@gmail.com

Andrew Thompson

andrewthompson.ksu@gmail.com

Theoretical Framework

It is widely accepted in SLA literature that learners need deep knowledge of at least the 2000 most frequently used words in English for basic communication (Nation, 2001). The necessary depth of knowledge of these top 2000 words remains open to question (Schmitt & Schmitt, 2014). At the very least, however, learners must move beyond receptive knowledge of these words and towards productive knowledge (Schmitt, 2008).

This study examined learner perceptions of their interest in an activity that aimed to teach learners high frequency words. As an educational construct, interest has an established relationship with positive academic outcomes (Silvia, 2008). Research in the area of learner interest has shown that learners learn best when they are engaged in an activity and see value or utility in doing the activity (Hidi & Berndorff, 1998; Schraw, Flowerday, & Lehman, 2001). In order to learn these words effectively, learners must be provided with activities and strategies that they find interesting.

The current study builds upon research done by Masson (2012) in which she explored learner perceptions of writing “mastery sentences.” In this activity learners are required to write a sentence for each target word. The sentences must clearly demonstrate the meaning of the target word within the sentence itself. For example, for the target word “couch,” learners might write “I have a couch in my apartment.” The goal of the activity, however, is to construct a sentence in which, if “couch” was left blank, could only be correctly completed with that target word. Using the “couch” example, any number of words can conceivably be used in the sentence, “I have a ____ in my apartment.” Learners are taught to improve the quality of their sentences by writing longer, more detailed sentences that clearly demonstrate the meaning of the target word, such as “I fell asleep on my couch in the living room while watching TV.”

Sentence writing is an effective activity for vocabulary acquisition (Laufer, 2003; Folse 2006). However, few studies have examined learner perceptions of these kinds of activities. This study reports the results of a questionnaire given to learners who had completed a course in which they wrote mastery sentences as a homework activity. The survey asked learners to report on their level of interest in the activity, as well as the usefulness and level of difficulty of the activity.

Table 1. “The activity was interesting” (1=Not true at all, 2=Not true for me, 3=Not quite true for me, 4=Somewhat true for me, 5=Quite true for me, 6=Very true for me)

	Writing	Reading	Listening	Speaking
Mode	4	4	5	5
Median	4	4	4	4
Mean	3.9	3.8	4.0	4.2
SD	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.3

n=120

Sample Population

The participants were 120 learners enrolled in four classes for a “Four Skills” course at a private university in Japan. Demographic data was not collected on this survey, however the vast majority of the learners were Japanese and demonstrated a low-intermediate level of English proficiency. Learners must attain a score of 140 on the TOEIC Bridge test to enter the program, and most learners score approximately 420 on the TOEIC test at the end of the course.

Procedure

Each week the learners were provided with a list of 40 high-frequency vocabulary items. For homework, the learners chose 20 words from the list and constructed a mastery sentence for each word. The learners were advised to choose words that were unfamiliar or for which they would find it difficult to construct a sentence. Learners could choose to study all 40 words, but they were required to study only 20 for homework. During the next class, learners reviewed their sentences with their peers using a variety of activities.

In the subsequent lesson, learners were given a quiz for which the teacher randomly chose 10 words from the list of 40, and learners were required to write a mastery sentence for each of the 10 words. The teacher collected the quizzes, provided written feedback on mistakes, and returned the quizzes to the learners. The learners then reviewed their quizzes and corrected any mistakes in their sentences based on the teacher’s feedback. This process was repeated for 10 weeks.

This aspect of the “Four Skills” course was considered the writing portion of the course. Learners also completed activities for developing reading, listening, and speaking skills. Upon completion of the course, the learners were asked to complete a questionnaire about their perceptions of each aspect of the course.

Results (Preliminary)

A 6-point Likert scale was used to measure the learners’ level of interest in each activity, the usefulness of each activity, and the difficulty of each activity. The questionnaire was in Japanese. The mastery sentence activity is referred to as the Writing activity in the charts below.

Table 2. “Usefulness” (1=Not useful at all, 2=Not useful, 3=Not quite useful, 4=Somewhat useful, 5=Quite useful, 6=Very useful)

	Writing	Reading	Listening	Speaking
Mode	5	5	4	5
Median	5	5	5	6
Mean	4.9	4.6	4.2	4.7
SD	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.4

n=120

Table 3. “Difficulty” (1=Very difficult, 2=Difficult, 3=Somewhat difficult, 4=Somewhat easy, 5=Easy, 6=Very easy)

	Writing	Reading	Listening	Speaking
Mode	3	3	3	4
Median	2	3	2	3
Mean	2.8	3.4	2.2	3.6
SD	1.3	1.2	1.4	1.4

n=120

Conclusions (preliminary)

Based on the preliminary results of this study, the data seems to suggest that while the learners perceived the mastery sentence activity to be quite useful, they found it to be difficult to do and not particularly interesting as compared to other activities in the course. This confirms Masson’s (2012) finding that learners perceive the activity to be difficult but useful. Learner comments on the survey further confirmed this. Typical comments included, “This format helped me to understand how to use a word” and “I learned the words more deeply than in regular classes.” The surprising outcome of the current study is that learners recognized the usefulness of the activity but did not perceive it to be interesting.

Future Directions

The learners’ vocabulary proficiency was not measured in this pilot study. Therefore, further research related to vocabulary activity interest levels and learner outcomes must be conducted. If learners show a significant improvement in vocabulary knowledge through this activity, it might indicate a contradiction in recent research that learners learn best when they are interested in an activity (Silvia, 2008). In addition, learner interviews should be conducted to gain more insight into what they found to be useful about the activity and why they show relatively little interest in the activity.

References

Folse, K. (2006). The effect of type of written exercise on L2 vocabulary retention. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(2), 273-293. doi: 10.2307/40264523

- Hidi, S., & Berndorff, D. (1998). Situational interest and learning. In Hoffman, L., Krapp, A., Renninger, K., & Baumert, J. (Eds.), *Interest and learning: Proceedings of the Seeon conference on interest and learning* (pp.74-90). Kiel, Germany: IPN.
- Laufer, B. (2003). Vocabulary acquisition in a second language: Do learners really acquire most vocabulary by reading? Some empirical evidence. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 59(4), 567-587. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.59.4.567>
- Masson, M.E. (2012). Learner feedback regarding the use of “mastery sentences”. *Vocabulary Education & Research Bulletin*, 1(1), 5-6.
- Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N. (2008). Review article: Instructed second language vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 329-363. doi: 10.1177/1362168808089921
- Schmitt, N., & Schmitt, D. (2014). A reassessment of frequency and vocabulary size in L2 vocabulary teaching. *Language Teaching*, 47, pp 484-503
doi:10.1017/S0261444812000018
- Schraw, G., Flowerday, T., & Lehman, S. (2001). Increasing situational interest in the classroom. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13, 211-224.
doi: 10.1023/A:1016619705184
- Silvia, P. J. (2008). Interest—The curious emotion. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17, 57-60. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8721.2008.00548.x

Poster Synopsis

What's a Jack? Proper Nouns and L2 Reading Comprehension

Kimberly Klassen

kklassen@kansai-gaidai.ac.jp

Background

Extensive reading is beneficial for language learners: they can strengthen their knowledge of existing vocabulary and grammar, learn new vocabulary, improve reading skills, and learn about the culture and history of the target language (Nation, 2008). It also promotes automaticity (Hill, 2013) and is usually done independently at an appropriate vocabulary level. One type of lexis often overlooked in the literature, however, is proper nouns, which can comprise 3-5% of the vocabulary in graded readers (e.g. Webb & Macalister, 2013). Names often carry cultural information that the L2 reader might not be privy to, which increases the learning burden since dictionaries often are of little use.

The general assumption in the literature is that proper names do not constitute a learning load for the L2 reader. Hirsh and Nation (1992) argue that proper names do not require previous learning because the text will reveal information about names as the story progresses, and their form (capitalization) and function (role) signal that they are proper names. Brown (2010) recounts in his discussion of text coverage calculations how it has become standard practice to ignore proper names in vocabulary coverage counts, citing studies such as Chujo and Utiyama (2005), Nation (2006), Schmitt (2008), and Webb and Rodgers (2009).

Conversely, Nation and Webb (2011) argue against assuming proper names are low-burden items. L1 readers hold prior knowledge of many names, which contributes to their comprehension of a text, such as which names refer to males, which are family names, and so on. Crystal (2006) notes that children are trained from a young age to recognize characteristics behind names, for example, *Goldilocks*. The L2 reader may not have this cultural familiarity and therefore, will be significantly encumbered by the names they meet. The authors of graded readers often overlook this burden, introducing many different characters in the first pages of a story (Hill, 2013).

Aims

The aim of this research is to investigate whether names are a source of difficulty for L2 readers and thus might warrant special consideration from teachers, researchers, and material writers. Two experiments were undertaken to study the potential burden of proper names for L2 readers.

Experiment 1: Method, Participants, and Results

The first study was an approximate replication of Erten and Razi (2009), which investigated the effect of cultural familiarity on L2 reading comprehension in Turkish advanced learners of English. The basic premise of Experiment 1 was to manipulate the proper names and other cultural referents in an American short story (2,902 words) in order to make them more culturally familiar to the learner group (here, L1 Japanese learners). The original setting was New York; in the adjusted version, this was changed to Osaka, a city near the participants' university with which they were familiar. Below is an example from the story used in Experiment 1:

Original version: *Fifth Avenue was shining in the sun when they left the Brevoort and started walking towards Washington Square.*

Adjusted version: *Midosuji was shining in the sun when they left Shinsaibashi and started walking towards Namba.*

The participants were 63 Japanese intermediate learners of English (TOEFL scores: 450–500), all first-year students at a private university (45 females, 18 males). One concern relating to these learners was the vocabulary level of the text, so a profile was created using VocabProfile (Cobb, 2015). When proper nouns were treated as known, the BNC-COCA 1K and 2K levels accounted for 95% of the text, which might allow for minimal comprehension (Laufer & Ravenhorst-Kalovski, 2010). However, when proper nouns were treated as off-list, the 1K and 2K levels accounted for only 90% of the text, perhaps rendering the text too difficult. Approximately half of the learners read the version with English names; the other half read the version with Japanese names. Comprehension was tested with a recall test (including True/False/Not Given, short-answer, and an events-ordering task) for a total of 40 points. The raw scores are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1

<i>Mean Comprehension Scores</i>			
Treatment	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Original version			
(English proper names)	35	18.97	7.15
Adjusted version			
(Japanese proper names)	28	19.21	8.12

The group that read the adjusted version did marginally better (48% comprehension) than the group that read the original version (47% comprehension). Levene's test ($p = .84$) was not significant, indicating the variance in the groups was equal. An independent samples t-test was conducted: the 95% CI for the differences in means was -3.61, 4.09 ($t = .126$, $p = .90$, $df = 61$), so there was no statistical difference between the groups. The effect size was also negligible ($d = 0.03$). This finding was in contrast to the original study (Erten & Razi, 2009), which found a large effect size between treatments, with much better comprehension for the adjusted version.

Experiment 2: Method, Sample and Results

The lack of statistically significant findings in Experiment 1 may be attributable to text length and vocabulary coverage. Therefore, a second experiment was conducted using a shorter text and 98% vocabulary coverage at the 1K and 2K levels to allow for adequate comprehension (Schmitt et al., 2011).

Two short academic texts were selected. Three versions were created from each: one with English proper names, one with Japanese names, and one without any names, only noun referents. Comprehension was tested in two ways: a written summary recall, followed by ten T/F/NG questions. These questions were included in case the participants had understood the text but lacked the productive skills to demonstrate this in a written summary. A total of 111 Japanese first-year university intermediate students of English (TOEFL scores: 450–500) took part in the experiment (74 females, 37 males). (Due to timing of the experiments, these participants differed from those in Experiment 1). The raw scores (out of 20) are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2

Comprehension Scores

Text 1			Text 2				
<u>Treatment</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Treatment</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
English names	39	13.03	3.63	English names	34	14.41	2.99
Japanese names	34	12.27	3.47	Japanese names	38	12.90	4.01
No names	38	12.05	3.30	No names	39	13.56	4.76

Initial data analysis showed that two assumptions of parametric tests had been violated: normal distribution, and homogeneity of variance. When the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test was run, no statistical significance was found for either Text 1 ($p = .52$) or Text 2 ($p = .30$). Interestingly, comprehension was better than in Experiment 1, ranging from 60% to 70%. Because the proficiency of the participants was similar to that of the participants in Experiment 1, the better comprehension is most likely a result of the 98% vocabulary coverage.

Conclusions and Future Directions

It is surprising that while some studies (Chihara, Sakurai, & Oller, 1989; Erten & Razi, 2009) have found an effect for cultural familiarity of names in reading comprehension, these two experiments did not. However, the lack of concrete evidence to date indicates that teachers and researchers should not assume proper nouns are known vocabulary by L2 readers. The results here suggest that a learning burden for proper names might not be of a semantic nature. In future studies, orthographic issues could be explored, such as the effect of the initial capital letter in English names and how effectively L2 readers process different letter cases when their L1 has no comparable writing convention.

References

- Brown, D. (2010). An improper assumption? The treatment of proper nouns in text coverage counts. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 22(2), 355-361.
- Chihara, T., Sakurai, T., & Oller, J. W. (1989). Background and Culture as Factors in EFL Reading Comprehension. *Language Testing*, 6(2), 143-151.
doi: 10.1177/026553228900600202
- Chujo, K., & Utiyama, M. (2005). Understanding the role of text length, sample size and

- vocabulary size in determining text coverage. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 17(1), 1-22.
- Cobb, T. (2015). VocabProfiler [Computer program]. <http://www.lex tutor.ca>.
- Crystal, D. (2006). *Words, Words, Words*. New York: Oxford.
- Erten, I. H., & Razi, S. (2009). The effects of cultural familiarity on reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 21(1), 60-77.
- Hill, D. R. (2013). Survey review: Graded readers. *ELT Journal*, 67(1), 85-125. doi: 10.1093/elt/51.1.57
- Hirsh, D., & Nation, P. (1992). What vocabulary size is needed to read unsimplified texts for pleasure? *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 8(2), 689-696.
- Laufer, B., & Ravenhorst-Kalovski, G. C. (2010). Lexical threshold revisited: Lexical text coverage, learners' vocabulary size and reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 22(1), 15-30.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2006). How large a vocabulary size is needed for reading and listening? *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63, 59-82. doi: 10.3138/cmlr.63.1.59
- Nation, I. S. P. (2008). *Teaching Vocabulary: Strategies and Techniques*. USA: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Webb, S. (2011). *Researching and Analyzing Vocabulary*. Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Schmitt, N. (2008). Instructed second language vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 12, 329-363. doi: 10.1177/1362168808089921
- Schmitt, N., Jiang, X., & Grabe, W. (2011). The percentage of words known in a text and reading comprehension. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 26-43. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01146.x
- Webb, S., & Macalister, J. (2013). Is text written for children useful for L2 extensive reading? *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(2), 300-322. doi: 10.1002/tesq.70
- Webb, S., & Rodgers, M. P. H. (2009). Vocabulary demands of television programs. *Language Learning*, 59, 335-366. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00509.x

Poster Synopsis

Peer Testing to Increase Motivation for Deliberate Vocabulary Study

Darrell Wilkinson

darrell_wilkinson@hotmail.com

Theoretical Framework***Importance of Vocabulary***

Vocabulary knowledge is widely acknowledged to be an essential component of language comprehension and use (Laufer & Shmueli, 1997; Nation, 2001; Schmitt, 2008, Wilkins, 1972). Vocabulary study generally can be divided into two types: incidental and intentional. Although some studies have shown that vocabulary can be learned incidentally, the reported gains usually have been quite small (Elley & Mangubhai, 1983; Pellicer-Sánchez & Schmitt, 2010; Saito, 2012; Waring & Takaki, 2003). On the other hand, numerous studies have highlighted the efficacy of deliberate vocabulary study (Mondria & Mondria-de Vries, 1994; Nakata, 2008; Schmitt & Schmitt, 1995). Therefore, while incidental vocabulary learning is important, learners also should devote considerable time to deliberate vocabulary study.

Vocabulary Selection

Learners should not only study the most frequent words (Laufer, 2014; Nation, 2001, Schmitt, 2008), but also self-select the words that they study (Harmon, et al., 2008; Hirai, 2014; Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001). Allowing the learners rather than the teacher to choose the words can motivate the learners and increase their engagement, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of their vocabulary study (Nation, 2001; Schmitt, 2008).

Importance of Testing

In many courses, regular testing is expected or desired, as it provides a means of checking learners' progress and assigning grades. Testing also might have learning benefits in terms of motivation, engagement, self-evaluation, and repetition (Butler, 2010; Deci, 1971; Harackiewicz & Sansone, 2000; Schmitt, 2008). These views are supported by interview and observation data gathered from an action research project in my current teaching context. Learners who self-selected words but were not tested on them did not seem interested or engaged in deliberate vocabulary study. When questioned during

interviews, many reported that the lack of testing not only provided little reason or motivation to study, but also meant that they had no means of assessing their progress. Therefore, introducing an element of regular vocabulary testing was deemed necessary in order to increase motivation and engagement.

Self-selection and Testing: A Common Challenge

However, if learners are self-selecting their vocabulary items, then each learner will have a different vocabulary set in their deliberate-study materials, especially given the differing vocabulary profiles of individual learners within a class (Brown, 2012; Iso, 2014; McLean, Hogg, & Kramer, 2014). Therefore, how are teachers to test all learners regularly on their specific vocabulary knowledge? Moreover, the test system should not take up too much class time, and should provide learning benefits (Nation, 2001).

One Possible Solution

To overcome these challenges, a peer-to-peer test system was developed. Peer tutoring improves motivation, engagement, and learning outcomes (Hattie, 2009; Schmitt, 2008), so it was hypothesized that a peer test system would offer both test benefits and peer support benefits. This paper outlines a simple and efficient testing procedure that increases learner motivation and time on task, enables learner self-assessment of vocabulary knowledge, and provides the teacher with a tool to monitor learners' progress.

Sample Population

The participants consisted primarily of Japanese learners between 18 and 19 years of age who had enrolled in compulsory English language courses at a private Japanese university in Tokyo. The sample included approximately 240 learners, with roughly equal numbers of male and female learners. Language levels varied, both between and within classes, with TOEIC total scores ranging from around 250 to 550. The learners were given the Vocabulary Levels Test (VLT), and results indicate that learners comprehended between 30% and 70% of the first 2000 words of the General Service List (GSL).

Procedure

After pre-course testing using the VLT, the learners were told how many words they needed to study to meet the course requirements, as well as on which level of the particular word list they should focus. They also were given training in deliberate vocabulary study strategies.

Next, the learners were told that peer-to-peer tests would be given frequently during

the course, and that the scores on these tests would form a small part of their grade for the vocabulary component of the course. During the second class, learners took a practice test in order to become familiar with the testing process. This process involved learners exchanging their deliberate-study materials with a partner, and then being tested by the partner using a test sheet (Appendix 1). Then, from week two, the learners were tested regularly by a different peer each time over the course of the semester. In addition, every learner was tested at least once by the teacher. At the end of the course, each learner calculated their average score.

Finally, in the last class, the learners were given a peer-generated written vocabulary test (Appendix 2). This test was designed and implemented using qualitative data previously collected through interviews in which a number of learners mentioned that they would study more frequently if a written test was given in addition to the weekly spoken tests.

Results (Preliminary)

Classroom observations, interviews, and an analysis of test scores have produced very positive results. Learners spend more time studying their words when they know that they will be tested on them. Moreover, they enjoy the weekly testing process, and are achieving scores of between 70-90% on the weekly tests and between 60-90% on the final written test. The test has offered myself and numerous other teachers a lighthearted and enjoyable, yet practical and effective method of motivating learners to study vocabulary, and to assess their individual level of effort.

Conclusions (Preliminary)

Although learners appreciate the self-selection vocabulary system, an element of testing is needed to increase motivation and time-on-task in many educational settings. Without sustained and high levels of motivation (Schmitt, 2008), and with an absence of a testing system, it is likely that many learners will not exert enough time or effort for deliberate vocabulary study. Therefore, tests such as those discussed above offer a practical solution to this problem and are well suited to mixed-ability contexts.

Future Directions

A controlled experimental study now being carried out will analyze the results of the above test system in terms of vocabulary acquisition and examine the correlation between the scores on these tests with the scores of other, more standardized, vocabulary tests. A paper describing how other teachers have adapted the test to their own teaching contexts

could also be illuminating and helpful to those working in different contexts.

References

- Brown, D. (2012). The frequency model of vocabulary learning and Japanese learners. *Vocabulary Learning and Instruction*, 1(1), 20–28. doi:10.7820/vli.v01.1.brown
- Butler, A. C. (2010). Repeated testing produces superior transfer of learning relative to repeated studying. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 36, 1118–1133. doi:10.1037/a0019902
- Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 18, 105–115. doi:10.1037/h0030644
- Elley, W. B., & Mangubhai, F. (1983). The impact of reading on second language learning. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 19, 53–67. doi:10.2307/747337
- Harackiewicz, J. M., & Sansone, C. (2000). Rewarding competence: The importance of goals in the study of intrinsic motivation. In C. Sansone & J. M. Harackiewicz (Eds.), *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The search for optimal motivation and performance* (pp. 79–104). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Harmon, J., Wood, K., Hedrick, W., & Gress, M. (2008). “Pick a word--not just any word”: using vocabulary self-selection with expository texts. *Middle School Journal*, 40, 43–52. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ809642>
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible Learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. London, England: Routledge.
- Hirai, A. (2014). A review of four studies on measuring vocabulary knowledge. *Vocabulary learning and Instruction*, 3(2), 85–92. doi:10.7820/vli.v03.2.hirai
- Iso, T. (2012). Examining the validity of the lexical access time test (LEXATT2). *Vocabulary Learning and Instruction*, 1(1), 78–82. doi:10.7820/vli.v01.1.iso
- Laufer, B. (2014). Vocabulary in a second language: selection, acquisition, and testing: a commentary on four studies for JALT vocabulary SIG. *Vocabulary Learning and Instruction*, 3(2), 38–46. doi:10.7820/vli.v03.2.laufer
- Laufer, B., & Hulstijn, J. (2001). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics*, 22, 1–26. doi:10.1093/applin/22.1.1
- McLean, S., Hogg, N., & Kramer, B. (2014). Estimations of Japanese university learners’ English vocabulary sizes using the vocabulary size test. *Vocabulary Learning and Instruction*, 3(2), 47–55. doi:10.7820/vli.v03.2.mclean.et.al
- Mondria, J. A., & Mondria-de Vries, S. (1994). Efficiently memorizing words with the help of word cards and “hand computer”: Theory and applications. *System*, 22, 47–57.

- doi:10.1016/0346-251x(94)90039-6
- Nakata, T. (2008). English vocabulary learning with word lists, word cards and computers: implications from cognitive psychology research for optimal spaced learning. *ReCALL*, 20, 3–20. doi:10.1017/s0958344008000219
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pellicer-Sánchez, A., & Schmitt, N. (2010). Incidental vocabulary acquisition from an authentic novel: Do Things Fall Apart? *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 1, 31–55. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ887875>
- Saito, Y. (2012). Does rote memorization deserve harsh criticism or close attention? What is the role of context in learning vocabulary? *Vocabulary Education and Research Bulletin*, 1, 9–10. Retrieved from <http://jaltvocab.weebly.com/publications.html>
- Schmitt, N. (2008). Review article: Instructed second language vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 12, 329–363. doi:10.1177/1362168808089921
- Schmitt, N., & Schmitt, D. (1995). Vocabulary notebooks: Theoretical underpinnings and practical suggestions. *ELT Journal*, 49(2), 133–143. doi:10.1093/elt/49.2.133
- Waring, R., & Takaki, M. (2003). At what rate do learners learn and retain new vocabulary from reading a graded reader? *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 15(2), 130–163. Retrieved from <http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/October2003/waring/waring.html>
- Wilkins, D. (1972). *Linguistics in language teaching*. London, England: Arnold.

Appendix 2: Written Peer-generated Test Sheet

	Word in English	Word in Japanese	No of Syllables	Part of Speech	Other Word Forms (adjective, adverb, noun, etc.)	Example Sentence
	1 point for each		½ point	½ point	1 point	Maximum of 2 points per sentence
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
Score	/10		/5	/5	/10	/20
						Total /50



SIG News

Vocabulary research and conference grants

The JALT Vocabulary SIG is pleased to announce the availability of two new grants. The first is a research grant, designed to provide funding for a vocabulary-related research project. The second is a conference grant, intended to provide funding for travel, lodging, and conference fees for a vocabulary-related conference presentation.

A total of three grants of either 50,000 or 100,000 yen may be awarded in 2015 depending on the number of viable applications.

The grants are available only to JALT Vocabulary SIG members who are working at least part-time as language instructors. (Interested parties are welcome to join the SIG in order to apply.)

The application deadline is November 15.

For more information and to download the application materials, please visit the SIG website at <http://jaltvocab.weebly.com/grants.html>.

CALL FOR PAPERS for Vocabulary Learning & Instruction

The Vocabulary SIG's *Vocabulary Learning and Instruction* (VLI) journal is calling for submissions for an upcoming issue. Submissions will be published online upon acceptance, and combined into an issue later this year.

VLI accepts long-form research papers (2000-7000 words) and brief reports, summaries, and commentaries (2000-3000 words) related to vocabulary acquisition, pedagogy, assessment, and lexical networks.

As an open journal, content is indexed on Google Scholar and made freely available on the internet without paywalls. Authors are free to also make their work available on sites such as academia.edu and researchgate.

All submissions are subject to a 2-step peer-review process:

A) Editors review manuscripts to ensure basic requirements are met, and that the work is of sufficient quality to merit external review. This process typically takes 1-2 weeks, at which point authors are informed of the outcome.

B) Submissions which meet these requirements are sent out for blind peer review by 2-3 experts in the field. This process takes approximately 1-2 months. Following external review, authors are sent copies of external reviewers' comments and notified of decisions (*accept, accept pending changes, revise and resubmit, or reject*).

VERB Submission Information

Short Papers

•Contributions to Short Papers and Word of Mouth sections must not exceed 1000 words, excluding references and titles. They are expected to adhere to APA 6th edition formatting guidelines. All submissions will undergo peer review, and may require rewriting and resubmission for acceptance.

Event Info

•If you know of a vocabulary-related event, or if you are planning to organize an event, let us know so we can get the word out for you!

Please send submissions to:
jaltvocabsig.verb@gmail.com

Deadline: January 12th 2015

For more information: <http://jaltvocab.weebly.com>

Special Thanks to VERB Reviewers & Proofreaders!

Their work is behind-the-scenes, but absolutely essential to the continuation of this publication. Thank you for your hours of work in making this possible!

Phil Bennett

Tomoko Ishii

Brandon Kramer

Mimi Masson

Tohru Matsuo

Atsushi Mizumoto

Tatsuya Nakata

John Racine

Rachel Ruegg

Jeff Stewart

Raymond Stubbe

Yuka Yamamoto

Proofreaders:

Clint Denison

Chris Edelman

George Higginbotham

Robert McClung

Steve Porritt

Vocab@Tokyo

12-14 September, 2016

Meiji Gakuin University, Tokyo, Japan



Call for Papers (Deadline: March 31, 2016)

The Vocab@Tokyo International Conference will gather the world's top vocabulary experts to share research and discuss the latest trends in pedagogy. The conference organizing committee invites 300-word abstracts for papers, posters, or colloquia on any topic relevant to the conference theme: "Current trends in vocabulary, lexical, and corpus studies."

Papers (15 minute presentation + 10 minute Q&A)

Paper submissions should report on projects that have clear and important findings of interest to the conference audience. They may be currently in-progress but should be expected to be completed or near completed by the time of the conference.

Posters (1 hour session)

Posters submissions can report on completed, near completed, or in-progress research projects that are of interest to the conference audience. We particularly welcome poster submissions that report on innovative research in its very earliest phases or new vocabulary resources, such as testing tools, corpora, or software.

Colloquia (1 hour)

Colloquia should focus on extended discussion and/or research on an aspect of vocabulary, lexis, or corpus work of strong interest to the conference audience. The motivation, aims, scope, and general timeline of the colloquium should be detailed in the submission.

More details are available at the conference website: <https://sites.google.com/site/vocabattokyo/>

Key dates are as follows:

Submissions open: **October 15, 2015**

Submission deadline: **March 31, 2016**

Notification of acceptance: **April 30, 2016**

Presenter confirmation and registration: **May 31, 2016**

Proceedings deadline **June 30, 2016**

Preliminary schedule: **July 1, 2016**

Conference dates: **September 12-14, 2016**

We look forward to your submissions.

Rob Waring (Conference Chair), Charles Browne (Site Chair), Laurence Anthony (Program Chair) Vocab@Tokyo Organizing Committee