



PROJECT MUSE®

Elementary School EFL Learners' Vocabulary Learning: The
Effects of Post-Reading Activities

Derin Atay, Gülke Kurt

The Canadian Modern Language Review / La revue canadienne des
langues vivantes, Volume 63, Number 2, December / décembre 2006,
pp. 255-273 (Article)

Published by University of Toronto Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/cml.2007.0000>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/207976>

Elementary School EFL Learners' Vocabulary Learning: The Effects of Post-Reading Activities

Derin Atay
Gökce Kurt

Abstract: As language learning involves the acquisition of thousands of words, teachers and learners alike would like to know how vocabulary learning can be fostered, especially in EFL settings where learners frequently acquire impoverished lexicons, despite years of formal study. Research indicates that reading is important but not sufficient for second-language vocabulary learning, and that it should be supplemented by post-reading activities to enhance students' vocabulary knowledge. The present study investigates the effects of two types of post-reading activities: discrete written tasks on their own and a combination of written tasks along with interactive tasks on the vocabulary acquisition of young learners in an EFL setting. A total of 62 Grade 6 students in two classes in a public school in Turkey participated in the study. Data were collected by the Cambridge English Test (CYLET) and Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS). Results showed that the experimental group students outperformed the control group students in acquisition of both selected and unselected vocabulary items. The use of interactive tasks as post-reading activities proved to be an effective way of enhancing the L2 vocabulary knowledge of young learners.

Résumé : Apprendre une langue nécessite d'assimiler des milliers de mots. C'est pourquoi les enseignants et leurs étudiants voudraient savoir comment faciliter l'apprentissage du vocabulaire, tout particulièrement dans le contexte de l'enseignement de l'anglais, langue seconde, dans lequel les apprenants n'acquièrent souvent qu'un lexique limité, même après plusieurs années d'études. Les recherches ont montré que la lecture joue un rôle important, mais insuffisant pour maîtriser le vocabulaire d'une langue seconde. Les lectures doivent être suivies d'activités supplémentaires visant à améliorer les connaissances en vocabulaire. L'article porte sur les effets de deux types d'activités après lecture sur l'acquisition du vocabulaire chez de jeunes apprenants de l'anglais, langue seconde : des activités individuelles de rédaction et des activités de rédaction associées à des exercices interactifs. Au total,

62 élèves de deux classes de 6^e année d'une école publique située en Turquie ont participé à l'étude. Les données ont été recueillies à l'aide de l'examen *Cambridge English Test* (CYLET) et d'une échelle de connaissance du vocabulaire, la *Vocabulary Knowledge Scale* (VKS). Le groupe examiné a obtenu de meilleurs résultats que le groupe témoin pour ce qui est de l'acquisition d'éléments sélectionnés et non sélectionnés du vocabulaire. On en conclut que faire suivre la lecture d'un texte par des exercices interactifs est un moyen efficace d'améliorer la connaissance du vocabulaire de la langue seconde des jeunes apprenants.

Introduction

The increasing body of L2 research literature on vocabulary learning and teaching in recent years clearly demonstrates the significance of vocabulary knowledge, both as part of L2 proficiency and as a basis for further L2 learning. However, there is mounting evidence that many learners, particularly in EFL contexts (Hunt & Beglar, 2005), are not developing their lexicons to levels that would permit them to communicate, read, or write adequately in English, despite years of formal study (Barrow, Nakanishi, & Ishino, 1999; Nurweni & Read, 1999). Thus, investigating the effectiveness of various types of vocabulary learning methods as well as instructional techniques has been of considerable value to L2 research and pedagogy.

Theoretical framework

Although incidental learning via guessing from context is known to be the most important source of L1 vocabulary expansion beyond the first few thousand words in common oral usage (Nagy, Herman, & Anderson, 1985; Nation & Coady, 1988), studies on the relationship between L2 reading practice and vocabulary gains have reported that 'getting students to read' is not sufficient for L2 vocabulary learning (Laufer, 1997; Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001; Meara, 1997). Second/foreign language learners in a variety of contexts were found to acquire few words through reading and guessing, even when these words were presented several times (Day, Omura, & Hiramatsu, 1991; Dupuy & Krashen, 1993; Pitts, White, & Krashen, 1989).

It appears from research that if systematic development of vocabulary is desired, reading should be enhanced through instructional intervention, especially in instructed foreign language contexts (Elley, 1989; Ellis, 1994; Hulstijn, 1992; Nation & Waring, 1997; Schmidt &

McCarthy, 1997; Stoller & Grabe, 1993; Zimmerman, 1997). Given the limitations of decontextualized vocabulary instruction, the question for L2 pedagogy in the last decades has been on investigating ways to enhance L2 vocabulary acquisition through instructional intervention. For example, the presence of marginal glosses was found to enhance vocabulary retention when compared to the absence of marginal glosses (Hulstijn, Hollander, & Greidanus, 1996; Watanabe, 1997). Paribakht and Wesche (1997) compared learners in a reading-only condition with learners in a reading-plus condition in which the students were asked to read the selected texts and carry out vocabulary exercises. The results indicated that the reading-plus vocabulary treatment led to greater gains in target vocabulary knowledge than the reading-only treatment. The results were consistent with those of Hulstijn (2001) in that word learning through reading was enhanced by making the words salient, which pedagogically helped learners understand and retain the target words better, not only because of multiple exposures to given words, but also because of cognitive 'elaboration' of form-meaning relationships through association-making and other mental activity. Finally, Laufer (2003) in a study with EFL students compared vocabulary gains from reading with gains from productive word-focused tasks, (i.e., sentence completion, sentence writing, and composition writing). The results of the study showed that if a word is practised in a productive word-focused task, its meaning has a better chance to be remembered than if the word is encountered in a text, even when it is noticed and looked up in a dictionary.

A review of literature has shown that the studies comparing the effects of reading only with those of reading along with vocabulary activities were done only with adolescent and adult learners. On the other hand, a number of studies carried out with L1 children have identified limited vocabulary as an important factor in the underachievement of children (Biemiller, 2004; Chall, 1983; Chall, Jacobs, & Belsdwin, 1990; Hart & Risley, 2003; White, Grace, & Slater, 1990). Children with larger vocabulary found reading easier, read more widely, and did better in schools (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001). Conversely, children who had limited vocabulary found reading difficult, resisted reading, learned fewer words, and consequently fell further behind (Dickinson, McCabe, Anastasopoulos, Peisner-Feinberg, & Poe, 2003; Stanovich, 1986).

On the basis of these findings, it seems likely that limited L2 vocabulary would affect the elementary school EFL learners in carrying out the basic skills in English. Given the importance of vocabulary to oral and written language comprehension, it is astounding that there

have been very few experimental studies on English vocabulary learning among elementary school children. In these studies, language minority children were provided with instruction consisting of a variety of strategies that had been effective with English-only learners (Beck & McKewon, 2001; Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2002; Beck, McKeown, & Omanson, 1987; Beck, Perfetti, & McKeown, 1982; Craik & Tulving, 1975; Stahl & Fairbanks, 1986; Stahl & Clark, 1987; Stahl, 1999). These strategies included providing definitional and contextual information about each word's meaning, actively involving students in word learning through talking about, comparing, analyzing, and using the target words, providing multiple exposures to meaningful information about each word, and teaching word analysis.

The present study aims to expand current knowledge on foreign-language vocabulary learning and to compare the effects of two types of post-reading activities on the vocabulary knowledge of beginner-level young EFL learners in Turkey. The main research question addressed was whether reading comprehension plus interactive tasks led to more effective acquisition of selected and unselected vocabulary items than did an equal amount of learning time spent on reading comprehension plus discrete written vocabulary exercises.

Before discussing the methodology of this study, brief information about the Turkish context will be provided.

Teaching English to young learners: The Turkish situation

Political, economic, and cultural needs, and technological and economic changes in the world have influenced foreign language education in Turkey, as in many other countries in the world. Starting from the 1960s, when international ties were being established, Turkey started to feel an increasing need to keep up with the rapidly globalizing world in foreign language proficiency. After the 1980s, the acquisition of English was also 'aided by the language-in-education-planning' (Doğançay-Aktuna, 1998, p. 28). Since then, English has become the *sine qua non* for a successful career in virtually any field, and consequently an integral component of national education at all levels.

In the last decade the Turkish educational system has undergone significant changes. The passage of a law in 1997 introduced the new eight-year compulsory education system, and as a result of the government's wish to equip its citizens with improved foreign language proficiency, it became obligatory for public primary school students to start studying a foreign language, generally English, from the fourth grade on.¹ In 2000, foreign language education at the level of kindergarten and

in the first three grades of primary education was officially permitted by the Ministry of Education.²

According to the regulations, English is taught two hours a week in Grades 4 and 5, and four hours a week in Grades 6, 7, and 8. English in public schools is generally taught by native speakers of Turkish, and the course books used are published by the Ministry of Education. The class size ranges from 35 to 60. In private elementary schools, however, the situation is totally different. English is taught as an 'extracurricular activity' for three to four periods per week from Grade 1 to make children familiar with the English sound system, and in Grades 2 and 3 some vocabulary development is customary. Formal instruction begins in the Grade 4 with eight to ten periods a week.

Besides the diversity in the number of hours dedicated to English language education, there is also a discrepancy in instructional methods and materials used. Typical foreign language instruction in public schools consists mostly of rote memorization of vocabulary, and written grammar exercises. Classes are predominantly teacher-centred, and students are usually asked to read passages from the course books and underline and look up the new words in a dictionary. Learning vocabulary by using traditional mnemonic techniques such as writing words repeatedly or mouthing them are highly popular. The words studied are mostly the ones that occur in a given text; oral communication in English is very limited. Thus, although there have not been any formal evaluation studies, it is a well-known fact that public primary school students have poor lexicons, despite years of formal study.

Method

Participants and setting

The participants in this study were 62 Grade 6 students in two classes in a public school in Istanbul, Turkey. The two classes were compared in students' first-term English achievement test scores, and the *t*-test applied to the achievement scores did not show any difference between the groups ($p < .545$). Thus, it was concluded that the groups, randomly assigned to control and experimental conditions, with 32 and 30 students respectively, were similar in their English proficiency.

The students were all native speakers of Turkish with an average age of 11. They were all from low-income families, none of them had ever been to an English-speaking country, and all had very few opportunities to use English for communicative purposes outside the classroom. They all had English in Grades 4 and 5 for two hours a week and as Grade 6

students they had English for four hours a week. In response to a question directed to all students at the beginning of the study 'Do you want to express your ideas in English?' all indicated they wanted to speak English but could not. Many of them noted that they wanted to 'chat in English, read English comics, and understand English movies/songs' but did not know 'sufficient' English words.

The English teacher of both classes was a Turkish native speaker with a five years of teaching experience. She had graduated from the ELT department of a state university in Istanbul.

Data collection and analysis

Data for the present study were collected by the Cambridge Young Learners English Test (CYLET) developed by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (2002) and by Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS) adapted from Paribakht and Wesche (1997).

Both instruments, the CYLET and VKS, were piloted with a different class of Grade 6, and were given to participants as pre-tests and post-tests. Both instruments had good internal consistency with a Cronbach alpha coefficient reported of .81 and .84, respectively.

The CYLET aims to test the English level of learners between the ages of 7 and 12, and consists of three levels of assessment: Starters, Movers, and Flyers. At the beginning of the study, it seemed more appropriate to use Movers, considering the amount of time learners had spent on learning English (approximately two and a half years). Yet during our observations and the pilot study we realized that the students' level of English was rather low, and most of the vocabulary and structures in Movers were unknown to them. Thus we decided to use Starters. For the purposes of the present study, only the reading/writing section, assessing the receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge of learners, was used.

The reading/writing section of Starters has five parts with five questions each. The first part aims to assess the receptive vocabulary knowledge of the students: There are five statements, each accompanied by a picture, and the student has to place a tick in a box if the statement describes the picture and a cross if it does not. In the second part, students are given a picture and a set of related statements, some of which are correct and some of which are not. Students only write 'yes' or 'no' as appropriate. In the third part, productive vocabulary knowledge is tested in a limited way. Students are given five pictures, accompanied by the name of the object in jumbled letters, and asked to put the

letters in order. In the fourth part, students read a short text of one paragraph with blanks. For each blank a picture is given and students are asked to supply the missing words by using the picture as a clue. In the last part, there are three pictures making up a story with five related questions, each of which requires a one-word answer. The scoring of the CYLET was carried out according to the scoring criteria suggested by University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate. In the present study CYLET was used to assess students' knowledge of 'unselected' words. We used the term *unselected* because the vocabulary in the CYLET was not related to the vocabulary in the course book of the students.

The VKS adapted from Paribakht and Wesche (1997) was designed to assess students' receptive and productive knowledge of selected target vocabulary; that is, how many of the target vocabulary items they were familiar with, and how accurately they could use a word in a sentence. The aim of the VKS was to elicit self-perceived and demonstrated vocabulary knowledge of learners in written form. The elicitation scale was originally a six-point scale, yet, as this study was carried out with young learners, the scale was modified and a two-point scale was used, as illustrated in Figure 1.

As can be seen, the self-report category A represented unfamiliarity with a word, while self-report category B represented knowledge of a word. If students chose category B for a word, they were asked to demonstrate this knowledge by writing its meaning in Turkish or in English and using it in a sentence in English.

The VKS consisted of 25 target vocabulary items, which were randomly selected from the students' course book (see Appendix A for sample words). For the scoring of student responses, the scoring scale of Paribakht & Wesche (1997) was adapted (see Appendix B).

The student responses in CYLET and VKS were evaluated by both researchers separately and the inter-rater reliability was found to be 0.85 and 0.81 respectively.

FIGURE 1

Elicitation scale (adapted from Paribakht & Wesche, 1997)

Self-report categories

A I do not know the word ()

B I know the word ()

Meaning: _____

Sentence: _____

An independent samples *t*-test was applied to the data obtained from the CYLET and the VKS before and after the study, and the significance level for both *t*-tests was set at $p < .05$.

Procedure

The study took place in the second term of the 2004–2005 academic year and lasted six weeks. During the first term we observed and video-recorded several regular EFL English classes in three different public primary schools in order to determine the ways primary school students were learning English vocabulary. Two weeks before the study we conducted a pilot study with the post-reading tasks we had prepared for vocabulary teaching with a different Grade 6 class, and we modified our design of instructional treatment.

In the first week of the term, both classes were given CYLET and the VKS as the pre-test on different days. To make the students in the experimental group familiar with the interactive tasks, the teacher gave all instructions in Turkish and modelled similar tasks to students who then practised them in groups for one week. The six-week vocabulary instruction in both groups started after the orientation week. One week following the instructional treatments, the same CYLET and VKS with the parts/words in a different order were given to the groups as the post-test.

Regular instruction in both groups

The course book used in English lessons was *Quick Step2*³ (Genç, Oruç, & Şeremet, 2003). In each unit a different topic – football, spring, office machines, animals – was introduced by a dialogue in which target words to be learned were presented in context, yet in a highly restricted language. After the students read the dialogue aloud in class, the teacher taught each target word explicitly and wrote it with the Turkish equivalent on the board, and the students copied the definition and the sentence with the relevant word from the dialogue into their notebooks. Following the comprehension and T/F questions, the teacher first presented the relevant grammar rule explicitly on the board, generally in Turkish, and then distributed worksheets of grammar exercises such as gap filling and transformation exercises. The answers were then checked as a whole class. For vocabulary, students were given discrete written vocabulary tasks, such as providing the equivalent of the target

word in L1, matching the target word with a definition or synonym, and fill-in-the-blanks exercises with sentences mostly taken from the text. Two hours were spent on these exercises.

Instructional treatments

In addition to the dialogue given in the course book, students in both classes were given a three or four-paragraph text thematically related to the dialogue in the course book⁴ (see Appendix C for a sample text; see Table 1 for the differences and similarities between groups in terms of instruction). For example, in the unit on animals, the extra text given was 'My Pets.' Students in the control group followed the procedure of regular instruction with the reading text: after reading the text, they went over the target words and did discrete written vocabulary tasks as post-reading activities similar to the ones mentioned.

Students in the experimental group, on the other hand, were asked to work in groups of three or four. Each student in the group was given a picture related to one paragraph of the text that he or she was to read. After each student read his or her part, the teacher collected the texts and gave each student a card with the key words of the paragraph. To make the jigsaw task easier for the children, some words were given on the picture in the first three weeks. Typically students worked through the cards sequentially, or told each other what their pictures contained and tried to use the given words. Each student was responsible for repeating and/or clarifying any points not understood by the rest. When asking questions or giving equivalents, students in general shifted to Turkish. When retelling was over, students wrote the story together. During this information exchange, the teacher monitored the groups and helped them with vocabulary when necessary. Then, asking students randomly, the teacher went over the whole text, particularly guiding them to use the target words – words they had learned in that specific unit. When students needed to use a different form of the target word, the teacher provided it and wrote a sentence with the new form on the board.

If they had time at the end of the lesson, they did one of the following tasks in class or were assigned as homework: drawing a relevant picture together or writing a poem on the topic and sharing it with the rest, writing questions to ask to other groups, or sharing their own experiences on the relevant topic. While monitoring these activities, the teacher looked for use of the target vocabulary as much as possible.

TABLE 1
Task similarities and differences between groups for a one-week period

| | Control group | Experimental group |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Week 1: 2 hours | Dialogue in the course book + discrete written tasks | Dialogue in the course book + discrete written tasks |
| Week 1: 2 hours | Thematically related text Individual reading | Thematically related text Group work – each student reads one paragraph |
| | Post-reading tasks: discrete written tasks | Post-reading tasks: interactive tasks in groups and whole class |

Note: Instruction was the same for all six weeks.

Results

To find whether there were differences between the experimental and control groups in their unselected vocabulary knowledge at the end of the study, an independent *t*-test was applied to both groups’ gain scores in the CYLET test. As can be seen in Table 2, there was a significant difference between the groups in their gain scores in unselected vocabulary items.

The groups were also compared in their selected vocabulary gain scores on the VKS at the end of the study. The results presented in Table 3 show that the gain score of the experimental group was significantly higher than that of the control group.

Discussion

The present study aimed to find out the effects of two types of post-reading activities on the vocabulary knowledge of beginner-level Turkish young EFL learners. Results of the study have shown that the experimental group students who carried out reading comprehension and interactive tasks as post-reading activities for six weeks outperformed the students in the control group who did reading as well as written vocabulary tasks in acquisition of selected and unselected vocabulary items.

The conceptual framework of this study is bounded by previous research in the social context of learning, reciprocal teaching, and communicative activities. Several researchers (Brown, 1992; Brown & Campione, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978) maintained that socially interactive learning is critical to learning and cognitive development. In the present study we tried to create an interactive environment through tasks and group work. Students worked together to accomplish a set task and

TABLE 2
Differences between groups in their CYLET gain scores

| Group | Test | <i>M*</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|----------------------------------|------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Experimental (<i>n</i> = 30) | Pre | 79.01 | 9.28 | 60 | 3.39 | 0.001 |
| | Post | 88.88 | 9.98 | | | |
| Control (<i>n</i> = 32) | Pre | 81.08 | 8.40 | 60 | 3.39 | 0.001 |
| | Post | 83.67 | 8.97 | | | |

* Total scores are out of 100.

TABLE 3
Differences between the groups in their vocabulary gain scores

| Group | Test | <i>M*</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>df</i> | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|----------------------------------|------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Experimental (<i>n</i> = 30) | Pre | 38.80 | 18.07 | 60 | 3.33 | 0.001 |
| | Post | 52.37 | 31.59 | | | |
| Control (<i>n</i> = 32) | Pre | 39.52 | 18.93 | 60 | 3.33 | 0.001 |
| | Post | 44.10 | 20.69 | | | |

* Total scores are out of 100.

were encouraged to ask questions of each other. In contrast to a traditional instructor-led environment, here the instructor observed the interactions of the groups and provided them with scaffolding when necessary.

Jigsaw activities based on reciprocal teaching techniques were used in several studies with the aim of strengthening the reading skills among poor readers of English (Palincsar & Brown, 1984; 1988) who were trained to use four metacognitive strategies necessary for reciprocal teaching. Results revealed that the reciprocal students scored higher on comprehension monitoring tests, and the success was attributed to not only the strategies involved but also the interaction of the students in cooperative learning. Other research has also shown reciprocal teaching to be beneficial in contexts beyond the building of reading skills in English (King & Parent Johnson, 1999; Webb, 1989). In the present study, the act of verbalization and exchanging information was a key component of group work. Students who were used to developing understanding of class material by reading the course book were asked to explain their part of the story to other students. The jigsaw task allowed them to combine the parts for which they were responsible with parts from other students to construct a complete body of knowledge that all could share. Thus, during this reciprocal teaching, each student became the teacher and the distributor of knowledge. Confirming the results of

studies on reciprocal teaching (Donaldson & Kötter, 1999; King & Parent Johnson), the reciprocal pattern of teaching and learning in this study seemed to promote students' collaborative relationship in constructing meanings together, thus positively affecting their productive use of vocabulary.

Studies carried out to investigate the attitudinal and motivational characteristics of young learners (Djigunovic, 1995; Nikolov, 1999) revealed that young learners were most strongly motivated by classroom practice rather than integrative or instrumental reasons. In the present study a number of characteristics of the tasks seemed to motivate the learners to learn. To begin, acquisition of the ability to speak the language is generally regarded as the primary expectation in English classes. However, teacher to student-led directives in English – the prevalent pattern of interaction in Turkish elementary classes – do not constitute true communication any more than student to teacher exchanges of brief, one-word answers or patterned responses. Such exercises fail for lack of reciprocity – recognized in the early 1900s by Kafka, who called it the 'social interdependence perspective' (Johnson & Johnson, 1994). As later defined by Lewin, this social interdependence is the essence of making the group a dynamic whole. Confirming the results of other research (Dörnyei, 1997; Kessler, 1992), the present study has shown that interdependency and collaboration among group members substantially enhanced the motivation of learners contributing to learners' vocabulary knowledge. Moreover, the use of thematically related texts, word cards, and pictures may have positively affected the learners. Finally, the teacher played a significant role in motivating the learners. She acted as an educational facilitator and social mediator, providing encouragement for participants. Responding promptly to the students' questions and requests for help in vocabulary also made them feel that the teacher supported them in the task.

Conclusion

To conclude, teaching English to young learners is a recent issue in Turkey, and the conditions for effective language learning in public schools are not fully established. Among other factors, course books with mostly discrete written grammar and vocabulary exercises in a restricted language, and students not being provided with sufficient opportunities for classroom interaction to develop their basic skills can be considered as the most important factors underlying this failure. As was seen in the present study, after having two and a half years of English for four to six hours a week, students could not cope with the

vocabulary of the Movers – the second level of the Cambridge Young Learners Test.

The findings of the study have implications for young-learner English instruction, especially in the EFL contexts where teaching and learning conditions are less than ideal. The findings of the present study have revealed that interactive tasks as post-reading activities are an effective way of enhancing L2 vocabulary knowledge of young learners. This type of post-reading task can be carried out in young-learner classes as an alternative to traditional discrete written vocabulary tasks.

Moreover, observations carried out during the study have indicated that interactive tasks were much more appealing to the needs and interests of young learners than written vocabulary exercises. In that respect, teachers of English working in the primary schools should be provided with in-service programs on the pedagogy for language teaching in primary education, and this training should be substantial and ongoing.

Finally, one of the aims of language learning is to gain critical literacy that is more than reading and writing and is inherently social and cultural (Gee, 1996; 2000). That is, the aim is that children are able to understand and communicate not only in their own native language but also in the language they are learning. Interactive tasks based on developing learners' lexicon may be considered as an important step to reach that aim.

The study has its limitations too. First, it is difficult to draw strong generalizations from the limited number of learners. Further research with a greater number of EFL learners in various contexts and in classes of different proficiency levels is needed to find the probable effects of free-production tasks on young learners' L2 vocabulary learning. Second, the small number of students was an important factor in making classroom activities possible (e.g., retelling in small groups); thus, the model may need certain modifications in large classes.

The studies referred to in the introduction section of this article focused on the impact(s) of different activities (e.g., productive tasks, dictionary use, glossing) on vocabulary learning in comparison to reading only. To put it another way, they did not address the question of how different types of post-reading activities may affect vocabulary learning. However, the present study has aimed to determine the contribution(s) of two types of post-reading activities to vocabulary learning. In conclusion, in spite of its limitations it has been beneficial in underscoring the crucial importance of free-production tasks in enhancing vocabulary knowledge of students as well as significantly improving their ability to put it into practice.

Derin Atay is an assistant professor at the Department of English Language Education at Marmara University, Ýstanbul, Turkey. She has published articles on the role of research and multiculturalism in pre-service and in-service English language teacher education. Her current research interests are the use of strategies and the role of vocabulary in learning English as a foreign language.

Contact: dyatay@yahoo.com

Gökce Kurt is an instructor at the English Language Teaching Department of Marmara University, Turkey. She is doing her PhD at Bogazici University, Turkey. Her research interests include teaching vocabulary in L2, teacher education, and learner autonomy.

Notes

- 1 Intensive English instruction has been provided in private schools for decades, and generally starts at the level of kindergarten.
- 2 For these levels, English instruction is optional.
- 3 *Quick Step 2* was published and suggested by the Turkish Ministry of Education.
- 4 The texts were chosen by the researchers and teacher together.

References

- Barrow, J., Nakanishi, Y., & Ishino, H. (1999). Assessing Japanese college students' vocabulary knowledge with a self-checking familiarity survey. *System*, 27, 223–47.
- Beck, I., & McKewon, M.G. (2001). Text talk: Capturing the benefits of read-aloud experiences for young children. *Reading Teacher*, 55, 10–20.
- Beck, I., McKewon, M., & Kucan, L. (2002). *Bringing words to life*. New York: Guilford.
- Beck, I., McKewon, M., & Omanson, R. (1987). The effects and use of diverse vocabulary instructional techniques. In M. McKewon & M. Curtis (Eds.), *The nature of vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 147–163). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Beck, I., Perfetti, C., & McKewon, M. (1982). Effects of long-term vocabulary instruction on lexical access and reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(4), 506–521.
- Biemiller, A. (2004). Teaching vocabulary in the primary grades: Vocabulary instruction needed. In J. Baumann & E. Kame'enui (Eds.), *Vocabulary instruction: Research to practice* (pp. 28–40). New York: Guilford.
- Brown, A.L. (1992). Design experiments: Theoretical and methodological challenges in creating complex interventions in classroom settings. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 2(2), 141–178.

- Brown, A.L., & Campione, J.C. (1990). Communities of learning and thinking, or a context by any other name. *Developmental Perspectives on Teaching and Learning Thinking Skills*, 21, 108–126.
- Cambridge Young Learners English Tests. (2002). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chall, J. (1983, May). *Vocabularies for reading: How large? What kind?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association, Anaheim, CA.
- Chall, J., Jacobs, V., & Baldwin, L. (1990). *The reading crisis: Why poor children fall behind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Craik, F.I.M., & Tulving, E. (1975). Depth of processing and the retention of words in episodic memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 104, 268–294.
- Day, R.R., Omura, C., & Hiramatsu, M. (1991). Incidental EFL vocabulary learning and reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 7, 541–551.
- Dickinson, D.K., McCabe, A., Anastasopoulos, L., Peisner-Feinberg, E.S., & Poe, M.D. (2003). The comprehensive language approach to early literacy: The interrelationships among vocabulary, phonological sensitivity, and print knowledge among preschool-aged children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(3), 465–481.
- Dickinson, D.K., & Tabors, P.O. (Eds.). (2001). *Building literacy with language: Young children learning at home and school*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Djigunovic, J. (1995). Attitudes of young foreign language learners. In M. Vilke & Y. Vrhovac (Eds.), *Children and foreign language* (pp. 16–34). Zagreb: University of Zagreb.
- Doğançay-Aktuna, S. (1998). The spread of English in Turkey and its current sociolinguistic profile. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 19(1), 24–39.
- Donaldson, R.P., & Kötter, M. (1999). Language learning in cyberspace: Teleporting the classroom into the target culture. *CALICO Journal*, 16, 531–557.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1997). Psychological processes in cooperative language learning: Group dynamics and motivation. *Modern Language Journal*, 81(4), 482–493.
- Dupuy, B., & Krashen, S. (1993). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in French as foreign language. *Applied Language Learning*, 4, 55–63.
- Elley, W. (1989). Vocabulary acquisition from listening to stories. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 24, 174–187.
- Ellis, R. (1994). Factors in the incidental acquisition of second language vocabulary from oral input: A review essay. *Applied Language Learning*, 5, 1–32.
- Gee, J.P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. London: Taylor & Francis.

- Gee, J.P. (2000). The new literacy studies: From 'socially situated' to the work of the social. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton, & R. Ivani (Eds.), *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context* (pp. 180–196). New York: Routledge.
- Genç, H., Oruç, N., & Şeremet, C. (2003). *Quick step 2*. Ankara: M.E.B. Yayınevi.
- Hart, B., & Risley, T. (2003). The early catastrophe. *American Educator*, 27(1), 4–9.
- Hulstijn, J.H. (1992). Retention of inferred and given word meanings: Experiments in incidental vocabulary learning. In P.J.L. Arnaud & H. Béjoint (Eds.), *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics* (pp. 113–125). London: Macmillan.
- Hulstijn, J.H. (2001). Intentional and incidental second-language vocabulary learning: A reappraisal of elaboration, rehearsal and automaticity. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 258–286). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hulstijn, J.H., Hollander, M., & Greidanus, T. (1996). Incidental vocabulary learning by advanced foreign language students: The influence of marginal glosses, dictionary use, and reoccurrences of unknown words. *Modern Language Journal*, 80, 327–339.
- Hunt, A., & Beglar, D. (2005). A framework for developing EFL reading vocabulary. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 17(1), 23–59.
- Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R.T. (1994). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive and individualistic learning* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kessler, C. (Ed). (1992). *Cooperative language learning: A teacher's resource book*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- King, C.M., & Parent Johnson, L.M. (1999). Constructing meaning via reciprocal teaching. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 38(3), 169–186.
- Laufer, B. (1997). What's in a word that makes it hard or easy? Intralexical factors affecting the difficulty of vocabulary acquisition. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp. 140–155). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Laufer, B. (2003). Vocabulary acquisition in a second language: Do learners really acquire most vocabulary by reading? Some empirical evidence. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 59(4), 567–585.
- Laufer, B., & Hulstijn, J.H. (2001). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics*, 22, 1–26.
- Meara, P. (1997). Towards a new approach to modelling vocabulary acquisition. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp. 109–121). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nagy, W., Herman, P., & Anderson, R. (1985). *Learning word meanings from context: How broadly generalizable?* (Tech. rep. no. 347). Urbana: Center for the Study of Reading, University of Illinois.

- Nation, I.S.P., & Coady, J. (1988). Vocabulary and reading. In R. Carter & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary and language teaching*. London: Longman.
- Nation, P., & Waring, R. (1997). Vocabulary size, text coverage and word lists. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp. 6–19). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nikolov, M. (1999). 'Why do you learn English?' 'Because the teacher is short.' A study of Hungarian children's foreign language learning motivation. *Language Teaching Research*, 3(1), 33–56.
- Nurweni, A., & Read, J. (1999). The English vocabulary knowledge of Indonesian university students. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18, 161–175.
- Paribakht, T.S., & Wesche, M. (1997). Vocabulary enhancement activities and reading for meaning in second language vocabulary acquisition. In J. Coady & T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy* (pp. 174–200). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palincsar, A.S., & Brown, A.L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension monitoring activities. Technical report #269, January 1983 (microfiche).
- Palincsar, A.S., & Brown, A.L. (1988). Teaching and practicing thinking skills to promote comprehension in the context of group problem solving. *Reading and Special Education*, 9(1), 53–59.
- Pitts, M., White, H., & Krashen, S. (1989). Acquiring second language vocabulary through reading: A replication of the Clockwork Orange study using second language acquirers. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 5, 271–275.
- Schmitt, N., & McCarthy, M. (Eds.). (1997). *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stahl, S. (1999). *Vocabulary development*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.
- Stahl, S., & Clark, C. (1987). The effects of participatory expectations in classroom discussion on the learning of science vocabulary. *American Educational Research Journal*, 24, 541–556.
- Stanovich, K. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21, 360–406.
- Stoller, F., & Grabe, W. (1993). Implications for L2 vocabulary acquisition and instruction from L1 vocabulary research. In T. Huckin, M. Haynes, & J. Coady (Eds.), *Second language reading and vocabulary learning* (pp. 24–45). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Strange, D., & Hall, D. (2000). *Pacesetter starter student's book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Watanabe, Y. (1997). Input, intake, and retention: Effects of increased processing on incidental learning of foreign language vocabulary. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 287–307.

- Webb, N.M. (1989). Peer interaction, problem solving and cognition: Multidisciplinary perspectives. *Journal of Educational Research*, 13(1), 1–119.
- White, T., Grace, M., & Slater, W. (1990). Growth of reading vocabulary in diverse elementary schools: Decoding and word meaning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 281–290.
- Zimmerman, C.B. (1997). Do reading and interactive vocabulary instruction make a difference? An empirical study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 121–141.

Appendix A

Sample words from the vocabulary checklist

For each word below, select A (I do not know the word) or B (I know the word). If you select choice B, you are expected to write the meaning of the word in Turkish or in English and to use this word in an English sentence.

1. Bicycle A () B ()
 Meaning (L1/L2): _____
 Sentence: _____
2. Cook A () B ()
 Meaning (L1/L2): _____
 Sentence: _____

Appendix B

Scoring of the vocabulary checklist

(adapted from Paribakht & Wesche, 1997)

A student receives a score of 1 if she or he chooses category A. As for the self-report B, the student's score depends on the accuracy of the response. To illustrate, incorrect translation of a word in self-report B will lead to a score of 2. A score of 3 reflects that correct translation has been given but the word has not been used in a sentence in self-report category B. A score of 4 is given if the word is translated correctly but used in a semantically and grammatically inappropriate sentence. A score of 5 is given if the word is translated correctly, used in a semantically appropriate but ungrammatical sentence. A score of 6 indicates the correct translation of a word and the use of the word in a semantically and grammatically correct sentence.

Sample A. Vocabulary item: *cook* (n.)

Student response: A () B (X)

Word meaning: *kek*

Although the student reported that he or she knew the word, the wrong translation was given. Thus, this response received the score of 2: 'The word is familiar but incorrect translation is given.'

Sample B. Vocabulary item: *sad* (adj.)

Student response: A () B (X)

Word meaning: *mutusuz*

Sentence: (no sentence)

It is clear from the correct translation that the student knows the meaning of the word. However, he or she did not use the word in a sentence and, therefore, this response received the score of 3: 'Correct translation is given but the word is not used in a sentence.'

Appendix C

Sample reading text

Read this article about a rich man's dream house.

A DREAM HOME

Bill Gates is a computer millionaire. He has got a very modern house in the USA. His home has got 45 rooms and there are computers for all the rooms. There are computers for all the radios, TVs, and videos in the house. There are two living rooms in the house: a small one for Bill Gates and his family and a very large one with sofas and chairs for 150 people! There are 12 bathrooms and there is a very large kitchen with a fridge, a cooker, a table, and some chairs.

Bill Gates and his family sometimes watch films in their private cinema – all the films are on computer – or they swim in their private swimming pool. They also have a garage for 20 cars.

Source: *Pacesetter Starter Student's Book* (Strange & Hall, 2000)