Vocabulary Education & Research Bulletin

Spring 2016 Volume 5, Issue 1

Greetings,

As we all gear up for the long-awaited vocab@Tokyo this year, we are happy to be bringing you the spring issue of The VERB. Our own **Stuart McLean** and **Brandon Kramer** start us off with a bilingual version of the New Vocabulary Levels Test. **Philip Riccobono** puts together the different usages of corpus linguistics in the classroom. And finally, **Tomoko Ishii** reviews *Working Memory in Second Language Acquisition and Processing* with a focus on how it can be of use to vocabulary researchers.

As our sister SIG publication *Vocabulary Learning and Instruction* (VLI) will be publishing a special issue to cover Vocab@Tokyo, The VERB will not be publishing an issue this fall. Our next issue will be in April of 2017, and the deadline for submissions will be January 16, 2017. For more information, see the guidelines at the end of this issue. Best wishes for a productive year in research and teaching!

The VERB editors
Magda Kitano & Stuart McLean

Table of Contents

Short Paper

The Development of a Japanese Bilingual Version of the New Vocabulary Levels Test

Stuart McLean stuart93@me.com
Brandon Kramer brandon.L.kramer@gmail.com

This paper describes a Japanese variant of the New Vocabulary Levels Test (NVLT) (McLean & Kramer, 2015), the process by which the test was produced, and advantages of bilingual vocabulary tests.

The New Vocabulary Levels Test

The NVLT is intended as a diagnostic or achievement vocabulary instrument for pedagogical or research purposes (McLean & Kramer, 2015). The NVLT measures knowledge of English lexis from the first five of Nation's (2012a) British National Corpus/Corpus of Contemporary American English (BNC/COCA) 1,000-word bands with 24 items per band, and the Academic Word List (AWL) (Coxhead, 2000) with 30 items. As Webb and Sasao (2013) state, "mastery of the 5,000-word level may be challenging for all but advanced learners, so assessing knowledge at the five most frequent levels may represent the greatest range in vocabulary learning for the majority of L2 learners" (p. 266).

Bilingual test creation

The Japanese bilingual NVLT uses the distractors created for the parallel Listening Vocabulary Levels Test (LVLT) which aurally tests the same target word families. In addition to the description below, further details regarding the creation of these distractors can be found in McLean, Kramer, and Beglar (2015).

The items were created by retrofitting and redesigning Vocabulary Size Test (VST) items using reverse engineered specifications from previous tests (Nation & Beglar, 2007; Nation, 2012b) in a process of specification-driven test assembly as recommended in Fulcher and Davidson (2007). As the VST measures knowledge of vocabulary according to frequency within the BNC, the items were then re-assigned to their appropriate BNC/COCA level. The context sentence for each item was then presented to volunteers in early pilot testing with pseudoword replacements for each target word to ensure the test was not conflating the construct of L2 contextual inferencing with vocabulary knowledge.

Finally, the key and distractors for each item were directly translated to the core Japanese meanings (Nation, 2012b). For example, the key for the target word *shoe* was written as 'the thing you wear on your foot' in version B of the VST. Rather than directly translate 'the thing you wear on your foot' into Japanese, 靴 (*kutsu*), the Japanese word for shoe, was used. When the translation of the target word was an English loanword in Japanese, the direct translation was replaced with an alternative Japanese word or phrase, as examinees could otherwise select the correct answer through phonological matching. For example, for the target word *pro* the distractor was changed to 専門家 [*senmonka*] which has a similar meaning to the direct translation プロ [*puro*].

Benefits of bilingual vocabulary tests

Test makers strive to create tests which yield unidimensional results or tests which isolate a single target construct. It is argued that bilingual tests more accurately estimate vocabulary sizes of examinees with limited knowledge of grammar and syntax (Elgort, 2013; Karami, 2012; Nguyen & Nation, 2011). Furthermore, bilingual vocabulary tests may reduce anxiety experienced by examinees, providing a "more accurate estimation of the breadth of their L2 vocabulary knowledge" (Elgort, 2013, p. 269). This difference in scores can be quite significant, with studies such as Elgort (2013) showing around 10% higher scores for bilingual test variants.

Furthermore, students read faster in their L1 (Fraser, 2007), and bilingual tests facilitate shorter distractors, so bilingual vocabulary tests should be completed quicker than monolingual tests. This difference is compounded by longer distractors, which "are unavoidable in monolingual tests to completely convey the meaning of more difficult words" (Karami, 2012, p. 56). Bilingual test distractors, in contrast, are primarily definitions or synonyms of distractor choices, consisting of usually only a word or phrase. For example, 引き出し (*hikidashi*), the direct Japanese translation of *drawer*, is the key distractor for the target word *drawer* rather than "*box that goes in and out for clothes*," the definition offered on a version of the monolingual test. A shorter test administration would be expected to reduce examinee fatigue, allowing for more accurate measurement.

Interpretability

While further research is required to empirically show the NVLT's utility in a variety of contexts, we hypothesize potential uses for teachers and researchers.

The NVLT can assess learners' readiness for a particular course of study or the appropriateness of materials for learners. Instructors could first estimate the written vocabulary load of instructional materials or a single text. Research posits that 98% or 99% coverage is ideal for easily comprehending written material (Carver, 1990; Hu &

Nation, 2000). Thus, the NVLT can be used to estimate learners' knowledge of lexis at particular word-frequency levels to determine whether they have the necessary lexical knowledge to comprehend course materials.

The NVLT can also diagnose learners' vocabulary knowledge at the beginning of a course of study, estimate achievement throughout the course of study (i.e., formative assessment), and measure the knowledge gained upon completion of a course (i.e., summative achievement). If the goal of a beginner level course is to acquire knowledge of the 2,000 most frequent words of English, the threshold for mastering a single 1,000-word level should be at least 23 out of 24 correct items. Importantly, for higher frequency bands the necessity for a high mastery threshold is crucial, as any language user will commonly meet the highest frequency words when using the target language.

Future research

Recommended future research using this test includes:

- Mixed-methods validation of the Japanese bilingual variant of the NVLT among various lexical proficiencies.
- Further research into the appropriateness of the 23/24 mastery threshold.
- An examination of the relationship between NVLT results and L2 reading ability.

Conclusion

In this paper we have described the creation of and justification for a bilingual version of the NVLT. When feasible, bilingual vocabulary tests are advantageous when measuring the lexical knowledge of monolingual populations because they help to produce unidimensional data, reduce test anxiety, and take less time to complete. Additionally, the NVLT can be used to determine the appropriateness of course materials and to measure knowledge of the most frequent words according to Nation's BNC/COCA lists (2012a). The test is freely available to download from the authors' profiles on Academia.edu.

References

Carver, R. P. (1990). *Reading rate: A review of research of theory*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*, 213–238.

Elgort, I. (2013). Effects of L1 definitions and cognate status of test items on the Vocabulary Size Test. *Language Testing, 30*(2), 253–272. http://doi.org/10.1177/0265532212459028

Fraser, C. A. (2007). Reading Rate in L1 Mandarin Chinese and L2 English across Five Reading Tasks. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(3), 372–394.

http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00587.x

Fulcher, N. G., & Davidson, F. (2007). *Language testing and assessment: an advanced resource book*. Routledge. Retrieved from https://lra.le.ac.uk/handle/2381/2808

Hu, M., & Nation, P. (2000). Unknown vocabulary density and reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 13*(1), 403–30.

Karami, H. (2012). The development and validation of a bilingual version of the Vocabulary Size Test. *RELC Journal, 43*(1), 53–67.

McLean, S., & Kramer, B. (2015). The creation of a new vocabulary levels test. *Shiken, 19*(2), 1–11.

McLean, S., Kramer, B., & Beglar, D. (2015). The validation of a listening vocabulary levels test. *Language Teaching Research, 19*(6), 741–760. http://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814567889

Nation, I. S. P., & Beglar, D. (2007). A vocabulary size test. *The Language Teacher, 31*, 9–13.

Nation, P. (2012a). *The BNC/COCA word family lists*. Unpublished paper. Retrieved from victoria.ac.nz/lals/about/staff/publications/paul-nation/Information-on-the-BNC_COCA-word-family-lists.pdf

Nation, P. (2012b). *The Vocabulary Size Test*. Unpublished paper. Retrieved from http://www.victoria.ac.nz/lals/about/staff/publications/paul-nation/Vocabulary-Size-Test-information-and-specifications.pdf

Nguyen, L. T. C., & Nation, P. (2011). A Bilingual Vocabulary Size Test of English for Vietnamese learners. *RELC Journal, 42*(1), 86–99. http://doi.org/10.1177/0033688210390264

Webb, S., & Sasao, Y. (2013). New directions in vocabulary testing. *RELC Journal, 44*, 263–277.

Short Paper

Authentic Help: Using Corpus Linguistics to Assist in Language Teaching

Philip Riccobono
psricc@gmail.com

Introduction

During the last 20 years, corpus linguistics (CL) has developed into a major research tool that aids in our understanding of how languages work. This paper discusses the ways in which corpus linguistics assists in the teaching of English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) both directly and indirectly. CL approaches the study of language in use through corpora or corpus (singular). A corpus entails a large compendium of naturally occurring instances of language (Bennett, 2010).

One notion which serves as a testament to the recent power of CL as a major facilitator of English language teaching is that CL provides authentic comprehensible input for English learners in the form of reading and listening, bridging the divide to meaningful input for English learners of general to specific purposes language used in education (Eggington, 2015). Such meaningful input helps learners achieve that progress. Biber, Conraad & Reppen (1998) describe CL as researching the usage of language in speech and writing.

Direct usage of CL in language teaching

CL provides instructors and learners with a genuine examination of language by way of user-friendly computer applications. One way for teachers to provide authentic language to English language learners is by utilizing corpora such as the Corpus of Contemporary English (COCA) or the British National Corpus (BNC), and by targeting specific collocations and concordances for learners to use.

I have used the AntConc and COCA concordancing programs to build frequency-based wordlists and keyword in context (KWIC) wordlists (content specific) for teaching vocabulary. Additionally, my students receive training on finding “associated words” from the lists by executing collocation searches. Nation (2001) claims that the use of corpora allows learners to encounter new vocabulary in real and multiple contexts, allowing them to gain a much richer amount of information about a lexical item. Through these multiple encounters, students not only learn basic word meanings, but other aspects of word knowledge such as phraseology, collocations, and register appropriateness, as

well. Additionally, students can form generalizations about usage and form from this information, which can help students gain a deeper understanding of the vocabulary, aiding retention.

Utilizing corpora can benefit English language learners (ELL) in other ways. Instructors do not have to rely on their own or other native speakers' intuitions or even on made-up examples, which lack empirical strength. Rather, they can draw on a large amount of authentic, naturally occurring language data produced by a variety of speakers or writers in order to confirm or refute their own hypotheses about specific language features on the basis of an empirical foundation (Braun, 2005; Tomlinson, 2011).

Another method of language instruction, which utilizes corpora, involves providing students with alternating concordance instruction and dictionary instruction, a measure shown to vastly improve students' vocabulary knowledge from pretest to post-test. According to Tribble and Jones (1997), this approach can be used to booster weekly quiz scores by providing students with concordance instruction (Cobb, 1997). "Concordancing software enables you to discover patterns that exist in natural language by grouping text in such a way that they are clearly visible. The real value of the concordance lies in this question of visibility" (p. 3).

According to Horst, Cobb, and Nicolae (2005) students can make significant gains in word knowledge after participating in ESL vocabulary courses that included data-driven learning (DDL) approaches, alongside CL approaches. As a result of these approaches, students have been shown to write more accurate definitions or appropriate example sentences for target words. This could indicate that the CL approach of utilizing DDL by means of "concordancing" (Garner, 2013, p. 412) can help students acquire both receptive and productive knowledge of new vocabulary. The approach allows students to use vocabulary acquired through DDL in cloze and sentence-writing activities. As evidence of Johns's (1991) notion that, "research is too important to be left to the researcher" (p. 2), researchers and instructors have been investigating ways students can be given direct access to corpora for their own learning. This approach, known as data-driven learning (DDL) (Johns, 1991), drastically changes the dynamic in the language classroom for teachers and learners.

In reading and writing classes, concordancing has been shown to be more effective than the use of an online dictionary as a means of helping students to build sentences with more accuracy and complexity (Kaur & Hegelheimer, 2005). This approach can show students to use n-grams or multi-word phrases and words (from corpora) correctly more often than referencing online dictionaries can. This indicates that transfer of academic word knowledge from concordancing to academic writing is possible by this approach.

According to Lin (2008), implementing wordlists into students' study routines

benefits them. According to Coxhead (2000), students who used online instructional materials to study the Academic Word List (AWL) showed improvements in their academic writing, definition matching test scores, and in tests of productive knowledge. Furthermore, wordlists derived from corpora foster sentence building and reading. By having students focus on AWL words it has shown an increased usage of this select lexicon in subject essays (Lin, 2008). Seemingly, DDL allows students to make gains in their receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge, but also leads them to demonstrate their understanding in their own writing (Garner, 2013).

The CL approach describes language features. Corpora, which contain recordings of different stages of learner language, can provide information for foreign language acquisition research. By means of historical corpora it is possible to track the development of specific features throughout the history of English, such as the emergence of the modal verbs *gonna* and *wanna*. Furthermore, sociolinguistic markers of specific age groups, such as the use of *like* as a discourse marker, can be investigated and taught for purposes of pragmatics, sociolinguistic or discourse-analytical research (Müller & Waibel, 2011).

Indirect usage of CL in language teaching

Thus far this paper has discussed the direct application of corpora in language teaching. Another dimension, the indirect applications of corpora in language teaching, also warrants mentioning. Barlow (1996, p. 32) notes, "[t]he results of a corpus-based application in English teaching can serve as a firm basis for both linguistic description and, on the applied side, as input for language learning." This implies that corpora and the evidence derived from them can greatly affect course design and the content of teaching materials (Hunston, 2002, p. 137). Existing pedagogical descriptions are evaluated in the light of "new evidence" (Sinclair, 2004, p. 271), and new decisions are made about the selection of language phenomena for classroom instruction, the progression of language courses, and the presentation of the selected items and structures (Mindt, 1981, p. 179). This kind of indirect pedagogical corpus use benefits from research based on or driven by general and specialized corpora. Large general corpora have aided in the design of language teaching syllabi which emphasize communicative competence and which give prominence to those items that learners are most likely to encounter in real-life communicative situations (Hymes, 1972).

Discussion

This paper opines that CL has changed language teaching, giving it even a more empirically credible position in the framework of language teaching. Modern electronic language corpora, mega mass quantities of data, and increasing availability, have brought

about many changes to the field of language pedagogy. They have assisted instructors and textbook writers in creating better descriptions of the workings of the target language and in presenting students with more realistic examples of language in use. They have also led to changes in how language is taught.

In the DDL approach, the corpus becomes an informant, holding vast amounts of text available for study. The student changes from being a simple receiver of information to now being a language researcher, examining language evidence and reaching their own conclusions. The teacher, hitherto the main source of information, now becomes a facilitator of research, aiding learners in the study of the target language. This approach gives the learner control, allowing him or her to form his or her own hypotheses of language usage. It also moves language learning from a deductive approach to an inductive one, helping learners improve their ability to make individual generalizations from their encounters with the target language (Bernardini, 2004; Johns, 1991). Despite these possible advantages, DDL has yet to be fully accepted in many language classrooms (Boulton, 2010; Cobb & Boulton, 2015; Smart, 2014). This is partially due to several critiques of the approach, such as its emphasis on bottom-up processing, reliance on inductive learning, and the lack of authenticity of concordance lines (Braun, 2005; Flowerdew, 2009). Despite these critiques, evidence from empirical studies has shown that DDL can be beneficial to student vocabulary acquisition (Cobb, 1997, 1999; Horst, Cobb, & Nicolae, 2005; Kaur & Hegelheimer, 2005; Lin, 2008).

Conclusion

Overall, CL and its approaches legitimize themselves through the use of authentic text. In my practice, I have created corpora-driven wordlists specific to business, veterinarian, and economic discourse as an authentic approach to improving students' lexicon and form via student vocabulary journals, worksheets, and teaching corpora search techniques. Since sentiment exists that course books do not provide the truth to language study, teachers can create worksheets originated from corpora (Boulton, 2010; Cobb & Boulton, 2015; Smart, 2014). CL will likely gain popularity and suit itself as commonplace with easier access to free, user friendly computer applications and corpora, leading to practical, authentic English language pedagogy. CL provides language learning with multiple and some might argue a wide array of data to present ELLs, assisting in authentic language acquisition.

When teachers introduce language into the classroom from corpora, they offer learning opportunities, which allow ELL to expand their language knowledge in creative and motivating methods.

References

Barlow, M. (2011). Corpus linguistics and theoretical linguistics. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 16*(1), 3-44.

Bennett, G. R. (2014). An Introduction to Corpus Linguistics. *UCLA International Institute, 27*.

Bernadini, S. (2004). Corpora in the classroom: An overview and reflections on future development. In J. Sinclair (Ed.), *How to use corpora in language teaching* (pp. 15-36). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boulton, A. (2010). Data-driven learning: Taking the computer out of the equation. *Language Learning*, *60*(3), 534–572. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00566.x

Braun, S. (2005). From pedagogically relevant to authentic language learning contexts. *ReCALL, 17*(1), 47-64.

Cobb, T. (1997). Is there any measurable learning from hands-on concordancing? *System, 25*(3), 301-315. doi: 10.1016/S0346-251X(97)00024-9

Cobb, T. (1999). Breadth and depth of lexical acquisition with hands-on concordancing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 12*(4), 345-360. doi: 10.1076/call.12.4.345.5699

Cobb, T., & Boulton, A. (2015). Classroom applications of corpus analysis. In D. Biber & R. Reppen (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of corpus linguistics* (pp. 478–497). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 213-238.

Eggington, W. G. (2015). Focusing on the challenges. In W. Norman, N. J. Anderson, & W. G. Eggington (Eds.), *ESL readers and writers in higher education: Understanding challenges, providing support* (pp. 36-49). New York, NY: Routledge.

Flowerdew, L. (2009). Applying corpus linguistics to pedagogy. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 14*(3), 393-417. doi: 10.1075/ijcl.14.3.05flo

Garner, J. R. (2013). The use of linking adverbials in academic essays by non-native writers: How data-driven learning can help. *CALICO Journal, 30*(3), 410-422.

Horst, M., Cobb, T., & Nicolae, I. (2005). Expanding academic vocabulary with an interactive on-line database. *Language Learning and Technology, 9*(2), 90-110.

Hunston, S. (2002). *Corpus in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge*:* Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269-293.). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Johns, T. (1991). Should you be persuaded - Two samples of data-driven learning materials. *ELR Journal, 4*(1), 1-16.

Kaur, J., & Hegelheimer, V. (2005). ESL students' use of concordance in the transfer of academic word knowledge: An exploratory study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 18*(4), 287-310. doi:10.1080/09588220500280412

Lin, J. (2008). Scalable language processing algorithms for the masses: A case study in computing word co-occurrence matrices with MapReduce. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (pp. 419-428). Association for Computational Linguistics.

Mindt, D. (1981). *Angewandte Linguistik und Grammatik für den Englischunterricht*. In P. Kunsmann & O. Kuhn (Eds.), *Weltsprache Englisch in Forschung und Lehre: Festchrift für Kurt Wächtler* (pp. 175-186). Berlin: Schmidt.

Müller, F., & Waibel, B. (2016). Corpus linguistics - an introduction. Retrieved March 27, 2016, from http://www.anglistik.uni-freiburg.de/seminar/abteilungen/sprachwissenschaft/ls_mair/corpus-linguistics/corpus-linguistics-an-introduction?set_language=en

Nation, I. S. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, J. (2004). New evidence, new priorities, new attitudes. In J. Sinclair (Ed.), *How to use corpora in language teaching* (pp. 271-299). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Smart, J. (2014). The role of guided induction in paper-based data-driven learning. *ReCALL, 26*, 184–201. doi:10.1017/S0958344014000081

Tognini-Bonelli, E. (2001). *Corpus linguistics at work (Vol. 6).* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Tomlinson, B. (2011). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tribble, C., & Jones, G. (1997). *Concordances in the classroom: A resource guide for teachers*. Houston, TX: Athelstan.

Book Review

Working Memory in Second Language Acquisition and Processing
Edited by Wen, Z., Mota, M. B., and McNeill, A.
Multilingual Matters (May 1, 2015) xxiv+314
ISBN 978-1-78309-358-8 (hbk)
ISBN 978-1-78309-357-1 (pbk)

Reviewed by Tomoko Ishii tmk_ishii@mac.com

Vocabulary researchers are interested in a wide range of topics, including which lexical items learners should acquire, how their knowledge is accessed and stored, and how we can test their knowledge. Teachers in classrooms are probably most interested in how to improve learners' recall of new words, and some vocabulary researchers seek answers in this area too. As the process of remembering vocabulary is an attempt to commit new knowledge to memory, for a constructive discussion regarding what makes vocabulary learning effective, taking psychological perspectives into account is crucial. However, although there are some researchers with a solid background in psychology who are carrying out studies on the mental lexicon, such as David Singleton, it seems that few investigations into improving the efficiency of vocabulary learning are paying enough attention to psychology literature. For instance, when discussing the negative impact of semantic clustering (cf. Tinkham, 1993), many of the recent papers on this topic very briefly mention the psychological concept *interference theory*, but do not examine it any further. If we embed the discussion on this topic in the context of memory studies, we might expect a clearer explanation of why certain ways of presenting vocabulary items are advantageous or disadvantageous for memory, which unfortunately is not the case at present.

One reason for the lack of integration of psychology literature into studies of vocabulary learning and teaching is that, just as with any other field of research, the literature on psychology grows quickly every year, and it is hard for non-specialists to keep up. In fact, without prior education, it is not easy to tackle the massive amount of psychological research and interpret the literature to make connections with second language acquisition. Research on vocabulary learning and teaching, as a result, is rather uninformed about psychological effects. To address this issue, the editors of *Working Memory in Second Language Acquisition and Processing* have compiled this volume with the intention of developing "an integration of working memory theory with second

language acquisition theory" (p.xxii), by filling the gap between the two fields.

This book starts off with an overview of *working memory* (WM), "our ability to briefly maintain and also operate on a limited amount of information in our mind when completing some mentally demanding task" (p.1), discussing the history of theories in this area and different approaches to the memory system (i.e. Baddeley's multi-component model and Cowan's embedded-process model). It then describes how WM has been shown to play an important role in L1 processing and learning. One example given in the introductory chapter is the importance of the phonological component of WM in vocabulary learning among young children. With accumulated evidence for the significance of WM in the L1, the book states that L2 research focused on WM increased, and the empirical studies that follow show how those theories can be operationalized in L2 research. From the examples presented, we can learn how hypotheses are generated based on WM theories, how the instruments to test those hypotheses are devised, and how the results are examined against theory. Studies presented in the book cover varying topics, including the role WM plays when interpreters are performing their task (Ch.4), how WM functions when processing Chinese characters (Ch.5), and the role of WM when processing sentences (Ch.6). Other chapters address the issue of WM and L2 under instruction (Ch.8-14), investigating how attention is distributed and how information is manipulated before the presented materials are learned.

Although none of the studies presented in this book directly address L2 vocabulary learning, the book is informative for vocabulary researchers. By showing WM operationalized in various studies, it gives us a clearer picture of this construct, as well as food for thought on the psychological basis of vocabulary learning. In its concluding chapter, the book states that "the study of WM provides real opportunities for deepening our understanding of the language learning process" (p.305). When informed by memory research, studies on the efficacy of learning can be designed based on psychologically valid hypotheses and research questions. To give my own example, I have been conducting studies on the issue of semantic clustering under a hypothesis generated with reference to WM theories (cf. Ishii, 2015). So far, the hypothesis that shared visual features among the referents of the target words are the major sources of what has been claimed to be the negative impact of semantic clustering seems promising, and I feel great benefit of learning from psychology.

In his presentation at the recent JALT Vocabulary SIG Learning and Testing Colloquium, Beglar (2015) argued for the importance of learning from other research areas for further advancement of vocabulary research, giving Paul Meara as a great example of someone who reads widely and adapts various concepts from other fields to vocabulary studies. As learning vocabulary involves committing new information to

memory, the expertise of memory research is an obvious resource to draw on. This book, written in a readable manner for non-experts, makes it easier to access up-to-date research on WM and explains how it can be operationalized in empirical research. It therefore enables researchers interested in the L2 lexicon to make a psychology-based contribution to the field of second language vocabulary acquisition.

References

Beglar, D. (2015). Teaching and learning foreign language vocabulary using insights from educational psychology. Presentation at the JALT Vocabulary SIG Vocabulary Learning and Testing Colloquium, Osaka.

Ishii, T. (2015). Semantic connection or visual connection: Investigating the real source of confusion. *Language Teaching Research*, *19*(6), 712-722.

Tinkham, T. M. (1993). The effect of semantic clustering on the learning of second language vocabulary. *System*, *21*, 371–380. doi:10.1016/0346-251X(93)90027-E

SIG News

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*).

Please see http://vli-journal.org/submissions.html for details.

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 16th 2017

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
Steve Porritt
Eric Shepherd

Vocab@Tokyo

12-14 September, 2016

Meiji Gakuin University, Tokyo, Japan

We would like to announce that the Vocab@Tokyo international conference on vocabulary acquisition will be held at Meiji Gakuin University in central Tokyo on September 12-14, 2016 in co-operation with the JALT Vocabulary SIG. The conference is the second in the series of "Vocab@" conferences, following the inaugural conference held at Wellington, New Zealand, in 2013. The Vocab@Tokyo conference will gather the world's top vocabulary researchers to share research and discuss the latest trends in pedagogy.

Speakers

We are happy to announce that Tess Fitzpatrick from the Centre for Language and Communication Research, Cardiff University, UK, will be our plenary speaker. The tentative title of her talk will be "Profiling word retrieval behaviour: generic patterns and individual differences."

Other confirmed attendees include: Paul Nation, Batia Laufer, Norbert Schmitt, Diane Schmitt, Averil Coxhead, Tom Cobb, Marlise Horst, Birgit Henriksen. John Read, Henrik Gyllstad and many many others ….

Key dates are as follows:

Submission deadline: **March 31, 2016**
Notification of acceptance: **April 30, 2016**
Presenter confirmation and registration opens: **May 31, 2016**
Extended abstract deadline: **June 30, 2016**
Preliminary schedule: **July 1, 2016**
Conference dates: **September 12-14, 2016**

More information is available at the conference website. You can contact us at vocabattokyo@gmail.com.

https://sites.google.com/site/vocabattokyo/home

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

JALT Vocabulary SIG

2016 Research and Conference Grants

I. Overview

1. **What grants are available?**
   There are two categories of grants, *research* grants and *conference* grants. There are separate application forms for each. Up to three grants of either 50,000 or 100,000 yen may be awarded in 2016 depending on the number of viable applications.

2. **Can a single project be awarded both grants?**
   No, a project can only be awarded one (1) grant. However, applicants who are denied a *research* grant are encouraged to apply again under the category of *conference* grant after they have been accepted to present at an appropriate venue (see below for details).

3. **Who can apply for the grants?**
   Grants are available for JALT Vocabulary SIG members who do not already have access to institutional assistance and research grant funding from their place(s) of employment. The grants are specifically designed for part-time instructors working from the kindergarten to tertiary levels, as well as individual instructors working for themselves, companies, or language schools. Full-time instructors who do not have access to institutional assistance and research grant funding from their place of employment may also apply. Part-time instructors who are enrolled as part-time or full-time graduate students are also eligible. Grant awardees must have a Japanese bank account.

4. **Are co-authored projects allowed?**
   Projects involving more than one instructor are welcome; however, the grant amount is fixed at 50,000 or 100,000 yen and does not change if more than one person is involved.

5. **What support can successful applicants get from the Vocabulary SIG for developing their research?**
   Grant recipients have the opportunity to benefit from collaborative support from members of the Vocabulary SIG who are experienced instructor-researchers. If requested, they will provide advice and support in order to assist the development and successful execution of the grant project.

6. **What is the deadline for applying for grants in 2016?**
   Applicants must submit their applications by 23:59 (JST) on Tuesday, September 20th, 2016. Applicants will then be informed of the results after the vetting period is completed on or around November 20th, 2016. Grant recipients will be announced on the JALT website, as well as at the Vocabulary SIG General Meeting at the JALT 42nd Annual International Conference, which will be held in Nagoya on November 25th to 28th, 2016. Recipients will also be individually notified by email.

II. Research Grants

Research grants are intended to provide funding for expenses that are incurred in carrying out a research project (e.g., human resources, equipment, office supplies, travel).

1. Do successful research grant applicants need to present on their research?

Research grant recipients are required to give a presentation on their research after the completion of their project. Research presentations may take place at one of the following annual conferences:

- JALT Annual International Conference
- JALT PanSIG Conference
- JALT Vocabulary Symposium.

Research Grant recipients will automatically be approved to present at the first two of these, and may be invited to present at the third.

2. Do successful research applicants need to write reports about their research?

Research grant recipients are required to write four short quarterly reports. The first three reports should be approximately 500 words in length while the final quarterly report should be at least 1,500 words. At the end of their research, grant recipientsare also required to submit an article to *Vocabulary Learning and Instruction*, the main publication of the Vocabulary SIG. Publication in *VLI* will depend on the quality of the submission.

3. What is the schedule for completing the research?

The main research schedule lasts from December 2016 to January 2018, with the research presentation coming after that.

Year	Date	Deadline
2016	April 20th – September 20th	Application period
2016	November 20th	Applicants and recipients informed of results
2016	December 20th	Grants paid out contingent on finalization of research plan
		Formal research period starts
2017	April 15th	Deadline for first short quarterly report
2017	July 15th	Deadline for second short quarterly report
2017	October 15th	Deadline for third short quarterly report
2018	January 31st	Deadline for final long report
2018		Presentation at one of the following conferences:

- JALT PanSIG Conference (Spring 2018)
- JALT Vocabulary SIG Symposium (2018)
- JALT International Conference (Fall 2018)

Submission of manuscript to *VLI*

4. When should grant recipients present on their research?

Research grant recipients should give a presentation at ONE (1) of the three annual conferences listed in the timeline above, after their research has completed (i.e., in 2018 for 2016 grant awardees). The aim of this presentation is to help the awardees complete their project successfully and confidently by presenting it to the JALT community.

III. Conference Grants

Conference grants provide funding for travel, lodging, and conference fees for applicants to present on an already-completed research project.

1. Do applicants need to already have been accepted at a conference to be eligible for the conference grant?

Prior acceptance to present research at a conference is recommended, but not required, for eligibility for a conference grant. The SIG aims to support the dissemination of high-quality, original research that contributes to the field, and application materials will be judged accordingly.

2. Are conference grant recipients required to present at a JALT-sponsored conference?

Conference grant applicants may present at any conference in linguistics, applied linguistics, or related fields.

3. Do successful conference grant applicants need to write reports about their activities?

Conference grant applicants are required to submit a summary of their completed research during the grant application process. Grant recipients are also required to submit an article to *Vocabulary Learning and Instruction*, the main publication of the Vocabulary SIG. Publication in *VLI* will depend on the quality of the submission.

4. What is the schedule for conference grant recipients?

The application deadline is 23:59 (JST) on Tuesday, September 20th, 2016. The following items must be submitted prior to December 31st, 2017: (a) proof of acceptance to present at a conference scheduled any time before December 31st, 2018, (b) a statement of conference registration fees and (c) estimated travel and lodging expenses. Grant funds will be disbursed thereafter.

IV. Feedback and Further Information

These guidelines have been adapted from JALT Research Grants Guidelines (http://jalt.org/researchgrants). If you have any suggestions for improving these guidelines or are in need of further information, please contact the Vocabulary SIG Research Grant Chairs (Dawn Lucovich and Tim Stoeckel) at jaltvocabSIGgrants@gmail.com.