Second Language Vocabulary Research: 2008

Yuji Tanaka

This is a review article on second language vocabulary research. Articles published in leading international research journals in 2008 are the scope of this investigation. The present review consists of the following key themes: the effects of various independent variables on second language vocabulary learning, second language reading comprehension and vocabulary development through reading, second language readers' vocabulary strategies and dictionary use, incidental second language vocabulary acquisition through extensive reading, using cognates to investigate cross-language competition in second language lexical processing, and formulaic sequences.

The Effects of Various Independent Variables on Second Language Vocabulary Learning

The Effects of Contrastive Analysis and Translation Activities on Incidental Second Language Vocabulary Learning

A study by Laufer and Girsai (2008) investigated the effects of explicit

contrastive analysis and translation activities on the incidental acquisition of single words and collocations.

The participants of their study were 75 Hebrew 10th graders (aged 15-16) learning English as a foreign language in Israel. They were comparable in terms of proficiency in English; in addition, they were from comparable socio-economic backgrounds. There were three intact classes. The teaching in these classes stressed communication, but occasional Focus on Form (FonF)[1] instruction happened as well. Teachers conducted the lessons in English and did not practice translation. Each class was randomly assigned to one of the following three conditions: (a) a message focused instruction (MFI)[2] group (n = 26), (b) a non-contrastive form-focused instruction (FFI) group (n = 23), and (c) a contrastive analysis and translation (CAT) group (n = 26) (p. 702).

As target vocabulary items, 10 unfamiliar words and 10 unfamiliar verb-noun collocations were used. Specifically, they are as follows (p. 703): (a) single words (*relish, glean, candid, laudable, opulent, plague, account, detractor, gregarious,* and *lavish*) and (b) collocations (*settle scores, present a problem, derive pleasure, hold a vote, fulfil an ambition, launch a campaign, reclaim the trust, hit the headlines, meet the expectations,* and *place orders*).

These target vocabulary items were embedded in a reading passage compiled by the second author (i.e., Girsai). The passage was based on six articles which dealt with Clinton's book *My Life.* The reading passage, the title of which was *Clinton's biography,* consisted of 536 word tokens. The grammar of the text was kept simple in order to minimize grammar-related comprehension difficulties. Moreover, the researchers inserted textual clues into the text so that the meanings of the target vocabulary items could be inferred from context without too much difficulty (p. 703).

The MFI group performed content-oriented communicative tasks (reading

comprehension and pair/group discussion) which did not require attention to the target items. The language of interaction in this group was English only (p. 694, p. 704). The non-contrastive FFI group performed text-based vocabulary tasks (an exercise in meaning recognition of the target vocabulary items and a text fill-in activity with the target vocabulary) which focused on the target items. The interaction was in English only (p. 694, pp. 704-705). The CAT group performed two text-based translation tasks: (a) translation from L2 (English) into L1 (Hebrew) and (b) translation from L1 (Hebrew) into L2 (English). During the second translation task (i.e., the above [b]), a brief explicit contrastive analysis instruction was provided (p. 694, p. 705).

Time-on-task was kept constant in the three conditions. After completing the tasks, all the participants were unexpectedly tested on the retention of the target vocabulary items by active recall tests (i.e., L1 into L2) and passive recall tests (i.e., L2 into L1). A week later, the same tests were administered to the participants in order to examine how much of the target vocabulary was retained (p. 694, pp. 705-706).

The results showed that the CAT (contrastive analysis and translation) group significantly outperformed the other two groups (i.e., the MFI group and the non-contrastive FFI group) on both the immediate recall tests and the delayed recall tests. Specifically, as for the immediate recall tests, the differences between all pairs of conditions were statistically significant. As regards the delayed recall tests, the only nonsignificant difference was between MFI and FFI in the passive recall of collocations. Excepting this case, on both the immediate recall tests and the delayed recall tests, the differences between all pairs of conditions were statistically significant. To sum up, the overall results demonstrated that the CAT group performed significantly better than the other two groups and that the FFI group performed significantly better than the MFI group (pp. 706-709).

In my judgment, this article by Laufer and Girsai (2008) is a significant contribution because it has made us realize the important role L1 plays in second language vocabulary learning. Their paper would be a valuable text for those involved in the teaching and learning of second language vocabulary.

The Effects of First Language Orthographic Experiences on Decoding and Semantic Information Retention of New Words in a Second Language

A study by Hamada and Koda (2008) investigated the effects of first language (L1) orthographic experiences on decoding and semantic information retention of new words in a second language (L2).

After reviewing the relevant literature, the researchers formulated the following three hypotheses (p. 8): (a) L2 learners with congruent L1 orthographic backgrounds would be more efficient in L2 phonological decoding than their counterparts with incongruent backgrounds; (b) L2 input properties (e.g., frequency and regularity) would also promote L2 decoding efficiency; and (c) L2 decoding efficiency, in turn, would enhance the learning and retention of newly introduced L2 words.

The researchers conducted two experiments (Experiment 1 and Experiment 2) with a view to testing these hypotheses.

In the case of Experiment 1, which examines (a) whether Korean ESL learners are more efficient in phonological decoding than their proficiency-matched Chinese counterparts and (b) whether the two ESL groups perform better when processing regularly spelled L2 pseudowords than irregularly spelled pseudowords (p. 10), 18 Chinese and 17 Korean students enrolled in an intensive English program in the United States served as participants. Let me give a supplementary note on the orthographic systems employed in Chinese and Korean; that is, “compared to Chinese,

Korean is orthographically much closer to English, and procedures involved in phonological decoding in Korean are more similar to those required in English" (p. 9).

The results of Experiment 1 indicated that the Korean ESL learners pronounced pseudowords significantly faster and more accurately than their Chinese counterparts (pp. 14-15). The researchers state that "given[3] that the two groups were matched in L2 proficiency and other relevant factors, the superior performance of the Korean group can be explained by the congruence between their L1 and L2 orthographic systems" (p. 15). In addition, the results also showed that "pseudoword naming was considerably faster and more accurate for the regularly spelled pseudowords than their irregularly spelled counterparts across groups" (p. 15).

As for Experiment 2, the purpose of which is to examine whether L2 decoding efficiency enhances the learning and retention of newly introduced L2 words, the same participants from Experiment 1 (i.e., Chinese ESL learners [n = 18] and Korean ESL learners [n = 17]) participated in the experiment.

The results demonstrated that L2 decoding efficiency significantly enhanced the learning and retention of newly introduced L2 words. Furthermore, it was shown that the two factors hypothesized to facilitate L2 decoding efficiency (i.e., L1-L2 orthographic congruity and L2 orthographic regularity) were both significant in explaining the variance of recall test scores (p. 22).

Overall, the results of the two experiments (i.e., Experiment 1 and Experiment 2) suggested that L1 print processing experience had a significant impact on L2 decoding development, that L2 input was a powerful force in the formation of L2 decoding skills, and that individual differences in L2 decoding efficiency could be explained jointly by L1 and L2 factors (p. 23).

This article by Hamada and Koda (2008) would be one of the basic readings for those interested in the effects of first language orthographic experiences on second

language decoding and word learning.

The Effects of First Language Phonological Awareness on Second Language Vocabulary Learning

A study by Hu (2008) investigated the effects of first language (L1) phonological awareness[4] on (a) the rate of learning second language (L2) color terms and (b) the rate of processing familiar color terms.

The participants of this study were 74 pupils (36 boys and 38 girls) in Taipei, Taiwan. These children were selected from a pool of 148 Chinese-speaking third-graders from eight classes based on their performances on the tests of L1 phonological awareness (p. 42).

As the tests of L1 phonological awareness, the following three were administered to the participants: (a) an L1 sound oddity test, (b) an L1 sound deletion test, and (c) a *zhuyin fuhao*[5] spelling test (p. 43).

By using the obtained data, the researcher classified the participants into the following two: (a) children with lower phonological awareness (n = 37) and (b) children with higher phonological awareness (n = 37) (pp. 43-44).

At Grade 5, over multiple trials, the children learned new L2 color terms interspersed with known color terms. They also rapidly named a series of familiar L2 color terms (p. 39, pp. 44-45).

The overall results suggested that the children with lower phonological awareness acquired new color terms more slowly and less accurately than the children with higher phonological awareness. In addition, it was also shown that the children with lower phonological awareness were slower in naming familiar color terms though they named the colors as accurately as the children with higher phonological

awareness (p. 39, pp. 45-46).

I am in agreement with Hu's (2008) comment that "relatively poor L1 phonological awareness has a negative effect on L2 word learning" (p. 47). As the researcher puts it, the findings reported in this intriguing study "call for further studies examining the effects of L1 coding difficulties on other subtle aspects of L2 vocabulary development" (p. 49).

In my view, this article by Hu (2008) is a significant contribution to second language vocabulary research because it reminded us of the relationship between *first language* phonological awareness and *second language* vocabulary learning. This paper would be a valuable text for those interested in the effects of *first language* phonological awareness and *first language* coding difficulties on *second language* vocabulary development.

The Effect of Noticing Alliteration in Lexical Chunks on Second Language Vocabulary Learning

A study by Lindstromberg and Boers (2008a) investigated the effect of noticing alliteration in lexical chunks on second language vocabulary learning.

After reviewing the relevant literature (pp. 201-208), the researchers presented the following three research questions (pp. 208-209): (a) Do alliterative phrases indeed have a stronger mnemonic effect than phrases which show little or no phonological repetition?; (b) Are learners likely to recognize or notice alliteration in everyday phrases without explicit guidance?; and (c) Does explicit guidance that alerts learners to salient repetitive sound patterns in phrases heighten the likelihood of their being stored in long-term memory?

In what follows, a concise description of their studies (i.e., Experiment 1,

Experiment 2, and Experiment 3) will be given; the above research questions (a), (b), and (c) were addressed in Experiment 1, Experiment 2, and Experiment 3, respectively.

As for Experiment 1, in which the research question (a) was addressed, 25 second-year modern language students[6] (aged 20-21) at a higher education college in Brussels, Belgium, served as participants (p. 209).

As experimental materials, 26 target phrases were used; they consisted of (a) 13 alliterative phrases and (b) 13 matching phrases with no phonological repetition. Specifically, they are as follows (p. 210): (a) *ring road, lamplight, teatime, milkman, day dream, car crime, sea salt, green grass, west wind, good guess, no news, fast food,* and *long life*; and (b) *key hole, hilltop, workplace, cowboy, phone call, hair loss, bath soap, grey hair, right hand, short nap, some chance, fresh air,* and *kind heart.*

Overall, the results of Experiment 1, which included both an immediate recall test and a delayed recognition test,[7] seemed to suggest that alliterative phrases were more memorable than phonologically non-repetitive ones (pp. 211-213).

In the case of Experiment 2, in which the aforementioned research question (b) was addressed, 31 third-year language majors (aged 21-22) at a college in Brussels, Belgium, served as participants (p. 213).

Materials used in Experiment 2 comprise the following four categories: (a) rhyme, (b) alliteration, (c) assonance, and (d) no pattern of phonemic repetition (p. 213). Each category contains six phrases; that is, there are 24 target phrases in total. Specifically, they are as follows: (a) *deep sleep, fine wine, night light, fish dish, wild child,* and *name game;* (b) *green grass, fast food, sunset, ring road, car crime,* and *west wind;* (c) *nice try, town house, cheap seat, wish list, soft job,* and *life time;* and (d) *loud noise, new car, golf course, bean soup, brick wall,* and *long way* (p. 213).

Each participant was given an envelope that contained 24 shuffled slips. The participants were told that among the 24 phrases, some had a special sound pattern

while the others did not, and that those with a special sound pattern could be divided into three different kinds. The participants were asked to (a) identify these sound patterns, (b) make four sets of slips of paper (using the paper clips), and (c) put them back into the envelope (pp. 213-214).

The obtained data seem to suggest that learners are not likely to notice alliteration in everyday phrases without explicit guidance (p. 214).

Does explicit guidance that alerts learners to salient repetitive sound patterns in phrases heighten the likelihood of their being stored in long-term memory? This question (i.e., the research question [c]) was addressed in Experiment 3.

Twenty-nine language majors (third-year students) at a higher education college participated in the experiment. To be specific, there were two intact classes; that is, the experimental group (n = 15) and the control group (n = 14) (p. 215).

In the case of the experimental group, the participants were alerted to salient repetitive sound patterns in phrases; the participants in the control group did not receive this treatment (pp. 215-217).

The results showed that the experimental group outperformed the control group in recalling alliterative phrases. However, it was also shown that the difference between the two groups in terms of the recall rates was not statistically significant (pp. 217-218).

Second Language Reading Comprehension and Vocabulary Development Through Reading

Pulido and Hambrick (2008) attempted to provide a model of second language (L2) reading comprehension and vocabulary development through reading by using structural equation modeling.

After reviewing the relevant literature (e.g., reading comprehension [pp. 165-166], language processing experience [pp. 166-167], and passage sight vocabulary [pp. 167-168]), the researchers presented the following research questions (pp. 168-169): (a) Does L2 language processing experience positively contribute to L2 passage sight vocabulary knowledge?; (b) Does L2 passage sight vocabulary knowledge positively contribute to comprehension of L2 passages containing such vocabulary?; and (c) Does L2 reading comprehension positively contribute to L2 vocabulary growth through reading?

The participants of their study were 99 adult English-speaking learners of Spanish. Specifically, they were recruited from the following three distinct university course levels: (a) beginning (second-semester elementary Spanish, n = 43), (b) intermediate (fifth-semester composition, n = 39), and (c) advanced (eighth-semester literature, n = 17) (p. 169).

The analysis of the obtained data by using structural equation modeling has suggested that "L2 processing experience and passage sight vocabulary contribute to and account for a moderate amount of variance in L2 narrative reading comprehension and vocabulary development through comprehension" (Pulido & Hambrick, 2008, p. 180).

Second Language Readers' Vocabulary Strategies and Dictionary Use

A study by Prichard (2008) aims to examine second language readers' vocabulary strategies and dictionary use while reading.

After reviewing the relevant literature on second language readers' dictionary use while reading (pp. 216-221), the researcher presented the following research question (p. 221): Can language learners actually determine which words are

important to the main point and which words are frequent and useful? Specifically, this study attempts to examine the dictionary use of Japanese university students with a view to measuring how selective they are when reading nonfiction texts for general comprehension (p. 221).

The participants of this study were 34 learners of English at a university in Japan; they comprised 17 first-year and 17 second-year students. These participants were in the highest level of the university's intensive English program. The program's reading curriculum focused on understanding the main points of articles and guessing vocabulary from context; however, the curriculum did not focus on dictionary use. The participants' scores on the paper-based Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) ranged from 457 to 600, with a mean of 503 (p. 221).

These participants read and summarized three authentic reading passages of various genres. They had access to an online bilingual dictionary while reading, and the words looked up were measured and analyzed for their frequency and their relevance to the passages' main points (pp. 221-222).

The results of this study suggested that high-intermediate and advanced learners were often selective when considering whether or not to look up a word. However, it was also shown that a third of the participants in this study were judged to have used the dictionary excessively and that a quarter of the words looked up in the study were neither essential to the articles' main points nor frequent or useful words (p. 216, pp. 223-226).

Incidental Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition Through Extensive Reading

A focus of Kweon and Kim's (2008) study is on incidental second language

vocabulary acquisition through extensive reading.

The participants of their study were 12 Korean learners of English taking an intermediate English reading course during the 2006 winter session at Pohang University of Science and Technology in Korea. All of the participants were majoring in science or engineering (p. 197).

These participants were asked to read authentic literary texts. Specifically, they were instructed to read three books over the course of five weeks. One of the three books contained 256 pages, another 189 pages, and the other 193 pages. As regards the number of words contained in each book, one had 46,213 different words, another 44,168 words, and the other 43,632 words. In total, the three books contained 638 pages and 134,013 words (p. 196).

As for testing procedures, the participants were tested on their knowledge of vocabulary before reading (pretest), immediately after reading (Posttest 1), and one month after Posttest 1 (Posttest 2) (p. 191, pp. 199-200).

The obtained data revealed that there was a significant word gain between the pretest and Posttest 1 and that most gained words were retained at Posttest 2 (pp. 200-205).

Using Cognates to Investigate Cross-Language Competition in Second Language Lexical Processing

Sunderman and Schwartz (2008) are interested in using cognates to investigate cross-language competition in second language lexical processing.

The researchers reported a psycholinguistic study investigating how the semantic ambiguity found in partial cognates affected lexical processing in a second language (p. 528).

Specifically, they predicted that "the cognate facilitation observed so frequently and consistently in previous research would be attenuated or possibly eliminated for partial cognates because of the competition from multiple meaning mappings" (p. 529).

To test this prediction, the researchers had late Spanish-English bilinguals (i.e., adult learners of English) complete a visual lexical decision task.

This study comprised 21 native speakers of Spanish studying at the University of Valencia, Spain. These participants were proficient in English, and their ages ranged from 18 to 31, with a mean age of 24.5 years (p. 530).

The overall results indicated that the participants recognized cognates significantly faster than noncognates (pp. 532-533).

In addition, the results also demonstrated that the overall magnitude of cognate facilitation was greater for the full cognates relative to the partial cognates. More specifically, full cognates were recognized on average 67 ms faster than their noncognate matched controls, whereas partial cognates were recognized only 9 ms faster than their respective controls (p. 533).

Furthermore, the obtained data also indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the mean accuracy rates of cognates and those of noncognates. To be concrete, cognates were more accurately identified than noncognates (p. 533).

Besides, the overall magnitude of cognate facilitation was greater for the full cognates relative to the partial cognates. More specifically, full cognates were recognized on average 17% more accurately than their matched controls, whereas partial cognates were recognized only 6% more accurately than their respective controls (p. 533).

Formulaic Sequences

Are formulaic sequences processed more quickly than nonformulaic phrases by native and nonnative speakers? This question was addressed in a study by Conklin and Schmitt (2008).

The participants of their study consisted of the following two groups: (a) 19 native English speakers from the University of Nottingham (mostly undergraduates) and (b) 20 L2 English speakers from the University of Nottingham (mostly postgraduates studying on the MA-ELT program) (p. 82).

It is generally believed that formulaic sequences are processed more quickly than nonformulaic phrases, and Conklin and Schmitt (2008) investigated this hypothesized processing advantage for formulaic sequences by comparing reading times for formulaic sequences versus those for matched nonformulaic phrases (p. 72, pp. 80-82).

The results showed that the formulaic sequences were read more quickly than the nonformulaic phrases by both native speakers of English and nonnative speakers of English (pp. 82-83).

In my view, an attempt to substantiate the hypothesized processing advantage for formulaic sequences is a vital prerequisite to the advancement of formulaic-sequence research, and I think that this article by Conklin and Schmitt (2008) would be a valuable addition to the existing literature on formulaic sequences.

Conclusion

In this article second language vocabulary research published in leading international research journals in 2008 was reviewed. In addition to the articles

examined in the preceding sections, the following papers were also published in 2008: for example, Alessi and Dwyer (2008),[8] Brown, Waring, and Donkaewbua (2008),[9] Churchill (2008),[10] Ecke (2008),[11] N. Ellis, Simpson-Vlach, and Maynard (2008),[12] Elston-Güttler and Williams (2008),[13] Erten and Tekin (2008),[14] Fender (2008),[15] Gardner (2008),[16] Kaivanpanah and Alavi (2008),[17] Keating (2008),[18] Kim (2008a),[19] Kim (2008b),[20] Lindstromberg and Boers (2008b),[21] McGee (2008),[22] Min (2008),[23] Schmitt (2008),[24] Schoonen and Verhallen (2008),[25] Shen (2008),[26] Siyanova and Schmitt (2008),[27] Tseng and Schmitt (2008),[28] Wan-a-rom (2008),[29] Webb (2008a),[30] and Webb (2008b).[31] The fact that a large number of articles were published in 2008 means that the second language vocabulary research community across the world is as active as it was in 2006 and 2007 (Tanaka, 2008, 2009), and I hope that this review will be of help to those interested in second language vocabulary research.

Notes

[1] The phrase, "Focus on Form (FonF)," is one of the technical words in the field of applied linguistics. According to R. Ellis (2001), FonF "overtly draws students' attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication" (p. 14).

[2] In this article Laufer and Girsai (2008) seem to use both "meaning focused instruction (MFI)" and "message focused instruction (MFI)" interchangeably. For example, on pages 694 and 704, the term *meaning focused instruction* is used. In contrast, for example, on pages 701 and 702, the terms *message-focused instruction* and *message focused instruction* are used, respectively.

[3] It should be noted that in the original source, the first letter of this word (i.e., given) was "G" (uppercase letter). In accordance with section 3.37 of "*Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association,* 2001, p. 119," the first letter of the first word was changed from "G" (uppercase letter) to "g" (lowercase letter).

[4] The technical word, *phonological awareness,* means “knowledge of the internal sound structure of spoken words” (Hu, 2008, p. 39).

[5] *Zhuyin fuhao* is “a set of phonetic symbols that are introduced and printed alongside Chinese characters as an auxiliary system for pronouncing Chinese characters when instruction in reading begins in Taiwan” (Hu, 2008, p. 43).

[6] The mother tongue of these students was Flemish Dutch (Lindstromberg & Boers, 2008a, p. 209).

[7] The delayed recognition test was administered 2 weeks after the immediate recall test (Lindstromberg & Boers, 2008a, p. 211).

[8] Will vocabulary assistance (either before or during reading) improve reading comprehension? Will vocabulary assistance (either before or during reading) affect reading time? These two research questions were addressed in a study by Alessi and Dwyer (2008).

The participants of this study were 76 undergraduate students taking intermediate Spanish at a large public university in the United States (p. 250).

[9] Brown, Waring, and Donkaewbua (2008) were interested in incidental second language vocabulary acquisition, and examined the rate at which English vocabulary was acquired from (a) reading, (b) reading-while-listening, and (c) listening to stories.

The participants of their study were 35 Japanese students of English literature studying at a medium-sized private university in Kyushu, Japan. The ages of the participants (32 females and 3 males) ranged from 18 to 21 years old (p. 140).

[10] A three-month diary study by Churchill (2008) describes the development of an adult learner's Japanese L2 lexical knowledge. (The participant of this study is the researcher himself [i.e., Churchill].)

[11] A study by Ecke (2008) examined the effect of English as a second language vocabulary on native Spanish speakers' word searches in their first language (i.e., Spanish).

[12] A study by N. Ellis, Simpson-Vlach, and Maynard (2008) triangulates the construct of *formula* from corpus linguistic, psycholinguistic, and educational perspectives.

[13] Elston-Güttler and Williams (2008) examined the influence of first language lexicalization patterns on the processing of second language words in sentential contexts. Specifically, they focused on cases in which a polysemous word in the L1 was realized by independent words in the L2. The participants of their study were 32 highly advanced German learners of English and 20 native speakers of English with minimal or no knowledge of German.

[14] Erten and Tekin (2008) examined the effects of presenting new words in semantically related sets versus presenting new words in semantically unrelated sets on vocabulary learning.

The participants of their study were 55 fourth graders studying at a primary school in Turkey.

[15] Fender (2008) examined the relationship between spelling knowledge (i.e., orthographic knowledge) and reading comprehension skills. The participants of the study were 16 high-intermediate-level Arab ESL learners, and a comparison group of 21 high-intermediate-level ESL learners (i.e., Chinese learners of English [*n* = 9], Korean learners of English [*n* = 5], and Japanese learners of English [*n* = 7]).

[16] A study by Gardner (2008) investigates the extent to which "specialized words recycle within various collections of authentic children's reading materials that are related by (a) theme (Mystery, Westward Movement, Mummy), (b) authorship (texts written by different authors vs. texts written by one author), (c) register (narrative fiction vs. expository nonfiction), and (d) the various combinations of (a-c) above" (p. 99).

[17] Kaivanpanah and Alavi (2008) attempted to examine the role of linguistic knowledge in inferring the meanings of unknown words.

[18] A study by Keating (2008) examined the Involvement Load Hypothesis (Hulstijn & Laufer, 2001; Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001).

[19] A study by Kim (2008a) examined the effects of collaborative and individual tasks on second language vocabulary learning.

This study comprised 32 learners of Korean as a second language enrolled in a preparatory Korean language program at a southwestern university in South Korea. The ages of the participants ranged from 18 to 26 years old. They had studied Korean for an average of 8 months, with a range of 5 to 12 months of study. These participants were randomly divided into the following two groups: a collaborative task group (*n* = 16) and an individual task group (*n* = 16) (p. 118).

[20] A study by Kim (2008b) examined the role of task-induced involvement and learner proficiency in second language vocabulary learning. The researcher conducted two experiments with a view to investigating the Involvement Load Hypothesis (Hulstijn & Laufer, 2001; Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001).

[21] Lindstromberg and Boers (2008b) attempted to explore the role of phonemic repetition (including assonance) in the learning of lexical chunks.

[22] McGee (2008) did a critique of Alderson's (2007) article which was published in "*Applied Linguistics,* Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 383-409." (Alderson's [2007] study investigated whether subjective frequency estimates of English words might be a reliable substitute for objective word frequency counts derived from corpora.)

[23] A study by Min (2008) examined and compared the effects of (a) reading plus

vocabulary enhancement activities versus (b) narrow reading (reading supplemental texts on the same theme) on second language vocabulary learning.

The participants of this study were 50 male Chinese speakers of English at a senior high school in Taiwan (p. 81).

[24] Schmitt (2008) made a review of second language vocabulary research. His review provided us with a number of significant second language vocabulary studies.

[25] Schoonen and Verhallen (2008) were interested in the assessment of young first and second language learners' deep word knowledge.

The participants of their study were 411 third graders (aged 9) and 384 fifth graders (aged 11). Specifically, the third graders consisted of 231 native speakers of Dutch and 180 learners of Dutch as a second language; the fifth graders consisted of 199 native speakers of Dutch and 185 learners of Dutch as a second language. These participants came from 19 schools in different parts of the Netherlands (pp. 220-221).

[26] Shen (2008) examined word decision strategies used by U.S. college beginning (n = 20) and advanced (n = 20) readers of Chinese.

[27] Siyanova and Schmitt (2008) conducted three studies examining second language learners' production and processing of adjective-noun collocations.

[28] A study by Tseng and Schmitt (2008) presents a structural model that integrates vocabulary knowledge and motivation with the following six latent variables: (a) the initial appraisal of vocabulary learning experience, (b) self-regulating capacity of vocabulary learning, (c) strategic vocabulary learning involvement, (d) mastery of vocabulary learning tactics, (e) vocabulary knowledge, and (f) postappraisal of the effectiveness of vocabulary learning tactics (p. 357).

[29] Wan-a-rom (2008) is interested in examining the wordlists of graded-reader books in detail. Specifically, this researcher compared the following three wordlists: (a) graded-reader wordlists, (b) the words in *General Service List* (West, 1953), and (c) the words actually used in graded-reader books.

[30] Webb (2008a) examined the effect of context on incidental vocabulary learning.

[31] Webb (2008b) examined the relationship between receptive and productive vocabulary sizes of second language learners.

References

Alderson, J. C. (2007). Judging the frequency of English words. *Applied Linguistics, 28,* 383-409.

Alessi, S., & Dwyer, A. (2008). Vocabulary assistance before and during reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 20,* 246-263.

American Psychological Association. (2001). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Brown, R., Waring, R., & Donkaewbua, S. (2008). Incidental vocabulary acquisition from reading, reading-while-listening, and listening to stories. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 20,* 136-163.

Churchill, E. (2008). A dynamic systems account of learning a word: From ecology to form relations. *Applied Linguistics, 29,* 339-358.

Conklin, K., & Schmitt, N. (2008). Formulaic sequences: Are they processed more quickly than nonformulaic language by native and nonnative speakers? *Applied Linguistics, 29,* 72-89.

Ecke, P. (2008). Cross-linguistic influence on word search in tip-of-the-tongue states. *TESOL Quarterly, 42,* 515-527.

Ellis, N. C., Simpson-Vlach, R., & Maynard, C. (2008). Formulaic language in native and second language speakers: Psycholinguistics, corpus linguistics, and TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 42,* 375-396.

Ellis, R. (2001). Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning, 51*(Suppl. 1), 1-46.

Elston-Güttler, K. E., & Williams, J. N. (2008). First language polysemy affects second language meaning interpretation: Evidence for activation of first language concepts during second language reading. *Second Language Research, 24,* 167-187.

Erten, İ. H., & Tekin, M. (2008). Effects on vocabulary acquisition of presenting new words in semantic sets versus semantically unrelated sets. *System, 36,* 407-422. (NB: The first name of the first author is "İsmail." It should be noted that the first letter is "İ." [This letter is different from "I."])

Fender, M. (2008). Spelling knowledge and reading development: Insights from Arab ESL learners. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 20,* 19-42.

Gardner, D. (2008). Vocabulary recycling in children's authentic reading materials: A corpus-based investigation of narrow reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 20,* 92-122.

Hamada, M., & Koda, K. (2008). Influence of first language orthographic experience on second

language decoding and word learning. *Language Learning, 58,* 1-31.

Hu, C. -F. (2008). Rate of acquiring and processing L2 color words in relation to L1 phonological awareness. *The Modern Language Journal, 92,* 39-52.

Hulstijn, J., & Laufer, B. (2001). Some empirical evidence for the Involvement Load Hypothesis in vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning, 51,* 539-558.

Kaivanpanah, S., & Alavi, S. M. (2008). The role of linguistic knowledge in word-meaning inferencing. *System, 36,* 172-195.

Keating, G. D. (2008). Task effectiveness and word learning in a second language: The Involvement Load Hypothesis on trial. *Language Teaching Research, 12,* 365-386.

Kim, Y. (2008a). The contribution of collaborative and individual tasks to the acquisition of L2 vocabulary. *The Modern Language Journal, 92,* 114-130.

Kim, Y. (2008b). The role of task-induced involvement and learner proficiency in L2 vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning, 58,* 285-325.

Kweon, S. -O., & Kim, H. -R. (2008). Beyond raw frequency: Incidental vocabulary acquisition in extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 20,* 191-215.

Laufer, B., & Girsai, N. (2008). Form-focused instruction in second language vocabulary learning: A case for contrastive analysis and translation. *Applied Linguistics, 29,* 694-716.

Laufer, B., & Hulstijn, J. (2001). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics, 22,* 1-26.

Lindstromberg, S., & Boers, F. (2008a). The mnemonic effect of noticing alliteration in lexical chunks. *Applied Linguistics, 29,* 200-222.

Lindstromberg, S., & Boers, F. (2008b). Phonemic repetition and the learning of lexical chunks: The power of assonance. *System, 36,* 423-436.

McGee, I. (2008). Word frequency estimates revisited: A response to Alderson (2007). *Applied Linguistics, 29,* 509-514.

Min, H. -T. (2008). EFL vocabulary acquisition and retention: Reading plus vocabulary enhancement activities and narrow reading. *Language Learning, 58,* 73-115.

Prichard, C. (2008). Evaluating L2 readers' vocabulary strategies and dictionary use. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 20,* 216-231.

Pulido, D., & Hambrick, D. Z. (2008). The *virtuous* circle: Modeling individual differences in L2 reading and vocabulary development. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 20,* 164-190. (NB: The second word in the title of this article [i.e., *virtuous*] should be italicized.)

Schmitt, N. (2008). Instructed second language vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research, 12,* 329-363.

Schoonen, R., & Verhallen, M. (2008). The assessment of deep word knowledge in young first and second language learners. *Language Testing, 25,* 211-236.

Shen, H. H. (2008). An analysis of word decision strategies among learners of Chinese. *Foreign Language Annals, 41,* 501-524.

Siyanova, A., & Schmitt, N. (2008). L2 learner production and processing of collocation: A multi-study perspective. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 64,* 429-458.

Sunderman, G., & Schwartz, A. I. (2008). Using cognates to investigate cross-language competition in second language processing. *TESOL Quarterly, 42,* 527-536.

Tanaka, Y. (2008). Second language vocabulary research: 2006. *Administration, 15,* 77-103.

Tanaka, Y. (2009). Second language vocabulary research: 2007. *Administration, 16,* 55-72.

Tseng, W. -T., & Schmitt, N. (2008). Toward a model of motivated vocabulary learning: A structural equation modeling approach. *Language Learning, 58,* 357-400.

Wan-a-rom, U. (2008). Comparing the vocabulary of different graded-reading schemes. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 20,* 43-69.

Webb, S. (2008a). The effects of context on incidental vocabulary learning. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 20,* 232-245.

Webb, S. (2008b). Receptive and productive vocabulary sizes of L2 learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 30,* 79-95.

West, M. (1953). *A general service list of English words.* Essex, England: Longman.